

THE RECOVERY OF THE ANCIENT HEBREW LANGUAGE



Hebrew Bible Monographs, 20

Series Editors

David J.A. Clines, J. Cheryl Exum, Keith W. Whitelam

Editorial Board

A. Graeme Auld, Marc Brettler, David M. Carr, Paul M. Joyce,
Francis Landy, Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, Stuart D.E. Weeks

THE RECOVERY
OF THE ANCIENT HEBREW LANGUAGE

THE LEXICOGRAPHICAL WRITINGS
OF D. WINTON THOMAS

John Day

*Accompanied by Copies of D. Winton Thomas's
Lexicographical Articles*



SHEFFIELD PHOENIX PRESS

2013

Copyright © 2013 Sheffield Phoenix Press

Published by Sheffield Phoenix Press
Department of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield
45 Victoria Street
Sheffield S3 7QB

www.sheffieldphoenix.com

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without the publishers' permission in writing.

A CIP catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

Typeset by Forthcoming Publications
Printed by Lightning Source

ISBN 978-1-906055-31-8
ISSN 1747-9614

CONTENTS

Preface	xi
Acknowledgments	xiii
Abbreviations	xvii
 Chapter 1	
DAVID WINTON THOMAS: THE MAN, HIS LIFE AND HIS WORK	1
 Chapter 2	
AN ADJECTIVE AND ALLEGED SUPERLATIVE (OR INTENSIVE) FORMS	9
 Chapter 3	
SOME NOUNS	23
 Chapter 4	
SOME VERBAL ROOTS	54
 Chapter 5	
THE VERB <i>yd'</i>	80
 Chapter 6	
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	101
 D. WINTON THOMAS'S LEXICOGRAPHICAL ARTICLES	113
1. <i>The Recovery of the Ancient Hebrew Language: An Inaugural Lecture</i> (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1939).	119
2. 'The Language of the Old Testament', in H.W. Robinson (ed.), <i>Record and Revelation: Essays on the Old Testament by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), pp. 374-402.	157

3. 'Some Observations on the Hebrew Word רִעָנָן',
in B. Hartmann *et al.* (eds.), *Hebräische Wortforschung:
Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner*
(VTSup, 16; Leiden: Brill, 1967), pp. 387-97. 186
4. 'A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing
the Superlative in Hebrew', *VT* 3 (1953), pp. 209-24. 197
5. 'Some Further Remarks on Unusual Ways of Expressing
the Superlative in Hebrew', *VT* 18 (1968), pp. 120-24. 213
6. 'The Use of נִצָּח as a Superlative in Hebrew', *JSS* 1 (1956),
pp. 106-109. 218
7. 'צִלְמוֹת in the Old Testament', *JSS* 7 (1962), pp. 191-200. 222
8. 'בְּלִיעָל in the Old Testament', in J.N. Birdsall and
R.W. Thomson (eds.), *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory
of Robert Pierce Casey* (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), pp. 11-19. 232
9. 'Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs',
JTS 38 (1937), pp. 400-403. 241
10. 'A Note on דִּעָה in Proverbs xxii. 12', *JTS* NS 14 (1963),
pp. 93-94. 245
11. 'A Note on דִּרְבִּים in Isaiah xlix. 9b', *JTS* NS 19 (1968),
pp. 203-204. 247
12. 'The Meaning of יָי in Psalm lxxx. 14', *ExpTim* 86 (1965),
p. 385. 249
13. 'A Note on Exodus xv. 2', *ExpTim* 48 (1937), p. 478. 250
14. 'The Meaning of הִנָּצַח in Proverbs x. 16', *JTS* NS 15 (1964),
pp. 295-96. 251
15. 'A Note on מַהֲלִצוֹת in Zechariah iii 4', *JTS* 33 (1932), pp. 279-80. 252
16. 'A Note on חֲלִיצוֹתָם in Judges xiv 19', *JTS* 34 (1933), p. 165. 254
17. 'A Note on לִיקְחָהָ in Proverbs xxx. 17', *JTS* 42 (1941),
pp. 154-55. 255
18. "'A Drop of a Bucket"? Some Observations
on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah 40 15', in M. Black and
G. Fohrer (eds.), *In Memoriam Paul Kahle* (BZAW, 103;
Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1968), pp. 214-21. 256
19. 'Job xl 29b: Text and Translation', *VT* 14 (1964), pp. 114-16. 264
20. 'The Interpretation of בָּסוֹד in Job 29 4', *JBL* 65 (1946), pp. 63-66. 267
21. 'Hebrew עָנִי "Captivity"', *JTS* NS 16 (1965), pp. 444-45. 271
22. 'The Word רִבֵּעַ in Numbers xxiii. 10', *ExpTim* 46 (1935), p. 285. 273
23. 'Textual and Philological Notes on Some Passages
in the Book of Proverbs', in M. Noth and D.W. Thomas (eds.),
*Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East Presented
to Professor Harold Henry Rowley* (VTSup, 3; Leiden:
Brill, 1955), pp. 280-92. 274
24. 'Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs',
VT 15 (1965), pp. 271-79. 287
25. 'Mount Tabor: The Meaning of the Name', *VT* 1 (1951),
pp. 229-30. 296

26. 'The Meaning of the Name Mishal', <i>PEFQS</i> 68 (1936), pp. 39-40.	298
27. 'En-dor: A Sacred Spring?', <i>PEFQS</i> 65 (1933), pp. 205-206.	300
28. 'The Meaning of the Name Hammoth-dor', <i>PEFQS</i> 66 (1934), pp. 147-48.	302
29. 'Naphath-dor: A Hill Sanctuary?', <i>PEFQS</i> 67 (1935), pp. 89-90.	304
30. 'Proverbs xx 26', <i>JJS</i> 15 (1964), pp. 155-56.	306
31. 'Kelebh "Dog": Its Origin and Some Usages of It in the Old Testament', <i>VT</i> 10 (1960), pp. 410-27.	308
32. 'The Root אָהַב "Love" in Hebrew', <i>ZAW</i> 57 (NF 16, 1939), pp. 57-64.	326
33. 'Some Observations on the Hebrew Root חָדַל', in <i>Volume du Congrès: Strasbourg 1956</i> (VTSup, 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), pp. 8-16.	334
34. 'HDL-II in Hebrew', <i>CBQ</i> 24 (1962), p. 154.	343
35. 'The Interpretation of Proverbs xxix. 5', <i>ExpTim</i> 59 (1948), p. 112.	344
36. 'The Revised Psalter', <i>Theology</i> 66 (1963), pp. 504-507.	345
37. 'The Root מָכַר in Hebrew', <i>JTS</i> 37 (1936), pp. 388-89.	349
38. 'A Further Note on the Root מָכַר in Hebrew', <i>JTS</i> NS 3 (1952), p. 21.	351
39. 'מָלְאָר in Jeremiah iv. 5: A Military Term', <i>JJS</i> 3 (1952), pp. 47-52.	352
40. 'A Note on the Hebrew Root נָחַם', <i>ExpTim</i> 44 (1933), pp. 191-92.	358
41. 'Job's "Comforters"', <i>Durham University Journal</i> 28 (1933), pp. 276-77.	360
42. 'A Note on the Meaning of מִתְנַחֵם in Genesis xxvii. 42', <i>ExpTim</i> 51 (1940), p. 252.	362
43. 'A Study in Hebrew Synonyms: Verbs Signifying "to Breathe"', <i>Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete</i> 10 (1935), pp. 311-14.	363
44. 'A Note on the Hebrew Text of Judges 16, 20', <i>AJo</i> 10 (1935), pp. 162-63.	367
45. 'A Note on לָבִי סָחַרְחָר in Psalm xxxviii 11', <i>JTS</i> 40 (1939), pp. 390-91.	369
46. 'A Lost Hebrew Word in Isaiah ii. 6', <i>JTS</i> NS 13 (1962), pp. 323-24.	371
47. 'The Text of Jesaia ii 6 and the Word שָׁפַק', <i>ZAW</i> 75 (NF 34, 1963), pp. 83-90.	373
48. 'Translating Hebrew 'asāh', <i>BT</i> 17 (1966), pp. 190-93.	376
49. 'Jeremiah v. 28', <i>ExpTim</i> 57 (1945), pp. 54-55.	380
50. 'The Root צָנַע in Hebrew, and the Meaning of קָרַנְיָה in Malachi iii, 14', <i>JJS</i> 1 (1949), pp. 182-88.	381
51. 'A Pun on the Name Ashdod in Zephaniah ii. 4', <i>ExpTim</i> 74 (1962), p. 63.	388
52. 'The Root سَنَى = שָׁנָה in Hebrew', <i>ZAW</i> 52 (NF 11, 1934), pp. 236-38.	389
53. 'The Root سَنَى = שָׁנָה in Hebrew II', <i>ZAW</i> 55 (NF 14, 1937), pp. 174-76.	392

54. 'The LXX's Rendering of שְׁנוֹת לֵב טוֹב in Eccclus. xxxiii 13',
VT 10 (1960), p. 456. 395
55. 'The Root ידע in Hebrew', JTS 35 (1934), pp. 298-306. 396
56. 'The Root ידע in Hebrew, II', JTS 36 (1935), pp. 409-12. 405
57. 'A Note on לֹא תִדַּע in Proverbs v 6', JTS 37 (1936), pp. 59-60. 409
58. 'More Notes on the Root ידע in Hebrew', JTS 38 (1937),
pp. 404-405. 411
59. 'A Note on וְלֹא יִדְעוּ in Jeremiah xiv 18', JTS 39 (1938),
pp. 273-74. 413
60. 'A Note on the Meaning of ידע in Hosea ix. 7 and Isaiah ix. 8',
JTS 41 (1940), pp. 43-44. 415
61. 'Julius Fürst and the Hebrew Root ידע', JTS 42 (1941),
pp. 64-65. 417
62. 'Some Rabbinic Evidence for a Hebrew Root ידע = و ر ع',
JQR NS 37 (1946), pp. 177-78. 418
63. 'A Note on וְיִדְעוּ אֱלֹהִים in Exod. ii. 25', JTS 49 (1948),
pp. 143-44. 420
64. 'A Note on בְּמִדְעָךְ in Eccles. x. 20', JTS 50 (1949), p. 177. 422
65. 'A Note on מוֹעֲדֵיךָ in Jeremiah 24, 1', JTS NS 3 (1952), p. 55. 423
66. 'A Note on בְּלִי יִדְעָה in Proverbs 9¹³', JTS NS 4 (1953),
pp. 23-24. 424
67. 'Note on לִדְעָתָה in Job 37', JTS NS 5 (1954), pp. 56-57. 426
68. 'Some Remarks on the Hebrew Root ידע', JJS 6 (1955),
pp. 50-52. 428
69. 'Note on הִדְעָתָה in Daniel xii. 4', JTS NS 6 (1955), p. 226. 431
70. 'Note on נִדְעָדוּ in Amos iii. 3', JTS NS 7 (1956), pp. 69-70. 432
71. 'A Note on וְנִדְעָ לָכֶם in 1 Samuel vi. 3', JTS NS 11 (1960), p. 52. 434
72. 'Psalm xxxv. 15f.', JTS NS 12 (1961), pp. 50-51. 435
73. 'Additional Notes on the Root ידע in Hebrew', JTS NS 15
(1964), pp. 54-57. 437
74. 'A Consideration of Isaiah liii in the Light of Recent Textual
and Philological Study', ETL 44 (1968), pp. 79-86,
in H. Cazelles (ed.), *De Mari à Qumran: L'Ancien Testament. Son milieu. Ses relectures juives. Hommages à Mgr J. Coppens* (Gembloux: J. Duculot,
and Paris: Lethielleux, 1968), pp. 119-26. Also published
in ETL 44 (1968), pp. 79-86. 441
75. 'A Note on נִדְעָ in 1 Samuel xxii. 6', JTS NS 21 (1970),
pp. 401-402. 449
76. 'Job xxxvii 22', JJS 1 (1948), pp. 116-17. 451
77. 'אֶרֶץ in Proverbs xxxi 4', VT 12 (1962), pp. 499-500. 452
78. "'Until the day break, and the shadows fly away'",
ExpTim 47 (1936), pp. 431-32. 454
79. 'A Note on Eccclus. 51: 21a', JTS NS 20 (1969), pp. 225-26. 455
80. 'A Note on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah xli. 27', JTS NS 18
(1967), pp. 127-28. 457
81. 'Zechariah x.11a', ExpTim 66 (1955), pp. 272-73. 459

82.	‘נָצַב in Psalm xxxix, 6’, in J.M. Grintz and J. Liver (eds.), <i>Studies in the Bible Presented to Professor M.H. Segal</i> (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1964), pp. 10*-16*.	460
83.	‘A Note on שָׁנָה יְהִי in Psalm xc 5’, VT 18 (1968), pp. 267-68.	467
84.	‘Isaiah xlv.9-20: A Translation and Commentary’, in A. Caquot and M. Philonenko (eds.), <i>Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer</i> (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1971), pp. 319-30.	468
	Bibliography	479
	Index of References	493
	Index of Authors	499
	Index of Major Hebrew Words and Roots Discussed	503

PREFACE

This work consists of a monograph analysing in depth the main views expressed in the lexicographical writings of David Winton Thomas, followed by copies of all his lexicographical articles. The idea for the volume originally came from Professor David Clines, who proposed it to me as long ago as 1995, and I apologize to him and the reader for the inordinate delay in completing this undertaking. I have been working on it intermittently from 1995 till January 2013, and unfortunately other projects kept delaying its completion. To Professor Clines I am also greatly indebted for his extremely careful proofreading of the work, and I am further in great debt to Dr Duncan Burns, the copy editor and typesetter, for his laborious work on what proved to be a challenging manuscript. I am also extremely grateful to Professors Hugh Williamson and Kevin Cathcart for offering comments on an earlier draft of the work as a whole and to Professor John Emerton for comments in particular on an earlier draft of Chapter 1.

David Winton Thomas, the climax of whose career was as Regius Professor of Hebrew at the University of Cambridge from 1938 till 1968, was noteworthy for the number of suggestions he made for new meanings of words in the Hebrew Bible on the basis of comparative Semitic philology, especially on the basis of Arabic. In this he was following in the train of his Oxford teacher, G.R. (later Sir Godfrey) Driver, but he pursued this method in a more cautious way. The reader will find here a thorough examination of Winton Thomas's lexicographical views such as has never before been undertaken. Admittedly it has not been possible to examine every single suggestion that Thomas ever made. But I remain confident that all his most important lexicographical proposals have been considered.

Throughout the monograph at the beginning of the volume the reader will find within square brackets numbered cross references to Thomas's articles in the second part of the volume, thus making it easier to read my evaluations alongside Thomas's articles.

John Day

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am greatly indebted to the following for permission to republish articles by D. Winton Thomas in this volume:

Archiv für Orientforschung:

‘A Note on the Hebrew Text of Judges 16,20’, *AfO* 10 (1935), pp. 162-63.

Brill

‘Mount Tabor: The Meaning of the Name’, *VT* 1 (1951), pp. 229-30; ‘A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew’, *VT* 3 (1953), pp. 209-24; ‘Textual and Philological Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs’, in M. Noth and D.W. Thomas (eds.), *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley* (VTSup, 3; Leiden: Brill, 1955), pp. 280-92; ‘Some Observations on the Hebrew Root חדל’, in *Volume du Congrès: Strasbourg 1956* (VTSup, 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), pp. 8-16; ‘Kelebh “Dog”: Its Origin and Some Usages of It in the Old Testament’, *VT* 10 (1960), pp. 410-27; ‘The LXX’s Rendering of שְׁנוֹת לֵב טוֹב in Ecclus. xxxiii 13’, *VT* 10 (1960), p. 456; ‘ס in Proverbs xxxi 4’, *VT* 12 (1962), pp. 499-500; ‘Job xl 29b: Text and Translation’, *VT* 14 (1964), pp. 114-16; ‘Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs’, *VT* 15 (1965), pp. 271-79; ‘Some Observations on the Hebrew Word רִעָנָן’, in B. Hartmann *et al.* (eds.), *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner* (VTSup, 16; Leiden: Brill, 1967), pp. 387-97; ‘Some Further Remarks on Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew’, *VT* 18 (1968), pp. 120-24; ‘A Note on וְיָדִי וְיָדֶיךָ שָׁנָה in Psalm xc 5’, *VT* 18 (1968), pp. 267-68.

Cambridge University Press

The Recovery of the Ancient Hebrew Language: An Inaugural Lecture (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1939).

Catholic Biblical Association

‘HDL-II in Hebrew’, *CBQ* 24 (1962), p. 154.

Deutsche morgenländische Gesellschaft

‘A Study in Hebrew Synonyms: Verbs Signifying “To Breathe”’,
Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete 10 (1935), pp. 311-14.

Verlag Walter de Gruyter

‘The Root שָׁנָה = سنى in Hebrew’, *ZAW* 52 (NF 11, 1934), pp. 236-38;
 ‘The Root שָׁנָה = سنى in Hebrew II’, *ZAW* 55 (NF 14, 1937), pp. 174-76;
 ‘The Root אָהַב “Love” in Hebrew’, *ZAW* 57 (NF 16, 1939), pp. 57-64;
 ‘The Text of Jesaia ii 6 and the Word שָׁפַק’, *ZAW* 75 (NF 34, 1963), pp. 83-90;
 ‘“A Drop of a Bucket”? Some Observations on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah 40 15’, in M. Black and G. Fohrer (eds.), *In Memoriam Paul Kahle* (BZAW, 103; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1968), pp. 214-21.

J. Duculot

‘A Consideration of Isaiah liii in the Light of Recent Textual and Philological Study’, in H. Cazelles (ed.), *De Mari à Qumran: L’Ancien Testament. Son milieu. Ses relectures juives. Hommages à Mgr J. Coppens* (Gembloux: J. Duculot, and Paris: Lethielleux, 1968), pp. 119-26.

Durham University

‘Job’s “Comforters”’, *Durham University Journal* 28 (1933), pp. 276-77.

Verlag Herder

‘בָּלִי־עַל in the Old Testament’, in J.N. Birdsall and R.W. Thomson (eds.), *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), pp. 11-19.

Journal of Jewish Studies

‘Job xxxvii 22’, *JJS* 1 (1948), pp. 116-17; ‘The Root צָנַע in Hebrew and the Meaning of קָדַרְנִית in Malachi iii, 14’, *JJS* 1 (1949), pp. 182-88;
 ‘מַלְאָךְ in Jeremiah iv. 5: A Military Term’, *JJS* 3 (1952), pp. 47-52;
 ‘Some Remarks on the Hebrew Root יָדַע’, *JJS* 6 (1955), pp. 50-52;
 ‘Proverbs xx 26’, *JJS* 15 (1964), pp. 155-56.

Maisonneuve

‘Isaiah xlv.9-20: A Translation and Commentary’, in A. Caquot and M. Philonenko (eds.), *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1971), pp. 319-30.

Oxford University Press

'The Language of the Old Testament', in H.W. Robinson (ed.), *Record and Revelation: Essays on the Old Testament by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), pp. 374-402; 'A Note on מַהֲלָצוֹת in Zechariah iii 4', *JTS* 33 (1932), pp. 279-80; 'A Note on הַלְיָצוֹת in Judges xiv 19', *JTS* 34 (1933), p. 165; 'The Root יָדַע in Hebrew', *JTS* 35 (1934), pp. 298-306; 'The Root יָדַע in Hebrew, II', *JTS* 36 (1935), pp. 409-12; 'A Note on לֹא־תָדַע in Proverbs v 6', *JTS* 37 (1936), pp. 59-60; 'The Root מָכַר in Hebrew', *JTS* 37 (1936), pp. 388-89; 'Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs', *JTS* 38 (1937), pp. 400-403; 'More Notes on the Root יָדַע in Hebrew', *JTS* 38 (1937), pp. 404-405; 'A Note on וְלֹא יָדְעוּ in Jeremiah xiv 18', *JTS* 39 (1938), pp. 273-74; 'A Note on לְבִי סָחַר־חָר in Psalm xxxviii 11', *JTS* 40 (1939), pp. 390-91; 'A Note on the Meaning of יָדַע in Hosea ix. 7 and Isaiah ix. 8', *JTS* 41 (1940), pp. 43-44; 'Julius Fürst and the Hebrew Root יָדַע', *JTS* 42 (1941), pp. 64-65; 'A Note on לִי־קָהָת in Proverbs xxx. 17', *JTS* 42 (1941), pp. 154-55; 'A Note on וַיֵּדַע אֱלֹהִים in Exod. ii. 25', *JTS* 49 (1948), pp. 143-44; 'A Note on בְּמִדְעָךְ in Eccles. x. 20', *JTS* 50 (1949), p. 177; 'A Further Note on the Root מָכַר in Hebrew', *JTS* NS 3 (1952), p. 21; 'A Note on מוֹעֲדִים in Jeremiah 24.1', *JTS* NS 3 (1952), p. 55; 'A Note on בַּל־יָדְעָה in Proverbs 9¹³', *JTS* NS 4 (1953), pp. 23-24; 'Note on לָדַעַת in Job 37', *JTS* NS 5 (1954), pp. 56-57; 'Note on הִדְעָתָה in Daniel xii. 4', *JTS* NS 6 (1955), p. 226; 'Note on נוֹעֲדוּ in Amos iii. 3', *JTS* NS 7 (1956), pp. 69-70; 'A Note on וַיִּנְוֹדֵם לָכֶם in 1 Samuel vi. 3', *JTS* NS 11 (1960), p. 52; 'Psalm xxxv. 15f.', *JTS* NS 12 (1961), pp. 50-51; 'A Lost Hebrew Word in Isaiah ii. 6', *JTS* NS 13 (1962), pp. 323-24; 'A Note on דָּעַת in Proverbs xxii. 12', *JTS* NS 14 (1963), pp. 93-94; 'Additional Notes on the Root יָדַע in Hebrew', *JTS* NS 15 (1964), pp. 54-57; 'The Meaning of הִטָּאָה in Proverbs x. 16', *JTS* NS 15 (1964), pp. 295-96; 'Hebrew עָנִי "Captivity"', *JTS* NS 16 (1965), pp. 444-45; 'A Note on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah xli. 27', *JTS* NS 18 (1967), pp. 127-28; 'A Note on דְּרָכִים in Isaiah xlix. 9b', *JTS* NS 19 (1968), pp. 203-204; 'A Note on Ecclus. 51:21a', *JTS* NS 20 (1969), pp. 225-26; 'A Note on נִינְדַע in 1 Samuel xxii. 6', *JTS* NS 21 (1970), pp. 401-402; 'The Use of נֶצַח as a Superlative in Hebrew', *JSS* 1 (1956), pp. 106-109; 'צָל־מָוֶה in the Old Testament', *JSS* 7 (1962), pp. 191-200.

Palestine Exploration Fund

‘En-dor: A Sacred Spring?’, *PEFQS* 65 (1933), pp. 205-206; ‘The Meaning of the Name Hammoth-dor’, *PEFQS* 66 (1934), pp. 147-48; ‘Naphath-dor: A Hill Sanctuary?’, *PEFQS* 67 (1935), pp. 89-90; ‘The Meaning of the Name Mishal’, *PEFQS* 68 (1936), pp. 39-40.

Sage Publications

‘A Note on the Hebrew Root נחם’, *ExpTim* 44 (1933), pp. 191-92; ‘The Word רָבַע in Numbers xxiii. 10’, *ExpTim* 46 (1935), p. 285; “‘Until the Day Break, and the Shadows Fly Away’”, *ExpTim* 47 (1936), pp. 431-32; ‘A Note on Exodus xv. 2’, *ExpTim* 48 (1937), p. 478; ‘A Note on the Meaning of מַתְנַחֵם in Genesis xxvii. 42’, *ExpTim* 51 (1940), p. 252; ‘Jeremiah v. 28’, *ExpTim* 57 (1945), pp. 54-55; ‘The Interpretation of Proverbs xxix. 5’, *ExpTim* 59 (1948), p. 112; ‘Zechariah x. 11a’, *ExpTim* 66 (1955), pp. 272-73; ‘A Pun on the Name Ashdod in Zephaniah ii. 4’, *ExpTim* 74 (1962), p. 63; ‘The Meaning of יִי in Psalm lxxx. 14’, *ExpTim* 86 (1965), p. 385.

Society of Biblical Literature

‘The Interpretation of בַּסִּיד in Job 29 4’, *JBL* 65 (1946), pp. 63-66.

United Bible Society

‘Translating Hebrew ‘āsāh’, *BT* 17 (1966), pp. 190-93.

University of Pennsylvania Press

‘Some Rabbinic Evidence for a Hebrew root ורע = רָע’, *JQR* NS 37 (1946), pp. 177-78.

The Estate of D. Winton Thomas (Judith Thomas)

‘The Revised Psalter’, *Theology* 66 (1963), pp. 504-507; ‘נָצַב in Psalm xxxix, 6’, in J.M. Grintz and J. Liver (eds.), *Studies in the Bible Presented to Professor M.H. Segal* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1964), pp. 10*-16*.

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	David Noel Freedman (ed.), <i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> (6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992).
'Abod. Zar.	'Abodah Zarah
AHw	Wolfram von Soden, <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> (3 vols.; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1959–81)
AJSL	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
AOAT	<i>Alter Orient und Altes Testament</i>
ARW	<i>Archiv für Religionswissenschaft</i>
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
AThR	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
AV	Authorized Version
BDB	Francis Brown, S.R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907).
BHK	R. Kittel (ed.), <i>Biblia hebraica</i> (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937)
BHS	<i>Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia</i>
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament
BT	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur ZAW
CAD	Ignace I. Gelb <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> (22 vols.; Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1956–2011).
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series</i>
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
ET	English Translation
ETL	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
ExpTim	<i>Expository Times</i>
GKC	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> (ed. E. Kautzsch, revised and trans. A.E. Cowley; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910).
HALAT	Ludwig Koehler <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament</i> (5 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1967–95).
HALOT	L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, J.J. Stamm <i>et al.</i> , <i>Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> (trans. and ed. M.E.J. Richardson; 5 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000)
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HCOT	Historical Commentary on the Old Testament
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs

HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JA	<i>Journal asiatique</i>
JANESCU	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
JB	Jerusalem Bible
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series</i>
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KAI	H. Donner and W. Röllig (eds.), <i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i> (3 vols.; Harrassowitz, 1962–64; 2002–, 5th edn).
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KB	Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner (eds.), <i>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros</i> (Leiden: Brill, 1957).
KHAT	Kurzer-Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
KTU	M. Dietrich, O. Loretz and J. Sanmartín, <i>The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places (KTU: Second Enlarged Edition)</i> (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995). 2nd edn of M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, J. Sanmartín, <i>Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit</i> (Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1976).
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
MVAG	Mitteilungen der vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft
NAB	New American Bible
NCB	New Century Bible
NEB	New English Bible
NF	Neue Folge
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIV	New International Version
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
NJPSV	New Jewish Publication Society Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Oudtestamentische studiën
PEFQS	<i>Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement</i>
<i>Praem. poen.</i>	Philo of Alexandria, <i>De praemiis et poenis</i>
PRU	<i>Le palais royale d'Ugarit</i>
REB	Revised English Bible
RSV	Revised Standard Version
RV	Revised Version
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series
SCM	Student Christian Movement
SEÅ	<i>Svensk exegetisk årsbok</i>
SEL	<i>Studi epigrafici e linguistici</i>
SJT	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
StudOr	Studia orientalia
UCOP	University of Cambridge Oriental Publications

<i>UF</i>	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>VTSup</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum, Supplements</i>
<i>WBC</i>	<i>Word Biblical Commentary</i>
<i>ZAH</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Althebraistik</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>

1

DAVID WINTON THOMAS: THE MAN, HIS LIFE AND HIS WORK

This volume concentrates on analysing the work of David Winton Thomas as a lexicographer. However, before we get down to that, it would be good to offer a brief survey of his life, so as to attain an idea of the man behind the work. He was of Welsh descent, something of which he remained proud, but he was not a Welsh speaker (though he did teach himself to read the language). David Winton Thomas was actually born in London on January 26, 1901. He was the son of the Reverend David John Thomas and Sarah Thomas, the former being Principal of the Home and Colonial Training College for Teachers in North London from 1897 till 1925. Remarkably, Thomas was the original surname not only of both his parents but also of both his grandparents on his father's side. In his family he was commonly called Winton to distinguish him from his father, and the name stuck throughout his life.¹ It is important to note that Winton was not part of his surname, as some scholars wrongly suppose when they index his name under Winton rather than Thomas!

He had the good fortune to attend Merchant Taylors' School at Northwood in London, where he was most unusually able to study not only Classical languages but also Hebrew, the latter under the Reverend E. Spencer. Other notable biblical scholars had previously studied Hebrew at this school, including R.H. Kennett, G.A. Cooke, C.F. Burney and G.H. Box, while subsequently Donald Coggan, who later became Archbishop of York and Canterbury and wrote a Foreword to the Winton Thomas *Festschrift*, was to study Hebrew there,² as did the Egyptologists

1. John Emerton tells me that Winton Thomas sometimes joked that if he had been ordained and become the Bishop of Winchester, he would have been able to sign himself 'Winton Winton'!

2. Coggan refers to this in P.R. Ackroyd and B. Lindars (eds.), *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. vii, where writing of Winton Thomas, he states: 'His was a name to conjure with in the Hebrew Room at Merchant Taylors' School—it was a source of encouragement to know that the man who had covered himself with glory at Cambridge

I.E.S. Edwards and J.M. Plumley and the Syriac scholar A.E. Goodman. Thomas went up to St John's College, Oxford with a Fish Exhibition in 1919 and studied *Literae Humaniores* (Classics), but surprisingly was placed only in the 4th class in 1922, taking his B.A. in 1923. We do not know for certain why he so underperformed (the Oxford 4th class—which no longer exists—was the lowest class meriting a degree at that time) but his low result probably reflects the fact that his interests were increasingly in the area of Oriental Languages.³ His classical background was nevertheless to stand him in good stead for his future scholarly work, in which he always took careful note of the Greek and Latin Versions of the Hebrew Bible. In 1922 he started studying the course in Oriental Languages (Hebrew and Aramaic) and gained a 1st in 1924, a result which more truly reflected his real ability. His outstanding ability was also shown in the whole array of prizes which he picked up at Oxford: the Junior Houghton Septuagint Prize (1921), the Pusey and Ellerton Hebrew Scholarship (1922), the James Mew Rabbinical Hebrew Scholarship (1923), and the Hall-Houghton Syriac Prize (1924), as well as the Kennicott Hebrew Scholarship (1923) and later the Kennicott Hebrew Fellowship (1928). While studying Oriental languages at Oxford Thomas was one of the first pupils of the eminent Semitist G.R. (later Sir Godfrey) Driver, whose comparative philological approach to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament he was to take over and practise in a more cautious way. In 1924 Thomas became Senior Scholar and was appointed lecturer in Oriental Languages at St John's College.

This was followed by several years spent abroad. First, from 1926 to 1927 he was in the Sudan acting as Arabic advisor to the government and lecturer in Arabic at Gordon College, Khartoum. This must have been a formative period in his mastering Arabic, something which he was to make great use of in his subsequent philological work. Next, from 1927

had sat where I sat and grappled with Davidson and with Brown, Driver and Briggs.' Curiously, this wrongly implies that Thomas had studied at Cambridge rather than Oxford! Thomas's time in Cambridge started only in 1938, when he became Regius Professor of Hebrew, a decade after Coggan's school days were over. Coggan must have known this, so one has to put the error down to infelicitous wording.

3. Interestingly, Thomas was not the only student at Oxford in 1922 to gain a 4th in *Literae Humaniores* who was subsequently to distinguish himself by becoming a Cambridge Professor in the area of Oriental Studies as well as a Fellow of the British Academy. The same was true of S.R.K. Glanville, who from 1946 to 1956 was the Cambridge Professor of Egyptology, and from 1954 to 1956 he was also Provost of King's College, Cambridge, the first Oxford man in 500 years to attain this exalted position!

to 1928 he studied under Karl Budde at Marburg, which likewise enabled him to perfect his German. Finally, from 1928 to 1930 he was a Research Fellow at the University of Chicago, where he became familiar with J.M. Powis Smith and James Henry Breasted, among others.⁴

Most unusually, Thomas's first full-time academic appointment at the age of 29 was to a Professorship, since in 1930 he had achieved the position of Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Languages in the University of Durham, a position he held until 1938. Here he was attached to the Theology Department, the Oriental School not being founded till after his departure. However, the major part of his career consisted of the thirty years during which he had the distinction of being Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge (1938–68), succeeding S.A. Cook.⁵ Already his inaugural lecture, subsequently published as *The Recovery of the Ancient Hebrew Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939) [= no. 1 below], set the stage for what was to become the dominant interest of his life, the search for new meanings of Hebrew words on the basis of comparative Semitic philology.⁶ In this he was following in the footsteps of his former teacher, G.R. Driver, though he was decidedly more cautious, as already mentioned above. Thomas put forward many of his original views on philological questions in a large number of short articles which are included in the present volume. It is to be noted that he never authored a single book *sensu stricto* (though he did write pamphlets), something he has in common with a few other eminent scholars whose interests are focused on detailed linguistic questions. However, he did undertake a lot of painstaking editing of volumes of collective authorship, all of which also contained a contribution of some kind from him. This work included the editing of a *Festschrift* for his predecessor as Regius Professor of Hebrew, S.A. Cook, entitled *Essays and Studies Presented to Stanley Arthur Cook* (London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1950), and the co-editing of *Festschriften* for his friend

4. G.R. Driver, 'David Winton Thomas', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 57, 1971 (London: Oxford University Press on behalf of the British Academy, 1973), pp. 463–76 (465), tells an amusing story pertaining to his Chicago period: 'One day while there the police, seeing one of his pockets bulging as he walked near the station, swooped down on him as a "gangster", only to find a small Hebrew Bible in his pocket!'

5. His Fellowship at St Catharine's College, however, did not begin till 1943, having been delayed by the War.

6. Thomas had outlined something of his approach in 'The Language of the Old Testament', in H.W. Robinson (ed.), *Record and Revelation: Essays on the Old Testament by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), pp. 374–402 [= no. 2 below].

H.H. Rowley (with M. Noth), *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley* (VTSup, 3; Leiden: Brill, 1955), and for his former teacher G.R. Driver (with W.D. McHardy), *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963). He also edited two volumes of essays sponsored by the Society for Old Testament Study, *Documents from Old Testament Times* (London: Thomas Nelson, 1958) and *Archaeology and Old Testament Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), the latter commemorating the society's jubilee year.

In 1958 Thomas was appointed to a commission chaired by Donald Coggan, then Archbishop of York, in order to produce a revision of the sixteenth-century Psalter of Miles Coverdale in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer (which had been translated from the Latin, not from the Hebrew), and this appeared as *The Revised Psalter* (London: SPCK, 1963; amended edition 1964). Other members of the committee included such luminaries as T.S. Eliot and C.S. Lewis, but Thomas was clearly the source of the Hebrew expertise in this venture, and he also produced a slim volume of textual notes about it entitled *The Text of the Revised Psalter: Notes* (London: SPCK, 1963), which informs the reader of departures from the Masoretic text as well as new philological proposals accepted. Such was Thomas's input into this work, a task he manifestly enjoyed, that it enables one to form a clear impression of his understanding of any textual problem in the Psalter.

During his tenure as Professor at Cambridge work also progressed on the New English Bible translation of the Old Testament under the chairmanship of G.R. Driver. As one of the most eminent Hebrew scholars in Britain it is rather surprising that Thomas participated only very briefly at the beginning of this project for which he was obviously so well qualified. Driver's obituary of Thomas in the *Proceedings of the British Academy* claims that this was because he would have found it too burdensome to participate in the translation work for both the NEB and the Revised Psalter at the same time.⁷ There may well be truth in this but the view has also been offered that it might have been a source of relief to Thomas that he was thereby spared from constantly having to disagree with Driver in the urging of greater caution about translations.

For part of the time that Thomas was Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge he was also involved in other activities. For example, he was Chairman of the committee overseeing the production of a new edition of the Peshitta under the aegis of the International Organization for the

7. Driver, 'David Winton Thomas', p. 469.

Study of the Old Testament, and he served on the committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund. The former reflected his strong concern for the ancient Versions of the Hebrew Bible, and the latter his interest in the findings of archaeology in so far as they related to the Bible, something also manifested in two edited volumes mentioned above as well as several articles on the inscriptions from Lachish.

Inevitably in the fulness of time various honours came his way. As a leading light in the Society for Old Testament Study (it is reported that at a certain period he would sit in the front row of its meetings alongside G.R. Driver and H.H. Rowley), it is entirely understandable that he served as President of the Society in 1953,⁸ giving his Presidential paper on the alleged use of the divine name as a superlative. He also had the distinction of being elected to a Fellowship of the British Academy in 1966, which further honoured him with the award of the Burkitt Medal for Biblical Studies in 1969. In addition he was awarded the honorary degree of DD by both the Universities of Durham (1965) and Wales (1968), in spite of the fact that he never saw himself as a theologian. Moreover, following his retirement in 1968 Thomas was presented with a *Festschrift* appropriately entitled *Words and Meanings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), edited by Peter Ackroyd and Barnabas Lindars, which contained articles from leading Hebrew and Old Testament scholars at home and abroad.

Thomas was hoping that during the years of his retirement he would be able to complete a revision of the venerable BDB Hebrew Lexicon. Unfortunately, this was not to be accomplished since early on in his retirement, on June 17, 1970, he collapsed in a Cambridge street and died the following day, which happened to be the day of the British general election. Following his death it became apparent that Thomas had completed the work for about half of the Hebrew Lexicon (up to the letter kaph), but unfortunately it was not in such an advanced form as to be able to be published. The notes from his work on this are now preserved at the University of Sheffield at the behest of David Clines, who was preparing *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (8 vols.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press and Sheffield Phoenix Press, 1993–2011). Had Thomas lived long enough he might well have prepared a serviceable replacement for BDB.

8. Curiously, G.R. Driver, 'David Winton Thomas', p. 468, mistakenly refers to the year as 1963 and states that it was the jubilee year of the society (that was rather 1967).

During his long period at Cambridge students from both the Oriental and Theology faculties attended his classes and lectures, which included such subjects as Hebrew prose composition, and the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy, Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah. Many of those who attended were themselves later to become eminent in the fields of Hebrew, Old Testament and Semitic studies, and these include such scholars as Peter Ackroyd, Leslie Allen, Sebastian Brock, Ronald Clements, David Clines, Stephanie Dalley, John Eaton, Robert Gordon, William Horbury, David Jobling, Wilfred Lambert, Alan Lowe, Barnabas (F.C.) Lindars, Gareth Lloyd-Jones, Andrew Macintosh, David Marcus, Brian Mastin, J.N. Postgate, Anthony Phillips, E.J. Revell, John Sturdy, Michael Weitzman, Gordon Wenham, and (in Winton Thomas's very last year) Hugh Williamson.⁹ Those whom I have consulted generally speak very well of him as a teacher, his lectures being noteworthy for their clarity. A tendency to concentrate on the 'new roots' which he detected in the Hebrew text has also been noted, something which is also apparent in his writings. Like his articles, his lectures concentrated resolutely on textual and philological matters, without much interest being evinced in the theological side of the biblical text. Indeed, those who knew him remark on his marked guardedness about talking about any personal religious beliefs at all, and several of those whom I have consulted believe he veered towards agnosticism. However, while he consistently refused offers to preach sermons either in his College or the University, as a good College man (for example, he acted as President [= Vice-Master] of his College from 1965 to 1968) he did regularly attend chapel services at St Catharine's College, and it should also be mentioned that he regularly attended the University sermons on Sunday afternoons in full term.

As a person he has been described in personal correspondence to me as 'formal but kind' (Stephanie Dalley), 'slightly forbidding (to an undergraduate) but very kind and supportive' (Sebastian Brock), and 'a reserved but kindly man who took great interest in my welfare' (Leslie Allen), while Anthony Phillips, who experienced him as a doctoral supervisor, refers to him as 'a perfect gentleman and an archetypal grandfather'. Indeed, all speak of the real concern for the wellbeing of his students that he manifested. The indications are that he was progressive-minded (a Labour voter, opposed to capital punishment,¹⁰ favouring women dining

9. As a Theology student at Cambridge from 1967, I unfortunately never had the opportunity of attending his lectures or meeting him, though I do recall Hugh Williamson pointing him out to me in a Cambridge street sometime around 1969.

10. For these two points I am indebted to Anthony Phillips.

in St Catharine's College,¹¹ etc.). And most unusually for a Hebrew Professor he maintained a lifelong interest in rugby football, not only having played it in his youth (including often for the London Welsh between 1923 and 1926 and being selected for an Anglo-Welsh Trial match in 1924) but also having continued thereafter to be an ardent spectator at University matches. With his wife Marion (Edith Marion Higgins), a Botanist whom he had met during his time at Durham and married in 1932,¹² he enjoyed a happy domestic life, and they had two sons and a daughter. His books were left at his request to the University at Bangor in Wales.

Rationale of the Following Chapters

In the following chapters I shall offer a thorough analysis—the fullest ever attempted—of Winton Thomas's proposals for finding new meanings of Biblical Hebrew words on the basis of comparative Semitic philology, especially Arabic, indicating where I believe him to be correct and where I hold him to be mistaken.¹³ In successive chapters I shall consider Thomas's consideration of an adjective (*ra'ānān*) and several alleged superlative or intensive forms (including the related noun *šalmāwet*), various nouns, some verbal roots, and finally the verb *yd'*, where Thomas suggested several different new meanings on the basis of Arabic *wadu'a*. My overall conclusions will then be summarized in the final chapter. The reader should be alerted to the fact that it has not been possible to analyse every single one of Thomas's numerous proposals, but I do believe that all his most important suggestions have been considered. Following this short monograph on Winton Thomas's philological work the reader will then find copies of all his lexicographical articles arranged according to the order in which they are first referred to in the monograph. Throughout the monograph the reader will find numbered

11. Ronald Clements recalls how he was invited to a Guest Night in St Catharine's College in 1968 and Winton Thomas wryly observed: 'Ronald, this is the first Guest Night when Fellows have been allowed to invite lady companions. Therefore, several Fellows are staying away!'

12. Winton Thomas, who could be quite witty and bemused by the foibles of scholars, later delighted to recall that he himself had set off on his honeymoon with a copy of August Dillmann's *Ethiopic Grammar* to work on! (Private communication from Ronald Clements.)

13. J.A. Emerton, 'The Work of David Winton Thomas as a Hebrew Scholar', *VT* 41 (1991), pp. 287-303 (296-302), has previously undertaken a brief survey of some of Thomas's lexicographical suggestions, and this proved a helpful starting point for my own research.

cross-references in square brackets to Thomas's articles printed later in the volume, thereby making it easier to read my evaluations alongside the articles. It is important to note that only works of lexicographical interest have been included.¹⁴ For a full list of Winton Thomas's publications the reader is directed to the compilations by Anthony Phillips, 'Bibliography of the Writings of David Winton Thomas', in P.R. Ackroyd and B. Lindars (eds.), *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), pp. 217-28, and 'Additional Bibliography of the Writings of David Winton Thomas', *VT* 22 (1972), pp. 105-106.

14. We have, however, not printed out Thomas's book *The Text of the Revised Psalter: Notes* (London: SPCK, 1963), part of which is text-critical and part philological, though account of its philological suggestions has been taken in this volume.

2

AN ADJECTIVE AND ALLEGED SUPERLATIVE (OR INTENSIVE) FORMS

raʿanān: Not ‘Green’!

One of Thomas’s enduring contributions was his article for the W. Baumgartner *Festschrift* entitled, ‘Some Observations on the Hebrew Word רָעָנָן’.¹ Here he demonstrated conclusively that the previously common rendering of the word as ‘green’—best known in the form of the expression ‘under every green tree’—was inaccurate, and that the word is better translated as ‘luxuriant’, ‘leafy’ or ‘spreading’. This point had been noted before Thomas wrote his article, but only relatively rarely,² and as a consultation of earlier modern Bible translations shows, the dominant understanding hitherto had been that the word indeed meant ‘green’.³ Thomas, however, showed that the ancient Versions generally understood the word not to mean ‘green’ but rather ‘thick with leaves’ or the like.

1. In B. Hartmann, E. Jenni, E.Y. Kutscher, V. Maag, I.L. Seeligmann and R. Smend (eds.), *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner* (VTSup, 16; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967), pp. 387-97 [= no. 3 below]. The word *raʿanān* occurs in Deut. 12.2; 1 Kgs 14.23; 2 Kgs 16.4; 17.10; 2 Chron. 28.4; Job 15.32; Pss. 37.35; 52.10 (ET 8); 92.11 (ET 10), 15 (ET 14); Song 1.16; Isa. 57.5; Jer. 2.20; 3.6, 13; 11.16; 17.2, 8; Ezek. 6.13; Hos. 14.9 (ET 8); and in Aramaic in Dan. 4.1 (ET 4).

2. For example, S.R. Driver was ahead of his time in always translating by ‘spreading’, in *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah: A Revised Translation, with Introductions and Short Explanations* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1906), *ad loc.*; C.F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903), p. 193, noted that ‘spreading’ was the probable rendering, and appealed to the ancient Versions in support; J. Moffatt, *The Old Testament: A New Translation* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1924), sometimes rendered by ‘spreading’, ‘leafy’, ‘flourishing’ in addition to ‘green’ and ‘evergreen’. *The Revised Psalter* always avoided ‘green’, but of course Thomas was the source of Hebrew expertise behind this translation.

3. Thus the AV rendered ‘green’ everywhere except Ps. 92.11 (ET 10) ‘fresh’, Ps. 92.15 (ET 14) ‘flourishing’, (+ Aramaic Dan. 4.4 [ET 4.1] ‘flourishing’); RV rendered ‘green’ everywhere except Ps. 92.11 (ET 10) ‘fresh’ (+ Aramaic Dan. 4.4 [ET 4.1] ‘flourishing’), and RSV has ‘green’ (or ‘evergreen’, Hos. 14.9 [ET 8]) everywhere except Ps. 92.11 (ET 10) ‘fresh’ (+ Aramaic Dan. 4.4 [ET 4.1] ‘flourishing’).

Such an understanding more readily accounts for the meaning ‘flourishing’ or ‘prospering’ when it is applied to human beings, as in the Aramaic of Dan. 4.4 (ET 1), where we read ‘I, Nebuchadnezzar, was at ease in my house and *prospering* in my palace’.

An examination of Bible translations published subsequent to Thomas’s article reveals that there is a greater recognition of the fact that *raʿanān* does not mean ‘green’ than had been the case previously, but this has been inconsistently followed through. Thus, while the NEB and REB most frequently render *raʿanān* as ‘spreading’, but on occasion by such words as ‘luxuriant’, ‘shaded’ and ‘leafy’, they both retain ‘green’ in Jer. 17.8. Again, the NJPSV has a considerable variety of renderings—‘leafy’, ‘luxuriant’, ‘thriving’, ‘robust’, etc.—but still resorts to ‘green’ in Ezek. 6.13. The NIV and JB also mostly have ‘spreading’, but do render as ‘green’ in some instances. At the other extreme, the NRSV always translates the word as ‘green’ (or ‘evergreen’ in Hos. 14.9 [ET 8]), except in Deut. 12.2 (‘leafy’) and Ps. 92.11 (ET 10), ‘fresh’. The NAB is very inconsistent in its renderings, though ‘green’ occurs more frequently than any other translation, and the NJB has gone back on the JB in rendering more passages with ‘green’ than with ‘spreading’ or ‘luxuriant’. It is therefore clear that the lesson of Thomas’s article has still not been fully taken in, something underlined by the very title of Susan Ackerman’s book, *Under Every Green Tree*, which appeared in 1992 and was reprinted in 2001.⁴

There has been no unanimity on the etymology of *raʿanān*, and in the article mentioned above Thomas has put forward an original suggestion, proposing that the apparent underlying Hebrew root *rʿn* is cognate with Arabic *lgn*, meaning ‘to be tangled’ (of plants), the eleventh form *ilḡānna* meaning ‘to be long and tangled’ (of plants), or as de Biberstein Kazimirski’s Arabic dictionary puts it, ‘to be long and thick/bushy, to the point of being intertwined’.⁵ As Thomas notes, the interchange between *r* and *l* is not uncommon in Semitic languages. This suggestion is probably correct. Subsequently, S. Morag and P.W. Coxon⁶ revived the view of

4. S. Ackerman, *Under Every Green Tree* (HSM, 46; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992; repr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001).

5. G.W. Freytag, *Lexicon arabico-latinum* (4 vols.; Halle: C.A. Schwetschke, 1830–37 [1837]), IV, p. 113; A. de Biberstein Kazimirski, *Dictionnaire arabe-français* (2 vols.; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1860), II, p. 1006; J.G. Hava, *Arabic–English Dictionary* (Beirut: Catholic Press, 1899/1921), p. 690.

6. S. Morag, “וְיִהְיֶה עֵץ רַעֲנָן (Ps. 37.35)”, *Tarbiz* 41 (1971–72), pp. 17–23 [Hebrew]; P.W. Coxon, “The Great Tree of Daniel 4”, in J.D. Martin and P.R. Davies (eds.), *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane* (JSOTSup, 42; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), pp. 91–111 (97).

A. Schultens⁷ that *ra*‘*anān* is rather to be understood as cognate with Arabic *ra*‘*una*. Although this verb means ‘to be foolish, weak-minded’, it also includes the concept of ‘height’, ‘tallness’ (cf. *ra*‘*n*, ‘the peak of a mountain’). However, the evidence from the ancient Versions fails to support the view that an *‘ēṣ ra*‘*anān* is ‘a tall/lofty tree’ and favours rather the contention of Winton Thomas that the reference is more to the denseness of the foliage.

Some Alleged Superlative or Intensifying Terms

The Divine Name as a Superlative (or Intensive)

In two of his articles on unusual ways of expressing the superlative in Biblical Hebrew Thomas claimed that the divine name (whether Elohim, El or Yahweh) could be used as a superlative.⁸ Thomas’s use of this term, however, is somewhat peculiar in this context. In normal usage the word ‘superlative’ is employed to denote adjectives ending in -est, e.g. ‘mightiest’, ‘finest’, or preceded by ‘most’, but when it comes to his actual renderings of instances where he finds what he calls the superlative Thomas often tends to translate rather by words like ‘mighty’, ‘fine’, etc. This suggests that superlative is not actually the most accurate term to describe what Thomas had in mind. However, although Thomas’s renderings are often suggestive of an intensive rather than a superlative use of the divine name, he is keen to emphasize that he is not arguing that the divine name is sometimes used as *merely* an intensifying epithet, as some, including A.B. Ehrlich,⁹ had previously argued was the case. In fact, he goes so far as to assert that the divine name never served as merely an intensifying epithet. Rather, his view is that the meaning of a word is intensified (or as he would say, given a superlative meaning) precisely because it is brought into connection with the deity in a real way.

7. A. Schultens, *Liber Jobi* (Leiden: J. Luzac, 1737), p. 391.

8. D.W. Thomas, ‘A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew’, *VT* 3 (1953), pp. 209-24 (210-19) [= no. 4 below]; ‘Some Further Remarks on Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew’, *VT* 18 (1968), pp. 120-24 (120-22) [= no. 5 below]. Support for Thomas’s approach may be found in P.A.H. de Boer, ‘יהוה as Epithet Expressing the Superlative’, *VT* 24 (1974), pp. 233-35; G. Brin, ‘The Superlative in the Hebrew Bible: Additional Cases’, *VT* 42 (1992), pp. 115-18.

9. E.g. A.B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel* (7 vols.; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1908-14 [1908]), I, pp. 99, 145-46.

Thomas noted that the idea that the divine name could sometimes have an intensive or superlative force was not new. He refers to earlier scholars who had supported this view, as well as tracing it back to the AV and mediaeval Jewish commentators, and even in one instance as far back as the Targum (where ‘mountains of God’ in Ps. 36.7 [ET 6] is rendered ‘mighty mountains’).¹⁰ Far from accepting all the intensive/superlative proposals that had previously been suggested, Thomas indicates that the number of valid examples should be reduced. For example, he notes that there is no reason why ‘voices of God’ (rather than ‘mighty thunderings’) should not be accepted as the translation of *qōlōt ’ēlōhîm* in Exod. 9.28, even though it refers to the thunder, and ‘fire of God’ (rather than ‘a great fire’) may be accepted as the rendering for *’ēš ’ēlōhîm* in Job 1.16, even though it alludes to the lightning.¹¹

However, Thomas himself put forward some examples of alleged superlatives/intensives which are no more plausible than the above.¹² For example, he claims that the *miktab ’ēlōhîm*, literally ‘writing of God’ in Exod. 32.18, means ‘fine work, as of a god’ in contrast to the scribbblings of a mere man on a potsherd, but in view of the similar allusion in Exod. 31.18 which refers to God giving Moses the two tablets of the testimony, ‘written with the finger of God’, there seems no reason why Exod. 32.18 should be saying more than that. Again, Thomas suggested that both *gan-’ēlōhîm*, literally ‘garden of God’, in Ezek. 28.13 and *gan-Yhwh*, literally ‘garden of the Lord’, in Isa. 51.3 may mean ‘a splendid garden’. However, in both instances the expression is parallel with ‘Eden’, and according to Gen. 2.8 the garden of Eden was planted by the Lord, so there seems no reason why the references in Ezekiel and Isaiah should convey a different meaning.

Another example that Thomas accepted and which has, in fact, been widely followed in English Bible translations since the AV, is Ps. 80.11 (ET 10), which, rendered literally, states of Israel, here symbolized as a vine, that ‘the mountains were covered with its shade, the cedars of God with its branches’. However, many prefer to translate ‘cedars of God’ (*’arzê-’ēl*) as ‘mighty cedars’ or the like (RSV, NRSV, NEB, REB, NIV), including Thomas, who renders it as ‘the goodly cedars’. But I would

10. Thomas, ‘A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew’, pp. 210-14.

11. Thomas, ‘A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew’, pp. 214-15.

12. The examples cited in this paragraph are all taken from Thomas, ‘Some Further Remarks’, pp. 120-21.

observe that Ps. 104.16 states quite specifically, 'The trees of the Lord are watered abundantly, the cedars of Lebanon which he planted'. Compare too Ezek. 31.8, which refers to 'the cedars in the garden of God' (cf. Ezek. 31.9, 16, 18). Ezekiel 31 sounds as if it is equating Lebanon with the garden of Eden (cf. the king of Tyre's connection with Eden in Ezek. 28.13), which, as we have seen from Gen. 2.8, was believed to have been planted by God. There is every reason, therefore, to follow the minority literal rendering of NAB, JB and NJB, 'the cedars of God' rather than 'mighty/goodly cedars'.

Yet another instance of what Thomas took to be the superlative use of the divine name is found in Ps. 68.16 (ET 15), but this is not discussed in either of his articles but rather is found in *The Revised Psalter*, for which, as previously noted, he was the primary source of Hebrew expertise. There we find the rendering, 'A mighty mountain is the mountain of Bashan', where 'mighty mountain' reflects Hebrew *har 'elōhîm*. The rendering of *har 'elōhîm* as 'mighty mountain', which did not originate with Thomas, has found quite a large following (e.g. RSV, NRSV; cf. NJPSV, 'O majestic mountain'). However, if it is truly a superlative one would expect the translation 'The mightiest mountain', not just 'A mighty mountain'. Further, there is every reason to believe that the idea of divinity in some sense should be retained in our rendering of *'elōhîm*, whether we translate 'The hill of Bashan is a hill of God indeed' (NEB), 'O mountain of Bashan, mountain of the gods',¹³ or 'Is Mount Bashan a mountain of God...?'¹⁴

In short, I fail to see why any of the examples of expressions with the divine name that Thomas cites need be regarded as having a self-consciously intensifying or superlative force. Of course, if the biblical writers had reflected on the matter they would doubtless have conceded that the 'garden of the Lord' or 'cedars of God', for example, constituted fine examples of a garden and cedars respectively. However, this was not the essential point they were trying to convey but rather that the specific entities to which they referred derived from God.

13. J. Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (UCOP, 35; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 115-18.

14. J.A. Emerton, 'The "Mountain of God" in Psalm 68:16', in A. Lemaire and B. Otzen (eds.), *History and Traditions of Early Israel: Studies Presented to Eduard Nielsen* (VTSup, 50; Leiden: Brill, 1993), pp. 24-37.

Māwet and lāmût as Superlatives (or Intensives)

Thomas¹⁵ next discusses instances in the Old Testament where he believes *māwet*, ‘death’, and *lāmût*, ‘to die’, are used in what he refers to as a superlative sense. He compares the way in English we might say something is ‘deadly dull’ or someone is ‘bored to death’. Apparently, Thomas indicates, little had been written on this subject previously, and this contrasts with the alleged use of the divine name as a superlative discussed above. However, as in the case of the divine name, it seems clear from his actual translations (e.g. ‘extremely’, ‘very’, ‘frightful’) that the word ‘superlative’ often does not always provide precisely the sense which Thomas had in mind, and on many occasions ‘intensive’ would seem a more accurate description. Nevertheless, in a few of his examples (cf. Judg. 5.18, ‘completely’; Isa. 53.8, 12, ‘utterly’; Ps. 18.5 [ET 4] ‘most terrible’), the term ‘superlative’ does seem acceptable for what he had in mind.

Two of Thomas’s examples seem particularly convincing. The first is in Judg. 16.16, where as a result of Delilah’s constantly pressing Samson to tell him the secret of his strength, we read, if we take the words literally, that ‘his soul was vexed to die’ (*wattiqšar napšô lāmût*). Clearly Samson is not literally on the point of death, so Thomas’s claim seems plausible that this means ‘his soul was vexed to death’, or as we might say in English, ‘he was tired to death’, i.e. extremely vexed. The second particularly convincing instance is in Ecclus 37.2, where the Hebrew text reads *hl’ dwn mgy’ ’l mwt r’ knpš nhpk lšr*, ‘Is it not a grief verging on death when a bosom friend becomes changed into an enemy?’ He plausibly holds that ‘a grief verging on death’ means ‘a very great grief’. He also cites some mediaeval Hebrew examples which sound plausible¹⁶ and as will be seen below, it seems likely that *māwet* has intensifying force in the word *šalmāwet*, literally ‘shadow of death’.

However, Thomas’s other examples do not seem convincing because they occur in contexts in which references to actual death are certainly present. Thus, in 2 Kgs 20.1 we read that Hezekiah was ‘sick unto death’. Thomas says this simply means he was very ill, since he subsequently recovered. However, since Isaiah tells Hezekiah later in the same verse

15. Thomas, ‘A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew’, pp. 219-22, with additional examples and discussion in ‘Some Further Remarks’, pp. 122-23.

16. See Thomas, ‘A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew’, p. 221.

that he is going to die, it seems more natural to suppose that the preceding words mean that he was on the point of death (so NIV; cf. REB, NAB 'mortally ill').

Again, in Jon. 4.9 Thomas believes that when Jonah replies to God, saying 'I do well to be angry unto death ('*ad-māwet*)', what he means is simply 'I do well to be extremely angry'. But this surely flies in the face of the previous verse, where Jonah 'asked that he might die, and said: "It is better for me to die than to live"'. It is therefore more natural that what Jonah means is 'I do well to be angry, angry enough to die' (RSV; similarly NRSV, NIV, NAB; cf. NEB, REB 'mortally angry').

Yet again, in Isa. 53.12 we read that the suffering servant 'poured out his soul unto death'. Thomas follows C.C. Torrey¹⁷ in seeing superlative force here, i.e. 'he poured out his soul utterly', a view followed by G.R. Driver and also regarded as possible by R.N. Whybray,¹⁸ who has sought to remove all implications of the Servant's death from this famous chapter. However, this chapter is so full of references suggestive of death that it seems forced to attempt to eliminate them all. Thus, v. 9 states that 'they made his grave with the wicked', and v. 10 speaks of his being made an '*āšām*', 'a guilt offering', sacrificial imagery suggestive of death, which coheres with the words 'he shall bear their iniquities' (v. 11) and 'he bore the sin of many' (v. 12). Further, v. 8 states that 'he was cut off out of the land of the living', and v. 9 (if we accept the MT) makes reference to 'in his death'. With all this language suggestive of death it seems unnatural to suppose that v. 12 alludes to the Servant's merely pouring out his soul utterly rather than to death. Similar objections apply to Thomas's proposal in a later article¹⁹ to emend the words of Isa. 53.8, *nega' lāmô* to *nugga' lammāwet*, and render as 'he was smitten to the

17. C.C. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928), p. 423. Torrey here also anticipated a few of Thomas's other examples involving *māwet*.

18. G.R. Driver, 'Isaiah 52:13–53:12: The Servant of the Lord', in M. Black and G. Fohrer (eds.), *In Memoriam Paul Kahle* (BZAW, 103; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1968), pp. 90–105 (102–103); R.N. Whybray, *Thanksgiving for a Liberated Prophet: An Interpretation of Isaiah Chapter 53* (JSOTSup, 4; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978), p. 104. It should be noted that, in addition to suggesting this understanding in both his 1953 article (p. 220) and his 1968 article (p. 122) referred to above, Thomas also followed this view in 'A Consideration of Isaiah liii in the Light of Recent Textual and Philological Study', *ETL* 44 (1968), pp. 79–86 (80, 86), also published in H. Cazelles (ed.), *De Mari à Qumran: L'Ancien Testament. Son milieu. Ses relectures juives. Hommage à Mgr J. Coppens* (Gembloux: J. Duculot, and Paris: Lethielleux, 1968), pp. 119–26 (120, 126) [= no. 74 below].

19. Thomas, 'Some Further Remarks', p. 123.

utmost'. Whether or not the emendation is justified, the meaning ascribed is untenable in the light of the above contextual arguments.

Another unlikely proposal concerns 1 Sam. 5.11. This verse states that the men of Ekron 'sent therefore and gathered together all the lords of the Philistines, and said, "Send away the ark of the God of Israel, and let it return to its own place, that it may not slay us and our people". For there was a panic of death (*m^ehûmat-māwet*) throughout the whole city. The hand of God was very heavy there.' In the expression which is literally 'panic of death' (*m^ehûmat-māwet*) Thomas again sees merely what he calls superlative force and he compares *m^ehûmâ g^edôlâ m^e'ôd*, 'a very great panic', mentioned just before in 1 Sam. 5.9 in connection with Gath. However, we need to remember that, in contrast to Gath, where the people were merely afflicted with tumours, in Ekron there was concern that the ark 'may not slay us and our people' (v. 11), and in fact some of the people there did die (v. 12). 'Panic of death' must therefore be taken more literally than Thomas supposes: presumably we are to understand this as a panic caused by fear of death. Compare NIV, 'For death has filled the city with panic'. The translations 'deadly panic' (NAB) or 'deathly panic' (RSV, NRSV), though not incorrect, are somewhat ambiguous.

Shortly before this in the ark narrative, Thomas finds another example in 1 Sam. 4.20. In connection with the death of Phinehas's wife following the loss of the ark, we read, 'And about the time of her death (*k^e'êṭ mûṭāh*) the women attending her said to her, "Fear not, for you have borne a son". But she did not answer or give heed.' Thomas claims that *mûṭāh* refers not to her death but to the intense difficulty she had in childbirth. Granted that the reference to her death is somewhat indirect, there seems no reason not to take this literally.

There are two other passages in the Psalms where Thomas thinks 'death' is not meant literally. The first is in Ps. 55.5 (ET 4), 'My heart is in anguish within me, the terrors of death (*'êṃôṭ māwet*) have fallen upon me'. Thomas thinks this could mean 'frightful fears', but this seems unnecessary, bearing in mind that the psalmist's enemies are spoken of as 'men of *blood* and treachery' in v. 24 (ET 23). The other passage is Ps. 18.5 (ET 4), where Thomas prefers to understand 'most terrible sorrows' rather than 'the sorrows of death' (though 'the cords of death' is a more common rendering; cf. RSV, NRSV). The allusions to death and Sheol in this verse relate to the enemies from whom the psalmist is delivered. Elsewhere these are spoken of as 'men of violence' (v. 49 [ET 48]), which makes death/Sheol language seem appropriate.

Thomas finds another possible example in Exod. 10.17, where following the destruction caused by the plague of locusts Pharaoh entreats

Moses to take from him ‘this death’ (*hammāwet hazzeh*). Thomas suggests that this perhaps really means ‘this frightful thing’. However, since we read that the locusts ‘ate all the plants in the land and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left; not a green thing remained, neither tree nor plant of the field, through all the land of Egypt’, the destruction of the vegetation of the land surely could be referred to literally as ‘death’ (cf. NJB, NRSV, ‘this deadly thing’; NAB, ‘this deadly pest’; NEB, REB, JB, NIV, ‘this deadly plague’).

In Song 8.6, Thomas says that the famous words ‘*azzâ kammāwet ’ah^abâ*’ should perhaps be rendered not as ‘love is strong as death’ but rather as ‘love is extremely strong’. Although that of course is the implication, it is unlikely that thoughts of literal death are excluded. Thus, not merely does the parallel line read ‘jealousy is cruel as Sheol’ (though Thomas thinks Sheol itself could be a superlative; see below), but in the passage which Thomas renders ‘Its flashes are flashes of fire, a most vehement flame’, the words rendered ‘flashes’ are literally ‘Reshephs’ (*rešāpîm*, construct *rišpê*), Resheph being a Canaanite underworld god.²⁰

It should also be noted that Thomas saw Judg. 5.18’s *lāmût* (perhaps reading *lammāwet* with the Versions) as a possible further example in his later 1968 article.²¹ He thought this verse could be translated, ‘Zebulun is a people which completely disregarded his life’ (cf. NEB, REB, which presuppose Thomas’s view, and Lindars²² too thinks it is possible). What makes one hesitate to follow this, however, is the fact that Judges 5 is describing a battle, so a reference to literal death is entirely natural.

S. Rin,²³ in response to Thomas, agrees that there are some places in the Old Testament where *mwt* serves as a superlative or intensifying word—he does not reject any of Thomas’s examples—but he argues that *mwt* acts as a superlative or intensifier because it is the divine name Mot, just like Yahweh or Elohim. Thomas, in his second article on the superlative,²⁴ already replied to Rin, rightly saying that though there may be

20. Accordingly Resheph was equated with the Mesopotamian god Nergal, a deity of the underworld and plague, and in *KTU* 1.78.2-4 Resheph appears as the sun goddess’s gatekeeper, guarding the entrance to the netherworld when she went down thither. See J. Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan* (JSOTSup, 265; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), pp. 198-99, and the discussion of Song 8.6-7 on pp. 204-205.

21. Thomas, ‘Some Further Remarks’, pp. 120-21.

22. B. Lindars (ed. A.D.H. Mayes), *Judges 1-5: A New Translation and Commentary* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995), p. 264.

23. S. Rin, ‘The מוֹת of Grandeur’, *VT* 9 (1959), pp. 324-25.

24. Thomas, ‘Some Further Remarks’, pp. 123-24.

traces of Mot in the phrases in 2 Sam. 22.5-6/Ps. 18.5 (ET 4) where the underworld is referred to, there is no evidence that this is the case in the other instances cited by Rin (e.g. 1 Sam. 5.11; Ps. 55.5, ET 4).

Sheol as Superlative (or Intensive)

An original idea of Thomas was that the word Sheol (š^e'ôl) could be used (like *māwet* and *lāmût*) in what he again calls a superlative sense.²⁵ He finds three instances of this, none of which is convincing. The first two have already been considered above (Song 8.6; Ps. 18.5 [ET 4]), since they also include *māwet*. The third is in Isa. 57.9. Quoting the AV, 'And thou wentest to the king with ointment, and thou didst increase thy perfumes, and didst send thy messengers far off, and didst debase thyself even unto hell', Thomas takes the words 'and didst debase thyself even unto hell' (*wattašpîlî 'ad-š^e'ôl*) as a reference to showing abject servility, with '*ad-š^e'ôl* meaning 'to the lowest depths'. However, as I have argued elsewhere, it is likely that we have here a reference to the god Molech as an underworld deity.²⁶ In support of Molech's being an underworld god the following points should be noted. First, Molech is specifically associated in the Old Testament with the valley of Hinnom (e.g. 2 Kgs 23.10), which gave its name to Gehenna (hell). Secondly, at Ugarit the god *mlk*, who appears to lie behind Molech, is associated with the place-name Ashtaroth (KTU 1.100.41; 1.107.42), which was also the dwelling place of *rp'u* (KTU 1.108.1-3), the singular of *rp'um*, who are clearly underworld spirits related to the Old Testament Rephaim (cf. KTU 1.161). Thirdly, another Ugaritic text mentions the god *mlk* alongside Resheph (RS 1986.2235.16-17), whose underworld associations are well attested. Fourthly, in two Mesopotamian god-lists we find Malik equated with the underworld god Nergal.²⁷ It is therefore attractive to suppose that Isa. 57.9 should not be translated as Thomas supposes, but rather that it

25. Thomas, 'A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew', pp. 222-24.

26. J. Day, *Molech: A God of Human Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (UCOP, 41; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 50-52, on Isa. 57.9 specifically, and pp. 46-55 on Molech as an underworld god generally.

27. S.H. Langdon (ed.), *The H. Weld-Blundell Collection in the Ashmolean Museum. I. Sumerian and Semitic Religious and Historical Texts* (Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Inscriptions, 1; London: Oxford University Press, 1923), p. 31, text 9, obv. col. 2, line 8; O. Schroeder, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts* (Ausgrabungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft in Assur. E: Inschriften, 3; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1920), 63.II.37. Cf. K. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta* (StudOr, 7; Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1938), p. 359.

contains a literal reference to Sheol, to be rendered as follows: ‘You journeyed to Molech with oil and multiplied your perfumes; you sent your envoys far off and sent down even to Sheol’.

(lā)neṣaḥ as a Superlative

Thomas further proposed to see superlative significance in several examples of the expression *(lā)neṣaḥ*, which occurs 37 times in the Hebrew Bible, of which there is a minor variant, *(lā)nēṣaḥ*, occurring four times. This term has traditionally been rendered ‘for ever’, and this is clearly supported by its parallelism with such expressions as *l’ad* (Amos 1.11), *lā’ad* (Ps. 9.19 [ET 18]), *l’ôlām* (Isa. 57.16; Jer. 3.5; Ps. 103.9), *l’dôr wādôr* (Ps. 77.9 [ET 8]), ‘*ad-dôr wādôr* (Isa. 13.20) and *l’ôrek yāmîm* (Lam. 5.20). Thomas does not deny this but claims that there are a few other instances where *(lā)neṣaḥ* has superlative force rather than meaning ‘for ever’. He finds this superlative force in Pss. 13.2 (ET 1); 74.10; 79.5; 89.47 (ET 46), passages where he claims the meaning ‘for ever’ produces a contradiction.²⁸ Thus, in Ps. 13.2 (ET 1), instead of ‘How long, O Lord, wilt thou forget me for ever?’, he renders, ‘How long, O Lord, wilt thou forget me completely?’, in Ps. 74.10 instead of ‘How long, O Lord, will the adversary reproach, the enemy spurn, thy name for ever?’, he translates ‘How long, O Lord, will the adversary reproach, the enemy spurn, thy name outrageously?’, in Ps. 79.5 instead of ‘How long, O Lord, wilt thou be angry for ever?’, he understands ‘How long, O Lord, wilt thou be extremely angry?’, and in Ps. 89.47 (ET 46) instead of ‘How long, O Lord, wilt thou hide thyself for ever?’, he translates ‘How long, O Lord, wilt thou hide thyself completely?’ Thomas derives this superlative sense from ‘pre-eminence’, which he understands as one of the basic meanings of this root.

Although Thomas’s suggestion seems to have been often neglected or rejected, it has received some support. Thus, as well as being followed in *The Revised Psalter* (in which Thomas had a large hand) in Pss. 13.2 (ET 1), 79.5 and 89.47 (ET 46), though not in Ps. 74.10, it is accepted for these same three verses in the NEB, REB and *The Psalms: A New*

28. D.W. Thomas, ‘The Use of נֶסַח as a Superlative in Hebrew’, *JSS* 1 (1956), pp. 106-109 [= no. 6 below]. In addition to these passages Thomas also noted a few other places where he believes this meaning is possible (see pp. 107-108), as well as in ‘Some Further Remarks’, p. 124. Prior to Thomas, P. Saydon, ‘Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew and Maltese’, *VT* 4 (1954), pp. 432-33, had suggested a similar meaning for several instances of this word in the Hebrew Bible, though he proposed a different etymology.

Translation for Worship (which was taken up in the Anglican Alternative Service Book), as well as for Ps. 13.2 (ET 1) only in NAB. In addition, A.A. Anderson²⁹ thought it probable in Pss. 13.2 (ET 1) and 79.5. However, Thomas's proposal seems unnecessary. Is it really likely that *lāneṣaḥ* in Ps. 74.10 has a different meaning from what it has in vv. 1 and 19 ('for ever')? Again, the vocabulary associated with some of these instances is comparable to that found in some passages where Thomas does not doubt that the meaning is 'for ever'. Note, for example, Ps. 13.2 (ET 1), where he sees superlative meaning in *neṣaḥ*, but this is a verse which has several parallels with Ps. 44.24-25 (ET 23-24), in both of which 'hide the face' and 'forget' appear alongside (*lā*)*neṣaḥ*, which clearly means 'for ever', and similarly 'forget' (*škh*) appears alongside (*lā*)*neṣaḥ* in both Ps. 13.2 (ET 1) and Lam. 5.20.³⁰

It is possible to overcome the apparent contradiction in meaning implied in the traditional understanding, to which Thomas has drawn attention, in one of two ways. First, bearing in mind that words for 'how long?' need not require an accompanying verb, one could render Ps. 13.2 (ET 1) as 'How long, O Lord? Wilt thou forget me for ever?', Ps. 74.10 as 'How long, O Lord? Will the adversary reproach, the enemy spurn, thy name for ever?', Ps. 79.5 as 'How long, O Lord? Wilt thou be angry for ever?', and Ps. 89.47 (ET 46) as 'How long, O Lord? Wilt thou hide thyself for ever?' This is, for example, how the RSV and NRSV render these passages, with the exception of Ps. 74.10. Alternatively, one could overcome the apparent contradiction by following P. Joüon's suggestion³¹ that in these passages the biblical writers have conflated two ideas, for example, Ps. 13.2 (ET 1), literally 'How long, O Lord, wilt thou forget me for ever?' combines the thoughts 'How long, O Lord, wilt thou forget me?' and 'Is it for ever?' This is the way that the JB and NJB understand all these passages.

šalmāwet, 'Deep Darkness', Literally 'Shadow of Death'

Thomas used his so-called superlative (or intensive) understanding of the word *māwet*, discussed above, to shed light on the meaning of the noun *šalmāwet*. This term, which occurs 18 times in the Hebrew Bible,

29. A.A. Anderson, *Psalms* (2 vols.; NCB; Oliphants [Marshall, Morgan & Scott], 1972), I, p. 128, and II, p. 578.

30. With regard to Lam. 5.20, it should be noted that though Winton Thomas did not see superlative force here, and indeed the parallelism with *l'e'ōrek yāmim* noted above tells against it, the NEB, REB and NRSV do see superlative force here.

31. P. Joüon, 'Notes de lexicographie hébraïque', *Bib* 7 (1926), pp. 162-70 (162-63).

exclusively in poetic passages (Isa. 9.1 [ET 2]; Jer. 2.6; 13.16; Amos 5.8; Pss. 23.4; 44.20 [ET 19]; 107.10, 14; Job 3.5; 10.21, 22; 12.22; 16.16; 24.17 [twice]; 28.3; 34.22; 38.17), has traditionally been rendered 'shadow of death'. This is how the word is universally vocalized in the MT and this understanding is also the dominant rendering of the ancient Versions. However, many scholars, particularly over the last century and a half,³² have believed that the word was originally vocalized *šalmût*, 'darkness', and is to be seen as cognate with Akkadian *šalāmu*, Arabic *zalima* IV and Ethiopic *šalma*, 'to be dark'.

Thomas wrote a most useful article on this subject.³³ He argues that the word does indeed simply mean 'deep darkness' and has no inherent connection with the underworld (*contra* F. Schwally and J. Hehn³⁴), and although there are two passages where it is used of the underworld (Job 10.21-22; 38.17), the actual meaning of the word there too is likewise 'deep darkness'. However, at the same time, Thomas defends the traditional vocalization *šalmāwet*, lit. 'shadow of death', supported by the MT and the ancient Versions, on the assumption that *māwet* functions as what he calls a superlative (though the term 'intensive' would be more appropriate), the existence of which form he had already argued for in his earlier article on the superlative.³⁵ For Thomas, a 'shadow of death' denotes a very deep shadow, and hence deep darkness.

In favour of Thomas's defence of the vocalization *šalmāwet*, literally 'shadow of death',³⁶ it may be pointed out that it would be extremely

32. E.g. W.R. Harper, *Amos and Hosea* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905), pp. 115, 117; S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, *Job* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921), II, p. 18; E. Dhorme, *Le Livre de Job* (Etudes bibliques; Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1926), p. 24, ET *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (trans. H. Knight; London: Thomas Nelson, 1967), pp. 26-27; R. Gordis, *The Book of Job* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978), p. 33; C. Cohen, 'The Meaning of צְלִמּוּת "Darkness": A Study in Philological Method', in M.V. Fox, V.A. Hurowitz, A. Hurvitz, M.L. Klein, B.J. Schwartz and N. Shupak (eds.), *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), pp. 287-309.

33. D.W. Thomas, 'צְלִמּוּת in the Old Testament', *JSS* 7 (1962), pp. 191-200 [= no. 7 below].

34. F. Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode* (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1892), p. 194; J. Hehn, 'צְלִמּוּת', in *Orientalische Studien Fritz Hommel zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag* (2 vols.; MVAG, 22; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1918), II, pp. 79-90.

35. Cf. Thomas, 'A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew', pp. 219-22. He later added additional examples in 'Some Further Remarks', pp. 122-23.

36. The traditional rendering 'shadow of death' has continued to be defended by various scholars over the years, including T. Nöldeke, review of A. von Kramer, *Alt-arabische Gedichte über die Volksage von Jemen...*, in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 1

odd—indeed unprecedented—for the pronunciation of a word to be changed because of popular etymology from *šalmût* to *šalmāwet*. The antiquity of the pronunciation *šalmāwet* is implied by its frequent rendering as *skia thanatou*, ‘shadow of death’, in the LXX, perhaps only a couple of centuries after the latest occurrence of the word in the book of Job (Job 34.22, part of the Elihu speeches, which are widely accepted to be a later addition to the text). Moreover, it counts against repointing the word as *šalmût* that the root *šlm* is nowhere else clearly attested with the meaning ‘dark’ in Biblical Hebrew³⁷ or even in any other North-West Semitic language. It would thus be surprising if the word *šalmāwet* is derived from it. In fact, if *šalmût* were the correct form, it would be the only abstract word in Biblical Hebrew ending in *-ût* lacking other words from the same root in that language. On the other hand, *šēl*, ‘shadow’, and *māwet*, ‘death’, are both common. Similarly, in Ugaritic we find *šlmt* in the sense of ‘darkness’ (parallel with *šlmt*, ‘concealment, obscurity’, cf. *KTU* 1.4.VII.54-55; 1.8.II.7-8) but no occurrences of a verb *šlm*, ‘to be dark’, although again *šl*, ‘shadow’, and *mt*, ‘death’, are well attested. This too suggests that the vocalization of the word as ‘shadow of death’ is correct, even though compound words in Hebrew are admittedly rare.

Summary

For a summary of the main conclusions of this chapter, please see the overall summary of the book in Chapter 6.

(1867), pp. 447-65 (456-57); ‘צֶלֶם und צֶלֶמָה’, ZAW 17 (1897), pp. 183-87; Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode*, p. 194; Hehn, ‘צֶלֶמָה’, pp. 79-90; H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*, I (Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1922), p. 506; J. Barr, ‘Philology and Exegesis. Some General Remarks, with Illustrations from Job 3’, in C. Brekelmans (ed.), *Questions disputées d’Ancien Testament* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, and Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1974), pp. 39-61 (50-55); L.L. Grabbe, *Comparative Philology and the Text of Job: A Study in Methodology* (SBLDS, 34; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 27-29; W.L. Michel, ‘ŠLMT, “Deep Darkness” or “Shadow of Death”’, *Biblical Research* 29 (1984), pp. 5-20.

37. It has sometimes been supposed that the Hebrew word *šelem* might mean ‘darkness’ in Pss. 39.7 (ET 6) and 73.20, but in each case the context supports rather a meaning like ‘shadow’ or ‘phantom’ (literally ‘image’).

3

SOME NOUNS

b^elîya'al, 'Belial'

There has been no consensus in modern scholarship over the etymology of the word *b^elîya'al*, 'Belial'. This word occurs most frequently in such phrases as a 'son of Belial' or 'sons of Belial' (*ben* or *b^enê b^elîya'al*, Deut. 13.14 [ET 13]; Judg. 19.22; 20.13; 1 Sam. 2.12; 10.27; 25.17; 1 Kgs 21.10, 13 [twice]; 2 Chron. 13.7), though we also read of a 'daughter (*bat*) of Belial' (1 Sam. 1.16) and 'man (*'îš* or *'ādām*) of Belial' (1 Sam. 25.25; 30.22; 2 Sam. 16.7; 20.1; Prov. 6.12; 16.27), and in addition the word Belial occurs with other expressions or by itself (Deut. 15.9; 2 Sam. 22.5, 23.6; Job 34.18; Pss. 18.5 [ET 4]; 41.9 [ET 8]; Prov. 19.28; Nah. 1.11; 2.1 [ET 1.15]).

Thomas wrote a most useful essay on the word.¹ This not only set out fully the renderings in the ancient Versions and in the English Bible up to his time (as well as the Luther Bible), but also discussed the various views which had been proposed to explain the word, exposing their weak points, as well as putting forward his own original suggestion. Thus, he points out that the view that Belial consists of *b^elî*, 'without', + *ya'al*, 'worth', is unlikely, since no such Hebrew word for 'worth' is otherwise attested. With regard to another common view, that Belial derives from *b^elî*, 'without', + apocopated form of *ya'^aleh*, 'will come up', so as to mean 'one who will not come up again', that is, from the underworld, he notes that the employment of *b^elî* as a negative with a verb is rare and the use of the apocopated form *ya'al* would be odd. As for T.K. Cheyne's view² that Belial derives from Bilili, an alleged Mesopotamian goddess of the underworld, Thomas points out that this had been widely criticized.

1. D.W. Thomas, 'בִּלְיָאֵל in the Old Testament', in J.N. Birdsall and R.W. Thomson (eds.), *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), pp. 11-19 [= no. 8 below].

2. T.K. Cheyne, 'The Origin and Meaning of "Belial"', *ExpTim* 8 (1896-97), pp. 423-24.

As a matter of fact, there is no evidence that Bilili was a goddess of the underworld.³

G.R. Driver⁴ had previously suggested that Belial is a word meaning ‘confusion’ and is to be derived from a postulated verb *bl’*, ‘to confuse’, + affirmative lamedh, which he envisaged as cognate with Arabic *balaġa*, ‘to reach’ (form 1), ‘to communicate’ (form 2). Thomas, however, preferred to see a connection with *bl’* in its well-attested sense ‘to swallow’, so that *bēliya‘al* would mean ‘the swallower’, referring to Sheol. He noted that in Ps. 18.5 (ET 4) = 2 Sam. 22.5 Belial is parallel with death (*māwet*), just as Sheol and death (*māwet*) stand parallel in the next verse, and in Prov. 1.12 Sheol is depicted swallowing up (*bl’*) people. Thomas suggested, therefore, that a man of Belial is ‘one whose actions or words engulf a man, bringing him to the abyss, to the underworld. Such a wicked man is, in colloquial English, “an infernal fellow”’.⁵

There are certain attractions in connecting Belial with the verb *bl’*. However, J.A. Emerton⁶ has noted the inappropriateness of comparing our English expression ‘an infernal fellow’, since Sheol was not hell but a place to which everyone went after death. He further points out that it would be more natural to assume that Belial is a direct term for evil rather than denoting it in the indirect way that Thomas suggests. Noting that the verb *bl’* can be translated ‘to destroy’ as well as ‘to swallow’ (cf. Job 2.3; Lam. 2.2, 8), he therefore suggests that we understand Belial as a word meaning ‘destructiveness’, and hence denoting that which is harmful or wicked. This seems to make excellent sense. ‘Sons of Belial’ clearly represent people whose actions had a destructive effect on society, and Belial is found parallel with words for wickedness. The underlying meaning ‘destructiveness’ explains how it could be employed parallel with ‘death’ in Ps. 18.5 (ET 4) without its actually being a name for Sheol, and also fits Ps. 41.9 (ET 8) admirably, where the psalmist’s enemies say of him, ‘A thing of Belial has fastened on him; he will not rise again from where he lies’, a passage in which Belial clearly denotes something like ‘deadly’ (RSV). It also makes sense as applied to Nineveh, whose actions

3. See W. Baudissin, ‘The Original Meaning of “Belial”’, *ExpTim* 9 (1897–98), pp. 40–45; P. Jensen, ‘On “Belial”’, *ExpTim* 9 (1897–98), pp. 283–84. On Bilili, see E. Ebeling, ‘Belili’, in E. Ebeling and B. Meissner (eds.), *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1932), I, p. 479.

4. G.R. Driver, ‘Hebrew Notes’, *ZAW* 52 (1934), pp. 51–56 (52–53). Cf. G.R. Driver, ‘Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament. IV’, *JTS* 33 (1932), pp. 38–47 (40–41).

5. Thomas, ‘בִּלְיָאֵל in the Old Testament’, p. 19.

6. J.A. Emerton, ‘Sheol and the Sons of Belial’, *VT* 37 (1987), pp. 214–18.

were not simply wicked but violently destructive (Nah. 1.11; 2.1 [ET 1.15]), and of the men whose actions led to the death of the Levite's concubine (Judg. 19.22; 20.13), and provides excellent parallelism in Shimei's words to David, 'Begone, you man of blood and man of Belial' (2 Sam. 16.17).

Thus, although Thomas did not get quite the right nuance for the word, he did point correctly to its underlying Hebrew root.

da'at, 'Law-suit' (Proverbs 22.12; 29.7; cf. 24.14)

There are two places in the book of Proverbs where Winton Thomas thought that the noun *da'at*, commonly understood in its normal meaning of 'knowledge', should rather be understood to mean 'law-suit', cognate with Arabic *da'way*, which has this meaning.⁷ One of these is Prov. 29.7,⁸ commonly translated 'The righteous know the rights of the poor, the wicked do not discern knowledge', or more paraphrastically, 'The righteous know the rights of the poor, but the wicked have no such understanding'. Thomas, however, proposed to render, 'The righteous considereth the cause of the poor: (But) the wicked regardeth not (his) suit'. This, however, is quite unnecessary, since a contrast between those who know the rights of the poor and those who lack this knowledge seems entirely natural. The other place where Thomas found the meaning 'law-suit' is in Prov. 22.12,⁹ which is generally translated, 'The eyes of the Lord keep watch over knowledge, but he overthrows the words of the faithless'. We may not suppose that 'knowledge' refers to those who have knowledge, since the contrast is not with the faithless but with 'the words of the faithless'. Finally, the verb underlying this word in Thomas's view, *d'h*, 'to seek', cognate with Arabic *da'ā*, 'sought, desired, asked, demanded', he finds in Prov. 24.14,¹⁰ translating 'So seek wisdom for thyself...' However, as Michael Fox pointed out,¹¹ the verb

7. E.W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* (8 vols.; London: Williams & Norgate (1863-93 [1867]), III, pp. 884-85.

8. D.W. Thomas, 'Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs', *JTS* 38 (1937) pp. 400-403 (401-402) [= no. 9 below].

9. D.W. Thomas, 'A Note on דַּעַת in Proverbs xxii.12', *JTS* NS 14 (1963), pp. 93-94 [= no. 10 below].

10. Thomas, 'Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs', p. 401; cf. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, III, p. 883.

11. M.V. Fox, *Proverbs 10-31* (AB, 18B; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), p. 748.

yd' can mean 'learn' (cf. Prov. 1.2; Eccl. 1.17; 8.16), which makes good sense here, so we may translate, 'So you should learn wisdom for yourself...' Thomas's suggestion thus seems uncalled for.

d^ekākîm (for d^erākîm), 'Sand-flats' (Isaiah 49.9)

A particularly weak proposal of Thomas¹² was the suggestion that we should emend *d^erākîm*, 'tracks', in Isa. 49.9 to *d^ekākîm* and render this as 'sand-flats', taking it to be cognate with Arabic *dak*, 'even, level sand'. This suggestion involves creating a *hapax legomenon* on the basis of an emendation, which has no support in any Hebrew manuscripts or in any of the ancient Versions, and then appeals simply to vocabulary-rich Arabic for an allegedly appropriate meaning. The motivation for this proposal was Thomas's acceptance of G.R. Driver's view¹³ that the parallel word in Isa. 49.9, *šepāyîm*, means 'sand dunes', but this itself is highly unlikely. As P. Joüon and A. Gelston¹⁴ have shown, the meaning 'track' is much more likely for *šepî*. The reason for this is not simply because—unlike the translation 'sand dune', which has no Versional support—it has considerable support in the ancient Versions: eight times in the Targum, seven times in the Peshitta, three times in the Vulgate, once in the Septuagint (our passage, Isa. 49.9), and once (Jer. 7.29) in Symmachus (in Cod. 88).¹⁵ It is also because the word *derek*, 'track, way', is actually found in close association with *šepî* not only in Isa. 49.9, the passage under consideration here, but also in Jer. 3.2 and 4.11.¹⁶ The fact that Isa. 49.9 is not alone in this regard makes it highly implausible that *d^erākîm* in this verse should be emended to *d^ekākîm* as Thomas supposed.

12. D.W. Thomas, 'A Note on סַבְרִים in Isaiah xlix.9b', *JTS* NS 19 (1968), pp. 203-204 [= no. 11 below].

13. G.R. Driver, 'Confused Hebrew Roots', in B. Schindler and A. Marmorstein (eds.), *Occident and Orient (Gaster Anniversary Volume)* (London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1936), pp. 73-83 (78-80). Driver notes that the rendering 'sand dune' had previously been suggested by F. Wutz, *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus* (ed. P. Kahle; Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen, 2; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933), p. 257.

14. P. Joüon, 'Le sens du mot hébreu סַבְרִים', *JA*, series 10, vol. 7 (1906), pp. 137-42; A. Gelston, 'Some Notes on Second Isaiah', *VT* 21 (1971), pp. 517-27 (518-21).

15. See Gelston, 'Some Notes on Second Isaiah', p. 519, for further details.

16. It should be pointed out that another translation sometimes offered for *šepî* is 'bare height', but this lacks the weight of evidence noted above for the rendering 'track'.

zîz, 'Locust, Worm' (Psalms 50.11; 80.14 [ET 13])

The rare Hebrew word *zîz* occurs in the Hebrew Bible only in Pss. 50.11 and 80.14 (ET 13), where it is used of some kind of creature. In Ps. 50.11 we read, 'I know all the birds of the air,¹⁷ and all the *zîz* of the field are in my sight', while in Ps. 80.14 (ET 13) we read, 'The boar from the forest ravages it, and the *zîz* of the field feed on it'. The ancient Versions give no clear picture of its meaning. Thus, in Ps. 80.14 (ET 13) some LXX manuscripts and Symmachus translate *monios*, 'the leader boar', with which Vulgate's *singularis (ferus)* may be compared. However, LXX manuscripts B and S render *onos*, 'ass' (similarly Quinta, *onargos*). Again, the Targum translates *tarngôl*, 'cock', Jerome *bestiae*, 'beasts', and similarly the Peshitta *haywâtâ*. In Ps. 50.11 Quinta, Targum and Peshitta all have the same renderings as in Ps. 80.14 (ET 13), though the LXX (*hōraiotēs*), followed by the Vulgate (*pulchritudo*), understand the word to mean 'beauty' (presupposing Hebrew *zîw*, 'brightness, splendour'), and Jerome translates 'everything' (*universitas*). Most of the English Bible translations in both passages have rather general translations like 'the wild beast(s)' (cf. AV, RV), 'creatures' (NIV), or 'all that move(s)' (RSV, NRSV).

Thomas appears to have shed new light on this question in an article which was published in 1967.¹⁸ He points out that there are no known Semitic cognates supporting the meaning 'boar' or 'cock'. Thomas further claims that the only possible Semitic cognates with an animalic meaning are Akkadian *zizānu*, 'a kind of locust',¹⁹ and the Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic *zîz*, *zîzā*, 'mite, worm',²⁰ which could either mean literally 'that which moves' (from the root *zûz*) or be onomatopoeic in origin. He further notes that a meaning like 'locusts' or 'worms', both small but destructive creatures, would be appropriate in Ps. 80.14 (ET 13) and would also be suitable standing in parallel with 'the birds of the air' in Ps. 50.11.

17. Most emend *hārîm* to *šamayim* or *mārôm* (cf. LXX, Targum, Peshitta). If this is correct it is possible that the reading was corrupted by the presence of *har^arê* in the preceding line.

18. D.W. Thomas, 'The Meaning of זִז in Psalm lxxx.14', *ExpTim* 86 (1967), p. 385 [= no. 12 below]. For some unaccountable reason Thomas does not also include Ps. 50.11 in the title of his article.

19. Cf. CAD, XV (Z), p. 149. The word was also spelled *sisānu*; see CAD, XXI (S), p. 321.

20. Cf. A. Cohen, 'Studies in Hebrew Lexicography', *AJSL* 40 (1924), pp. 153-85 (170); Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (2 vols.; New York: Pardes, 1950), I, p. 393.

Although most modern English Bible translations and commentators seem to be unaware of this view, it is significant that, in addition to the NEB, which translates ‘the teeming life’ in Ps. 50.11 (similarly REB) and ‘the swarming insects’ in Ps. 80.14 (ET 13; REB here inconsistently reverts to ‘the wild creatures’), Thomas’s view is also followed by the translation which was taken up in the Anglican Alternative Service Book, *The Psalms: A New Translation for Worship* (grasshoppers, locusts), *HALAT* (ET *HALOT*, referring to small creatures that ruin the fields), the new Gesenius dictionary (an insect) and Seybold (cricket, locust).²¹ Interestingly, *HALAT* (ET *HALOT*), the new Gesenius dictionary and Seybold also cite in support Arabic *zîz*, ‘tree cricket’, which Thomas did not mention. However, Thomas’s view is not found in either passage in *The Revised Psalter* (1963, amended version 1964). Presumably, the idea which Thomas published in 1967 was not yet formulated in his mind. In broad terms the kind of meaning Thomas argued for has been supported in a recent detailed study by R. Whitekettle,²² who advocates the meaning ‘small herbiferous terrestrial animal’, or more simply ‘bugs’, ‘insects’ or ‘wugs’ (the last being an ethnobiological technical term). Such an understanding is to be preferred to the recent proposal of N. Wazana²³ that *zîz* represents the mythological bird Anzu (a giant lion-headed eagle) attested in Mesopotamian sources. The contexts of Psalms 50 and 80 do not support such a mythological understanding and the two words have nothing in common except the letter *zî*!²⁴

zîmrât, ‘Protection, Strength’ (Exodus 15.2, etc.)

In Exod. 15.2, Ps. 118.14 and Isa. 12.2 there occur the identical hymnic words ‘*ozzî w^ezîmrât yāh*’, ‘The Lord is my strength and *zîmrât*’. Traditionally this was rendered ‘The Lord is my strength and song’, a view

21. K. Seybold, *Die Psalmen* (HAT, 1.15; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996), pp. 204-205, 316-17.

22. R. Whitekettle, ‘Bugs, Bunny, or Boar? Identifying the *Zîz* Animals of Psalms 50 and 80’, *CBQ* 67 (2005), pp. 250-64.

23. N. Wazana, ‘Anzu and Ziz: Traces of a Mythological Bird in the Ancient Near East, the Bible and Rabbinical Traditions’, *Shnaton* 14 (2004), pp. 161-91 [Hebrew], updated in her ‘Anzu and Ziz: Great Mythological Birds in Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Rabbinic Traditions’, *JANESCU* 31 (2009), pp. 111-35.

24. *Ziz* is the name of a fabulous bird in later rabbinic sources, sometimes associated with Behemoth and Leviathan. This notion clearly came about by pressing the parallelism of the word with ‘birds’ in Ps. 50.11 and by taking *b^ehēmôt* in the previous verse (Ps. 50.10) as the name of the monster Behemoth rather than the common word for cattle.

which still has some support.²⁵ Probably a majority, however, now translate ‘The Lord is my strength and protection/defence/might’.²⁶ Thomas was not the absolute first to propose this, though he was one of the first, but his original contribution was to point out that the very first scholar to suggest this rendering was E. Ben-Yehuda, in his *Thesaurus*,²⁷ something which had been and indeed still tends to be overlooked because the work is in Modern Hebrew. Already Ben-Yehuda, like scholars after him, appealed to Arabic *damara*, ‘to protect’. In more recent decades strong support for this view has been added by the parallelism of ‘z and *dmr* in Ugaritic in KTU 1.108.24 [all of lines 23-27 are cited below]:

l[rp]i arš ‘zk *dmrk* lank ḥtkk nmrtk btk ugrt lynt špš wyrḥ wn ‘mt šnt il

May your strength, your protection, your might, your paternal care and your splendour be that of the Rephaim of the earth in the midst of Ugarit for as long as the days of the Sun and Moon and the goodly years of El.

25. ‘Song’ is the rendering found in AV, RV, RSV, JB, NJB, NIV, for example, and is followed by such modern commentators as B.S. Childs, *Exodus* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1974), p. 242 (thus his translation, but his discussion shows awareness of other views and is not dogmatic); J.I. Durham, *Exodus* (WBC, 3; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), pp. 199, 201, and C. Houtman, *Exodus* (4 vols.; HCOT; Kampen: Kok, 1993–2002 [1996]), II, pp. 223, 278-79. Houtman, who translates ‘My protection and the source of my hymn of praise is YHWH’, says that the fact that we have the verb *šîr*, ‘to sing’, in v. 1 should make a reference to ‘song’ unsurprising in v. 2, but this overlooks the fact that *zimrât* is parallel to ‘*ozzî*, not the verb *šîr*. This word is also presupposed by S.E. Loewenstamm, “‘The Lord is my Strength and my Glory’”, *VT* 19 (1969), pp. 464-70, although he prefers to translate *zimrât* as ‘glory’. E.M. Good, ‘Exodus xv 2’, *VT* 20 (1970), pp. 358-59, feels Loewenstamm is on the right track but takes ‘*ozzî w^e zimrât(i)*’ as a hendiadys, ‘my singing about my strength’, i.e. ‘my glorification’.

26. In recent years this understanding has been followed by NEB, REB, NPSV, NRSV, and it presumably lies behind NAB’s ‘my courage’. It was supported by F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman, ‘The Song of Miriam’, *JNES* 14 (1956), pp. 237-50 (243), and followed by KB, *HALAT* (ET *HALOT*) and J.P. Hyatt, *Exodus* (NCB; London: Oliphants [Marshall, Morgan & Scott], 1971), p. 164. It has received particularly strong support from S.B. Parker, ‘Exodus xv 2 Again’, *VT* 21 (1971), pp. 373-79, and M.L. Barré, ‘My Strength and my Song in Exodus 15:2’, *CBQ* 54 (1992), pp. 623-37. For the earliest proponents of this view, see n. 27 below. Cf. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*, pp. 29-30, who sounds sympathetic.

27. D.W. Thomas’s article was ‘A Note on Exodus xv.2’, *ExpTim* 48 (1937), p. 478 [= no. 13 below]. E. Ben-Yehuda first put forward the proposal in his *Thesaurus totius hebraicitatis et veteris et recentioris* (17 vols.; Berlin-Schöneberg: Langescheitsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1908–59 [1911]), III, pp. 1363-64. Prior to Thomas, T.H. Gaster also proposed this view in ‘Notes on the “Song of the Sea” (Exodus xv.)’, *ExpTim* 48 (1936), p. 45, but in a subsequent article, ‘Exodus xv.2: מִי־יָמִי וְיָמִי מִי־יָמִי’, *ExpTim* 49 (1938), p. 189, he noted that he had been anticipated by I. Zolli, ‘Note esegetiche: Es. xv.2’, *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* 48 (1935), pp. 290-92 (290). Neither of these was aware of Ben-Yehuda’s priority, to which Thomas drew attention.

Here 'z and *dmr* must be synonymous, meaning 'strength' and 'protection', and there can be no question of the latter having the meaning 'song'. This Ugaritic root is presumably also found in *KTU* 1.3.II.13-15, where *dmr* is parallel with *mhrm*, 'warriors', so probably meaning there 'soldier'.²⁸ One may perhaps compare Arabic *damīr*, 'brave, gallant', and note also the use in English of 'forces' to mean 'army'. On the other hand, the claim sometimes made²⁹ that Old South Arabic *dmr* means 'to protect' does not appear to be justified.³⁰ Thus, the dictionary of J.C. Biella³¹ simply lists under this root *dmr* I, 'ordain, pronounce sentence', and *dmr* II, from which comes *mdmrn*, 'plantations'.

Other evidence has also been amassed over the years. Thus, already T.H. Gaster³² noted that the LXX rendered *zimirāt* in Exod. 15.2 by *skepastēs*, 'protector'. Moreover, in Gen. 43.11 Israel (Jacob) instructs his brothers to take Joseph (though the latter's identity is not yet known) some of the *zimirat hā'āreš*, and the continuation of the verse indicates that this must mean something like 'the produce of the land'. Other Hebrew terms for 'strength' are used in this very sense, including *kōah* in Gen. 4.12, Job 31.39 and *hayil* in Joel 2.22, so it fits perfectly if *zimirā*, 'produce', literally means 'strength' here.³³ It has also been suggested that this meaning is to be found in 2 Sam. 23.1 and Job 35.10. In 2 Sam. 23.1 we read that David is 'the Anointed of the God of Jacob, *ûne'îm z'emirôt yiśrā'el*'. Although these last three words have traditionally been rendered 'the sweet psalmist of Israel',³⁴ and the translation 'the favourite of the songs of Israel' has also been suggested,³⁵ the parallelism of *z'emirôt yiśrā'el* with 'the God of Jacob' suggests that *z'emirôt* is an epithet of God. This makes some such rendering as 'the beloved of the Mighty

28. Noted by Barré, 'My Strength and my Song in Exodus 15:2', p. 626.

29. E.g. KB; Cross and Freedman, 'The Song of Miriam', p. 243 note b.

30. So Loewenstamm, 'The Lord is my Strength and my Glory', p. 466; Barré, 'My Strength and my Song', pp. 624-25.

31. J.C. Biella, *Dictionary of Old South Arabic, Sabaean Dialect* (HSS, 25; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), pp. 96-97.

32. Gaster, 'Exodus xv.2', p. 189.

33. With regard to Gen. 43.11, these parallel expressions were noted by Barré, 'My Strength and my Song in Exodus 15:2', pp. 628-29. He also refers to *kōah* in Hos. 7.9, but this particular nuance seems less obvious to me there.

34. Cf. AV, RV, RSV.

35. RSV margin; cf. A.M. Cooper, 'The Life and Times of King David according to the Book of Psalms', in R.E. Friedman (ed.), *The Poet and the Historian: Essays in Literary and Historical Biblical Criticism* (HSM; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), pp. 117-31 (129), 'the Hero of Israel's songs'.

One/Protector/Guardian of Israel' preferable.³⁶ We should then understand *z^emirôt* as a plural of excellence. Again, in Job 35.10, Elihu declares, 'But no one says, "Where is God my maker, who gives *z^emirôt* in the night..."' Traditionally, *z^emirôt* has been rendered 'songs',³⁷ but it is rather strange to hear of God *giving* songs! Dhorme³⁸ therefore supposed that the reference is to God's manifestation in the thunder, but nowhere else in the Bible is this spoken of as constituting a song. Gordis's view³⁹ that the reference is akin to the music of the spheres also seems unlikely. There is therefore some attraction in seeing *z^emirôt* as referring to 'protection' or 'strength' in the night, from the root *zmr* being considered here. This is supported by scholars such as E.J. Kissane ('succour'), N.H. Tur-Sinai and M.H. Pope,⁴⁰ and the NEB, REB and NRSV.

Finally, just as we have the Cypriot royal name Azbaal, 'Baal is strong'⁴¹ (cf. too the Cypriot divine name Baal-Az⁴² and the Ugaritic

36. Cf. NAB; NRSV; H.N. Richardson, 'The Last Words of David. Some Notes on II Samuel 23:1-7', *JBL* 90 (1971), pp. 257-66 (259, 261-62); T.N.D. Mettinger, "'The Last Words of David": A Study of the Structure and Meaning in II Samuel 23:1-7', *SEÅ* 41-42 (1976-77), pp. 147-56 (149-51); R.P. Gordon, *1 and 2 Samuel: A Commentary* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1986), p. 310. P.K. McCarter, *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (AB, 9; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), pp. 476-77, renders slightly differently, 'the darling of the *stronghold* of Israel'.

37. E.g. A. de Wilde, *Das Buch Hiob* (OTS, 22; Leiden: Brill, 1981), p. 330; J.E. Hartley, *The Book of Job* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1988), pp. 464, 466; D.J.A. Clines, *Job 21-37* (WBC, 18A; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2006), pp. 787, 790.

38. Dhorme, *Le Livre de Job*, p. 487, ET *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, pp. 533-34.

39. Gordis, *Job*, pp. 401-402.

40. Cf. E.J. Kissane, *The Book of Job: Translated from a Critically Revised Hebrew Text with Commentary* (Dublin: Brown & Nolan, 1939), pp. 238, 240, 'succour'; N.H. Tur-Sinai, *The Book of Job: A New Commentary* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, rev. edn, 1967), pp. 490-91, who understands it to refer to '(fresh) strength' and compares one of the benedictions following the morning prayer where God is said to be one 'who gives strength to the tired'; M.H. Pope, *Job: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 15; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1973), pp. 262, 263-64, 'strength'. However, Grabbe, *Comparative Philology and the Text of Job: A Study in Methodology* (SBLDS, 34; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), p. 109, may well be justified in arguing that the Qumran Job Targum's *lnšbñ* does not presuppose this rendering (cf. 'strength', 'hardness' in Dan. 2.41), but rather, reflecting the fact that *nišb^etā* can mean 'plant, shoots', took *z^emirôt* to be related to *zāmîr*, *z^emôrâ*, 'tendril, shoot'.

41. See G.F. Hill, *Catalogue of Greek Coins of Cyprus* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1904), pp. xxx-xxxi, xxxii-xxxiii, lii, 10-13, 16 note, plate III.1-9.

42. Cf. P. Xella, 'Le dieu B'1 'z dans une nouvelle inscription phénicienne de Kition (Chypre)', *SEL* 10 (1993), pp. 61-69.

expression *b'l. 'z* in *KTU* 1.6.VI.17, 18, 20), so we find the personal names *b'lzmr* in Samaria ostrakon 12, *dmrb'l* in Ugaritic (*KTU* 4.75.II.5) as well as Zimraddu in the Akkadian of Ugarit (*PRU* 3:262), and Zimraddu, Zimri-Dagan, Zimri-Lim, etc. at Mari.⁴³ The name of the Israelite king Zimri (1 Kgs 16.9-20; 2 Kgs 9.31) should also be noted. In all these instances it is plausible to see the root *zmr*, 'to be strong'.

ḥaṭṭā't, 'Penury' (Prov. 10.16)

Proverbs 10.16 reads, 'The wages of the righteous is life, the income of the wicked is *ḥaṭṭā't*'. The normal meaning of *ḥaṭṭā't* is 'sin', and this is the traditional rendering that some still defend.⁴⁴ However, it is widely noted that 'sin' does not make good sense here, since this is the source rather than the reward of a wicked man's actions. Clearly, some antithesis to 'life' is here intended. In the past some felt constrained to emend *l'ḥaṭṭā't* to *lim'ḥittā*, 'to destruction' or *l'māwet*, 'to death',⁴⁵ but graphically both emendations appear too drastic to be convincing, and all the ancient Versions presuppose MT's *l'ḥaṭṭā't*.

It was against this backdrop that Thomas appealed to comparative Semitic philology and proposed that *ḥaṭṭā't* should be understood here in the same sense as Ethiopic *ḥaṭ'at*, 'penury'.⁴⁶ The opposing word 'life' he likewise understood in the specific material sense of 'maintenance' (cf. Prov. 27.27). Thomas's specific proposal has had little following, though R.J. Clifford⁴⁷ does translate *ḥaṭṭā't* by 'want' here, but without

43. For these and other comparable Mari theophoric personal names, see H.B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), p. 188.

44. So RSV, NRSV, NAB, NJB; also (with nuancing; see below n. 49) commentators such as W. McKane, *Proverbs* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1973), pp. 225, 425; O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia)* (BKAT, 17; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984), pp. 121-22, 127; R.E. Murphy, *Proverbs* (WBC, 22; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998), pp. 70, 74; Fox, *Proverbs 10-31*, p. 520.

45. C.H. Toy, *Proverbs* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899), pp. 208-209, suggested emending to *lim'ḥittā*, 'to destruction', though on p. 211 he also suggested *l'māwet*, 'to death', as an alternative. *BHS* suggests that we should perhaps read *lim'ḥittā*, which presumably lies behind JB's 'destruction', whilst R.B.Y. Scott, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes* (AB, 18; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), p. 82 note *b*, proposes *l'māwet*, 'to death'. On p. 84 Scott suggests that Paul was referring to this verse in Rom. 6.23, 'The wages of sin is death...'

46. D.W. Thomas, 'The Meaning of חַטָּא' in Proverbs x. 16', *JTS* 15 (1964), pp. 295-96 [= no. 14 below].

47. R.J. Clifford, *Proverbs* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1999), pp. 110, 115.

referring to Thomas's earlier proposal of this understanding. It is a disadvantage to Thomas's view that the occurrence of *ḥaṭī'at*, 'penury' in Ethiopic is extremely rare, according to A. Dillmann,⁴⁸ but more significantly, this meaning for *ḥaṭṭā't* is found nowhere else in the Old Testament, unlike an alternative rendering which I shall consider presently.

Although we should reject Thomas's specific solution, it is nevertheless right that we retain the MT and seek some meaning of *ḥaṭṭā't* other than 'sin' that can form an appropriate antithesis to 'life'. The best solution is to recognize that *ḥaṭṭā't* is capable of meaning 'punishment (for sin)' in addition to the more usual 'sin' (or 'guilt'), just as is the case with the Hebrew word *āwōn*. Although a few commentators on the book of Proverbs have come close to this, translating 'sin' but claiming that sin's consequences are also included,⁴⁹ none, so far as I am aware, has noted that the specific meaning 'punishment' is supported by Zech. 14.19, where modern translations are agreed that we should render, 'This shall be the punishment (*ḥaṭṭa't*) of Egypt and the punishment (*ḥaṭṭa't*) of all the nations that do not go up to keep the feast of booths'. This refers to the plague previously mentioned in v. 18. Although overlooked by commentators on the book of Proverbs, this translation is supported by the new Gesenius Hebrew Lexicon and the NIV. We may accordingly render, 'The wages of the righteous is life, the income of the wicked is punishment'.⁵⁰

ḥ^alīṣōt and maḥ^alāṣōt, 'Clean Clothes'
(Judges 14.19; Isaiah 3.22; Zechariah 3.4)

The word *maḥ^alāṣōt* occurs twice in the Old Testament, once in Zech. 3.4 and again in Isa. 3.22, and clearly refers to some kind of garments.

48. See A. Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae* (Leipzig: T.O. Weigall, 1865), col. 621.

49. So McKane, *Proverbs*, pp. 225, 425; Plöger, *Sprüche*, pp. 121-22, 127; Murphy, *Proverbs*, pp. 70, 74; similarly B.K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs, Chapters 1-15* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 2004), pp. 450, 465, who renders 'sin and death'; Fox, *Proverbs 10-31*, who writes that 'the wage of the wicked is conducive to sin (and hence to death)'. Toy, *Proverbs*, p. 209 n. *, rejects the rendering 'punishment' here, noting (rightly) that this meaning had implausibly been proposed in Isa. 5.18; 1 Kgs 13.34; Num. 32.23 and Dan. 9.24, but failing to note the appropriateness of this meaning in Zech. 14.19.

50. R.N. Whybray, *Proverbs* (NCB; London: Marshall Pickering, and Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1994), p. 166, hankers after some meaning related to the verb *ḥt*, which can sometimes mean 'to miss', but the meaning 'punishment', which I have argued for, has the advantage that it is found elsewhere in the Old Testament (Zech. 14.19).

Traditionally, it has been explained as meaning either a 'change of garment' or 'rich apparel'. However, Thomas showed that the context in Zech. 3.4 requires the meaning 'clean garments'.⁵¹ Thus, the *maḥ^alāṣôt* which the high priest Joshua puts on replace the 'filthy garments' of vv. 3-4a, and explicitly include a 'clean turban' in v. 5. Moreover, Thomas points out that there is philological support for this translation, since Arabic *ḥalaṣa* means 'to become clear, pure, genuine, white'⁵² and is actually used of garments in its adjectival form.⁵³ (Thomas also appeals to Akkadian *ḥalāṣu*, which he claims means 'to purify' [oil], though according to CAD, VI (H), *ḥalāṣu* = (1) to press, squeeze out [used of oil, etc.], (2) to clean by combing.) Among those who follow this view are KB and HALAT (ET HALOT; 'festival dress'), C.L. and E.M. Meyers, J.C. VanderKam and L.-S. Tiemeyer.⁵⁴ C.L. and E.M. Meyers make the additional supporting point (reiterated by J.C. VanderKam) that 'Since the term does not appear in any of the detailed descriptions of priestly vestments in Exodus or Leviticus, the term clearly cannot refer to a specific type of garment but rather to the state of apparel so denoted'.

Since this is the meaning in Zech. 3.4 this must also be the case in Isa. 3.22, where the word occurs in a long list of female accoutrements. Along with H. Hönig,⁵⁵ H. Wildberger⁵⁶ follows this view, saying 'It is easy to see how the transferred meaning "festival garments" developed'.

In a subsequent article, Thomas⁵⁷ sought to find a comparable meaning in the word *ḥ^alīṣâ* in Judg. 14.19. However, unlike his suggestion about *maḥ^alāṣôt* in Zech. 3.4, he does not appear to have gained any following here. He fails to note that the same word occurs also in 2 Sam. 2.21 (*ḥ^alīṣâtô*), where Abner says to Asahel, 'Turn aside to your right hand or to your left, and seize one of the young men, and take *ḥ^alīṣâtô*'. It does not seem appropriate to render this either as 'clean clothes' or 'festal

51. D.W. Thomas, 'A Note on מַחֲלָצוֹת in Zechariah iii 4', *JTS* 33 (1932), pp. 279-80 [= no. 15 below].

52. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, II, p. 785.

53. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, II, p. 786.

54. HALAT (ET HALOT); C.L. and E.M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8* (AB, 25B; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987), p. 190; J.C. VanderKam, 'Joshua the High Priest and the Interpretation of Zechariah 3', *CBQ* 53 (1991), pp. 553-70 (556); L.-S. Tiemeyer, 'The Guilty Priesthood (Zech 3)', in C.M. Tuckett (ed.), *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 1-19 (8).

55. H.W. Hönig, 'Die Bekleidung des Hebräers' (dissertation, Zurich, 1957), p. 115.

56. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja Kapitel 1-12* (BKAT, 10.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd edn, 1980), pp. 143-44, ET *Isaiah 1-12* (trans. T.H. Trapp; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), p. 154.

57. D.W. Thomas, 'A Note on חֲלִיצָה in Judges xiv 19', *JTS* 34 (1933), p. 165 [= no. 16 below].

garments'. More likely the reference is to spoil, literally 'his spoil'.⁵⁸ Compare the verb *hlš*, which in Ps. 7.5 (ET 4) seems to mean 'to plunder, despoil', as well as the Christian Palestinian Aramaic pael of *hlš*, 'to strip'. We should probably therefore understand *h^alîšâ* in Judg. 14.19 likewise to mean 'spoil', as has often been done. The linen and festal garments (Judg. 14.12, 19) would thus constitute part of the spoil (*h^alîšâ*) rather than *h^alîšâ* being simply a synonym for these garments in the way that Thomas supposes.

lah^aqâ, 'Senior Ones' (1 Samuel 19.20),
l^ehîqâ, 'Old Age' (Proverbs 30.17)

The idea that there was a root *lhq*, 'to be old', in the Hebrew Bible goes back as far as H. Ludolf in the seventeenth century, who envisaged it in 1 Sam. 19.20, *lah^aqat hann^ebî'im*, which he rendered 'senatus propheta-rum'.⁵⁹ This view was argued afresh by G.R. Driver in 1928,⁶⁰ apparently without his being aware that Ludolf had already suggested it long before, and he appealed not only to Ethiopic *lähqa*, 'to be old, senior', but also to Arabic *lahaqa*, 'to be white' (e.g. of hair). Subsequently this view has been followed by others.⁶¹ We would thus have a reference in 1 Sam. 19.20 to 'the senior ones among the prophets' rather than 'company of prophets' (with regard to the latter, cf. the parallel story, which has *hebel n^ebî'im*, 'a band of prophets' in 1 Sam. 10.5, 10). However, as Jonas Greenfield rightly pointed out,⁶² nothing in 1 Sam. 19.20 itself suggests that we should prefer this rendering to the traditional 'company of prophets', the latter rendering being followed by all the ancient Versions. Scholars have tended either to emend *lah^aqat* to *q^ehillat*, 'assembly'

58. Alternatively, it has been suggested that the *h^alîšâ* in 2 Sam. 2.21 is a belt. Cf. Targum, NEB, REB, 'belt', and see C.H. Gordon, 'Belt-Wrestling in the Bible', *HUCA* 23.1 (1950-51), pp. 131-36 (132).

59. H. Ludolf, *Lexicon Aethiopico-Latinum* (Frankfurt a.M: J.D. Zunnerus and N.W. Helwig, 2nd edn, 1699), col. 635. This was pointed out by E. Ullendorff, 'The Contribution of South Semitics to Hebrew Lexicography', *VT* 6 (1956), pp. 190-98 (194 n. 3), who states that he learnt of this from his research student and colleague, David Hubbard.

60. G.R. Driver, 'Some Hebrew Words', *JTS* 29 (1928), pp. 390-96 (394).

61. E.g. Ullendorff, 'The Contribution of South Semitics to Hebrew Lexicography', p. 194; Barr, *Comparative Philology*, pp. 25-26, 270-71.

62. J.C. Greenfield, 'Lexicographical Notes I', *HUCA* 29 (1958), pp. 203-28 (212-13), reprinted in S.M. Paul, M.E. Stone and A. Pinnick (eds.), *'Al kanfei yonah: Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2001), II, pp. 653-78 (662-63).

or seen it as related to it by metathesis.⁶³ Greenfield, however, proposed that the meaning ‘company’ could be understood for *lah^aqat* by taking it to be cognate with Arabic *laḥiqā*, ‘to overreach, reach’: with the prepositions *ilā* or *bi* it can mean ‘to cleave to’, *alḥaqa* can mean ‘to join with, to annex, add to a thing’, and *istāḥaqa* is ‘to become affiliated to’, and the nominal form *ilḥāq* means ‘affiliation’ and *lāḥiq*, ‘connected, adjoined’. Although Arabic here has *ḥ* for Hebrew *h*, Greenfield points out that in Arabic these two letters do sometimes get mixed up. Whichever of these views we follow, it appears that there are inadequate grounds for finding a root *lhq*, ‘to be old’, in 1 Sam. 19.20. Significantly, no modern Bible translations render ‘the senior ones among the prophets’.

Though Thomas⁶⁴ accepted Driver’s view of 1 Sam. 19.20, he made a better case for the view that a root *lhq*, ‘to be old’, is to be found in Prov. 30.17. The MT reads:

‘ayin til‘ag l^e‘āb w^etābūz līqq^ahat-‘ēm
yīqq^erūhā ‘ōr^ebē-naḥal w^eyō‘k^elūhā b^enē-nāšer

This has traditionally been rendered:

The eye that mocks a father
and scorns to obey a mother
will be picked out by the ravens of the valley
and eaten by the vultures.

Thomas, however, pointed out that for *līqq^ahat* the LXX read *gēras*, ‘old age’, and the Targum and Peshitta likewise read ‘old age’ here, *qaššîšūtā* and *saybautā* respectively, the latter literally meaning ‘white hairs’. Rashi also understood ‘old age’ here. Thomas’s view has found considerable support⁶⁵ and among modern Bible translations it has been followed by the NEB, REB, NAB and JB (though not NJB), the former two rendering ‘a mother’s *old age*’ and the latter two ‘an *aged* mother’ and ‘an *ageing*

63. Greenfield, ‘Lexicographical Notes I’, p. 212 n. 2 (reprint, p. 662 n. 2), pointed out that David Kimhi, ספר השרשים (eds. J.H.R. Biesenthal and F. Lebrecht, Berlin: G. Bethge, 1847), p. 177, already compared the Hebrew word *qōhelet*.

64. D.W. Thomas, ‘A Note on לִיקְחָהּ in Proverbs xxx.17’, *JTS* 43 (1941), pp. 154–55 [= no. 17 below].

65. Thomas has been followed by Ullendorff, ‘The Contribution of South Semitics to Hebrew Lexicography’, p. 194 n. 3; Greenfield, ‘Lexicographical Notes I’, pp. 213–14; Scott, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes*, p. 179; H. Ringgren, *Sprüche*, in H. Ringgren, A. Weiser and W. Zimmerli, *Sprüche, Prediger, das Hohe Lied, Klagelieder, das Buch Esther* (ATD, 16.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), p. 116; McKane, *Proverbs*, pp. 259, 657; Whybray, *Proverbs*, p. 415; Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs Chapters 15–31*, pp. 459–60 n. 49; KB.

mother' respectively. Although one could suppose that this rendering implies the presence of Hebrew *l^ezignat* (cf. Prov. 23.22, where the root *zqn* occurs in a similar context),⁶⁶ this seems a somewhat drastic solution, as it implies that not just one but two of the letters were corrupted at some point (*l^ezignat* to *lⁱqq^ahat*). Thomas, followed by Greenfield, provided a simpler solution by proposing that the original Hebrew word was cognate with the Ethiopic *lāhqa* and Arabic *lahaqa* referred to above. The original text, according to Thomas, would then have had the word *l^ehîqat* (or less close to the current MT, *lih^aqat*), which the MT would then have read as *lⁱqq^ahat*, 'obedience of' (cf. Gen. 49.10, *yiqq^ehat*).⁶⁷ Already before Thomas, C.H. Toy⁶⁸ had noted that the verb *bûz*, 'scorn, despise', is more naturally followed by a direct reference to the mother rather than 'obedience' (though he preferred emending to *l^ezignat*).

mur, 'Dust', and madlê, midlê, 'Balances' (Isaiah 40.15)

Modern translations have varied a little in their rendering of Isa. 40.15. Thomas⁶⁹ has a very valuable discussion and shows that those scholars are correct who would render *šahaq* by 'dust' rather than 'moisture' (though the plural *š^ehāqîm* means 'clouds'), like *daq* later in the verse. (Both come from roots meaning 'to pulverize'.) This not only creates a more exact parallel with the last line of the verse, but in the Middle East dust rather than moisture is likely to attach itself to the scales. Again, he argues convincingly that those scholars are right who read plural *yittôlû* for MT *yittôl* at the end of the verse and who translate 'weigh' (cf. Syriac *nîl*, 'to turn the scale, weigh heavy, be heavy', and cf. *nêtel* in Prov. 27.3).

But where Thomas is original is in his treatment of the first line of the verse. This has traditionally been rendered, 'Behold, the nations are like a drop from the bucket (*k^emar midd^elî*)', but Thomas attains more direct parallelism by means of the following translation:

*Behold, nations are like the dust of the balances,
And like the fine dust of the scales are reckoned,
Behold, the isles weigh only as fine dust.*

66. *l^ezignat* is followed by Toy, *Proverbs*, p. 532; Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, VI, p. 171; G. Beer in *BHK*; *HALAT* (ET *HALOT*).

67. 'Obedience' is still maintained by Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia)*, pp. 352, 354; Murphy, *Proverbs*, pp. 232-33; Clifford, *Proverbs*, pp. 264-65.

68. See above n. 66 for Toy.

69. D.W. Thomas, "'A Drop of a Bucket'?" Some Observations on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah 40 15', in M. Black and G. Fohrer (eds.), *In Memoriam Paul Kahle* (BZAW, 103; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1968), pp. 214-21 [= no. 18 below].

Thomas achieves this rendering by repointing *mar* as *mur* and taking it to be cognate with Arabic *mūr*, ‘dust moving to and fro in the air’, ‘dust raised by the wind’, or ‘dust carried to and fro by the wind’.⁷⁰ As for *middēlî*, he compares Ethiopic *madlôt* (plural *madâlewe*), ‘weight, scale’,⁷¹ from the verb *dalawa*, ‘to weigh’. He says it should perhaps be vocalized *madlê* or *midlê* (variant spellings of *madleh*, *midleh*, which we would more naturally expect). This is ingenious and not impossible; indeed L.G. Rignell had already suggested previously that *middēlî* might refer to a type of balance, though Thomas seems to have been unaware of this.⁷² However, this view appears to have gained little following and the fact that it postulates up to two emendations when the MT makes good sense as it stands renders it less likely than the traditional rendering. One point to note is that *dēlî* clearly means ‘bucket’ in Num. 24.7,⁷³ where we read ‘water shall flow from his buckets’. Another point is that the first line need not have the identical meaning as lines 2 and 3: it is sufficient that the general idea corresponds. So, if we retain the traditional translation ‘drop from a bucket’ (which has continued to have wide support since Thomas’s suggestion was made⁷⁴), the dominating idea of the verse is the smallness and insignificance of the nations in comparison to God.

nō‘ār, ‘Sparrow’ (*Job 40.29 [ET 41.5]*)

Job 40.29 (ET 41.5) has traditionally been rendered, ‘Will you play with him [Leviathan] as with a bird, or tie him up for your maidens?’ Thomas,⁷⁵ however, proposed to render the second half of the verse as ‘or canst thou

70. Lane, *Arabic–English Lexicon*, VII, pp. 2743–44.

71. Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae* cols. 1082–83.

72. L.G. Rignell, *A Study of Isaiah ch. 40–55* (Lunds universitets årsskrift, NF 1.52.5; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1956), p. 16.

73. Thomas, ‘“A Drop of a Bucket”?’ , p. 220, refers mistakenly more than once to this verse as Num. 26.7. He says that the meaning of *middolyāw* in Num. 24.7 and its connection with Isa. 40.15 must remain problematical.

74. Cf. NRSV, REB, NIV, *HALAT* (ET *HALOT*); K. Elliger, *Deuteriojesaja*, I. *Jesaja 40,1–45,7* (BKAT, 11.1; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd edn, 1989), pp. 40, 54–55; J.L. Koole, *Isaiah III. I. Isaiah 40–48* (HCOT; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1997), pp. 95–96; K. Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (trans. M. Kohl; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), pp. 60, 70; J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 19A; New York: Doubleday, 2002), p. 187; J. Goldingay and D. Payne, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2007), I, p. 106, prefers ‘a drop from a pan’.

75. D.W. Thomas, ‘Job xl 29b: Text and Translation’, *VT* 14 (1964), pp. 114–16 [= no. 19 below].

tie him with string like a young sparrow (young sparrows)?' This involves reading *kannō'ār(-â, -ôt)* instead of *l^ena'arôtêkâ* and understanding the noun as not the common word for 'maidens' but as a Hebrew *hapax legomenon* cognate with Arabic *nuġar*, feminine *nuġarah*, 'a species of sparrows, young sparrows'.⁷⁶ His motivation for this is the fact that the LXX contains the words *hōsper strouthion*, 'like a sparrow', in the second half of the verse. R. Gordis⁷⁷ agreed with Thomas in seeing a word for 'sparrow' here, cognate with the Arabic cited, but felt it a disadvantage for Thomas's view that it involved double emendation of the consonantal text (as well as of the vocalization). He argued that *l^e* can be translated as 'as' and that the MT's plural can be taken distributively, so that without any emendation one may render '...or tie him up as one of your sparrows'. The NEB also sees a reference to a bird here, '...or keep it on a string like a song-bird for your maidens?' This latter stands somewhat closer to the LXX, which has '...or bind him as a sparrow for a child (*ē dēseis auton hōsper strouthion paidiōi*)'. However, the fact that *paidion* in the LXX is sometimes a translation for *na'ar* (admittedly nowhere else for *na'arâ*) leads me to conclude that the words *hōsper strouthion*, 'like a sparrow', are not a translation of *l^ena'arôtêkâ* but of some other word. Rather than creating a *hapax legomenon*, it seems simpler to suppose with Dhorme⁷⁸ that the words *hōsper strouthion* should be regarded as an intrusion of the word *k^ena'anîm*, 'merchants' at the end of the following verse into the text here as *kay^e'ēnîm*, 'like sparrows', since the LXX actually renders *kay^e'ēnîm* in Lam. 4.3⁷⁹ as *hōs strouthion*.⁸⁰ It is surely significant that the Qumran Targum of Job did not recognize the name of a bird in Job 40.29b. This therefore seems to be a case where Thomas created a *hapax legomenon* by appeal to Arabic when a simpler and more likely solution to the LXX's rendering is to be found by means of text criticism of the Hebrew.

sôd, 'Protection' (Job 29.4)

As part of his recounting an earlier period when he experienced God's blessing, Job recalls the time 'when I was in my prime, when the *sôd* of God (*b^esôd 'elôah*) was upon my tent' (Job 29.4). *Sôd* means 'council',

76. Cf. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, VIII, p. 2817.

77. R. Gordis, 'Job xl 29—An Additional Note', VT 14 (1964), pp. 491-94.

78. Dhorme, *Le Livre de Job*, p. 572, ET *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, p. 627.

79. Reading *kay^e'ēnîm* here with many Versions and the qere.

80. Cf. too *strouthos* for *bat hayya'anâ* in Lev. 11.16 (ET 15); Deut. 14.15; Job 30.20; Isa. 34.13; 43.20.

and some have drawn from this the meaning of ‘intimacy’ or ‘friendship’,⁸¹ but most reject this, since the preposition ‘*alê*, ‘upon’, reads oddly if that is the case. Winton Thomas⁸² proposed to solve the problem by postulating a new Hebrew word *sôd*, ‘protection’, cognate with Arabic *sadda*, ‘close, stop up’,⁸³ thus reading ‘...when the protection of God was upon my tent’. However, on balance it seems preferable to obtain this same meaning—which seems highly appropriate and is supported by the LXX, Symmachus and the Peshitta—by emending *b^esôd* to *b^esôk*, that is, *b^e* + the infinitive construct of *sûk*, ‘to hedge or fence in’, or of *sākak*, ‘to cover, protect’, which thus avoids having to create an otherwise unattested Hebrew word. This view is widely followed in the modern scholarly literature.⁸⁴ It is easy to see how the final kaph could have become corrupted to a daleth in the square Hebrew script, especially since the phrase *b^esôd ’elôah* does actually occur elsewhere in Job 15.8, a point not previously noted, so far as I am aware. Moreover, the verb *sākak* is followed by ‘*al* in a number of other places in the Hebrew Bible, including Ps. 25.12 (ET 11), where it is similarly used of God’s protecting the psalmist, and interestingly the related verb *sûk*, ‘to protect, hedge in’ is actually used of God’s attitude towards Job in his earlier happy days in Job 1.10.

‘*onî*, ‘Captivity’ (*Proverbs 105.18; 107.10; Job 26.8*)

Psalms 107.10, Job 36.8 and Ps. 105.18 are generally translated in some such fashion as follows: ‘They dwell in darkness and gloom, prisoners of affliction and in iron’ (Ps. 107.10), ‘Then if they are bound with fetters, they are caught in bonds of affliction’ (Job 36.8), and ‘They afflicted his feet with fetters, iron came round his neck’ (Ps. 105.18). In the first two instances the italicized words represent the noun ‘*onî* and in the third the piel of the related verb ‘*anâ*, but in these particular cases Winton Thomas preferred to translate ‘*onî* by ‘captivity’ and ‘*innû* as ‘they imprisoned’.⁸⁵

81. Cf. RSV ‘friendship’; NIV ‘God’s intimate friendship’. The AV’s ‘secret’ derives from the notion of *sôd* as ‘secret counsel’.

82. D.W. Thomas, ‘The Interpretation of בְּסוֹד in Job 29 4’, *JBL* 65 (1946), pp. 63-66 [= no. 20 below].

83. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, IV, p. 1328.

84. E.g. Dhorme, *Le Livre de Job*, p. 380, ET *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, pp. 416-17; H.H. Rowley, *Job* (NCB; London: Thomas Nelson, 1970), p. 236; Clines, *Job 21-37*, pp. 934-35; J. Gray, *The Book of Job* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010), p. 353; JB, NAB, NEB.

85. D.W. Thomas, ‘Hebrew בְּסוֹד “Captivity”’, *JTS* NS 16 (1965), pp. 444-45 [= no. 21 below].

Thomas endeavoured to find support for these translations not only from the contexts but also on the basis of Arabic *'aniya*, which means 'to take captive'.⁸⁶ However, so far as I can see his new renderings have gained no support except from the NEB, which follows Thomas in all three cases (doubtless under the influence of G.R. Driver). The philological basis is rather weak, since it is founded on Arabic alone. Moreover, while in all three instances the context is one of captivity, Thomas's proposals for translation seem unnecessary, since a study of the usage of the noun 'affliction' and the verb 'to afflict' elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew shows that they can cover a variety of different contexts, including situations of slavery and exile, as well as illness, childlessness and poverty.

rōba 'Dust Cloud' (Numbers 23.10)

Numbers 23.10a reads: *mî mānâ 'apar ya^aqōb ūmispār 'et-rōba' yisrā'el*. It is widely recognized that in the second half we should read *ūmî sāpar* for *ūmispār*, with the support of the Samaritan and LXX Versions, so that we then have parallel halves: 'Who can count the dust of Jacob, or number the *rōba* of Israel?' The dust appears to refer to the dust raised up by the marching of Israel's hosts (cf. Ezek. 26.10; Nah. 1.3 and Akkadian parallels⁸⁷). Traditionally, *rōba* was understood to mean 'fourth part', and there are still a few who follow this view today,⁸⁸ but it has been widely recognized that this does not provide a very good parallel to *'āpār*, 'dust' (here in the construct). Sometimes *rōba* has been emended to *rib^ebōt*, 'myriads'.⁸⁹ Most commonly in recent years, however, it has been usual to accept that a parallel word for dust is most naturally to be seen in

86. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, V, pp. 2178-79.

87. For Akkadian parallels, see H.R. (C.) Cohen, *Biblical Hapax Legomena in the Light of Akkadian and Ugaritic* (SBLDS, 37; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978), p. 37.

88. For example, it has been followed by AV, RV, RSV, NIV. Cf. Aquila *tou tetratou* and Peshitta *rw b'h*, both meaning 'the quarter', while the Targum paraphrases on the basis of the sense 'four'. The LXX and Vulgate, however, saw respectively a reference to the 'peoples' (*dēmous*) or 'race' (*stirpis*) of Israel.

89. For example, A. Dillmann, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua* (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament; Leipzig: Hirzel, 2nd edn, 1886), p. 151; A.H. McNeile, *The Book of Numbers in the Revised Version* (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), p. 132; G.B. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), p. 348; L.E. Binns, *The Book of Numbers: With Introduction and Notes* (Westminster Commentaries; London: Methuen, 1927), p. 162; BDB; REB.

rōba‘. Already as early as 1874 Friedrich Delitzsch⁹⁰ compared *rōba*‘ with Akkadian *turbu’tu(m)*, ‘dust cloud’ (referred to by Delitzsch as *turbu’u*), though he mistakenly thought these Akkadian and Hebrew words referred to a ‘crowd’. It was only after the work of H.L. Ginsberg and W.F. Albright⁹¹ that the view that we have here a word for ‘dust’ or the like became common. Albright argued that the accusative *’et* before *rōba*‘ in the MT preserved the *t* from the beginning of the word such as we find in the Akkadian equivalent.

Meanwhile, in 1902 B. Jacob⁹² pointed out that *rbwḥ* in Christian Palestinian Aramaic means ‘dust’ (in which language *ḥ* is often found for ‘), and that in Gen. 18.27 the Samaritan Targum renders *’ēper*, ‘ashes’, by *rbw*‘. J.H. Hertz,⁹³ the Chief Rabbi of the British Empire at the time, drew attention to Jacob’s parallels supporting *rōba*‘ in Num. 23.10 as meaning ‘dust’, or ‘ashes’ as Hertz preferred to render it, though ‘ashes’ has not been generally followed.

It was in response to Hertz’s article that Thomas wrote a brief note⁹⁴ which pointed out that Arabic *rabg* means ‘pulvis tenuissimus’ (= very fine dust),⁹⁵ and that this supports our seeing *rōba*‘ as meaning ‘dust’.

90. Friedrich Delitzsch, *Assyrische Studien* (Leipzig: 1874), I, p. 73; *idem*, *Assyrische Lesestücke* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 4th edn, 1900), p. 184b. Besides *tarbu’tu(m)*, von Soden, *AHW* III, pp. 1328-29 also cites the variant forms *turbu’ttu*, *tur(u)bu*, *turba’u*, *tarbû* (II), and *tarbûtû*, ‘Staub(wirbel)’.

91. H.L. Ginsberg, ‘Lexicographical Notes’, *ZAW* 51 (1933), pp. 308-309 (309); W.F. Albright, ‘The Oracles of Balaam’, *JBL* 63 (1944), pp. 207-33 (213 n. 28). This translation is followed by JB and NJB, ‘cloud’; NAB, ‘wind-borne particles’; NRSV and NJPSV, ‘dust-cloud’; KB, *HALAT* (ET *HALOT*), ‘dust’; as well as by various commentators and other scholars: N.H. Snaith, *Leviticus and Numbers* (NCB; London: Thomas Nelson, 1967), pp. 292-93 (who mistakenly states that RV margin has ‘dust clouds’ when he means RSV margin); Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*, p. 270; J. de Vaulx, *Les Nombres* (Sources bibliques; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1972), p. 276; J. Sturdy, *Numbers* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. 170; Cohen, *Biblical Hapax Legomena*, pp. 37-39; S. Loewenstamm, ‘Notes on the History of Biblical Phraseology’, in his *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures* (AOAT, 204; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, and Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1980), pp. 210-21 (218-21); J. Milgrom, *Numbers* (JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia and New York: Jewish Publication Society, 1990), p. 197; T.R. Ashley, *The Book of Numbers* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1993), p. 468.

92. B. Jacob, ‘Das hebräische Sprachgut im Christlich-Palästinischen’, *ZAW* 22 (1902), pp. 83-113 (111).

93. J.H. Hertz, ‘Numbers xxiii.9b, 10’, *ExpTim* 45 (1934), p. 324.

94. D.W. Thomas, ‘The Word רַבַּע in Numbers xxiii.10’, *ExpTim* 46 (1935), p. 285 [= no. 22 below].

95. Cf. Freytag, *Lexicon arabico-latinum*, II, p. 115.

This further philological support has frequently been overlooked by subsequent scholars. However, Thomas himself overlooked the fact that a couple of years earlier H.L. Ginsberg⁹⁶ had already drawn attention to the Arabic cognate, though this Arabic word was misprinted in his article.

It would seem to me that in view of the Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Samaritan and Arabic forms noted above, it is probably preferable to follow Thomas and retain the MT form *rōba* ‘rather than attempt, with Albright, to emend it to a form closer to the Akkadian cognate.’⁹⁷ Retaining the MT we may thus render, ‘Who can count the dust of Jacob or number the dust cloud of Israel?’

šālāl, ‘Wool’ (*Proverbs 31.11*)

As part of the description of the good wife in Prov. 31.10-31, v. 11 states, ‘The heart of her husband trusts in her, and he will not lack *šālāl*’. Elsewhere in the Old Testament *šālāl* means booty taken in war, and the most commonly held view is that in this passage the meaning has been transformed from ‘booty’ to ‘gain’. Although nowhere else attested,⁹⁸ this particular meaning does make good sense in the context.

96. H.L. Ginsberg, ‘Lexicographical Notes’, ZAW 51 (1933), pp. 308-309 (309).

97. In the light of the normal meaning of ‘*āpār* as ‘dust’ and the evidence supporting *rōba* ‘as a word with similar meaning, the view of B.A. Levine, *Numbers 21–36* (AB, 4A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), seems uncalled for that we should translate rather ‘Who can chart the *terrain* of Jacob, and who can measure Israel’s quarterland?’ Levine connects *rōba* ‘with Akkadian *rebītu* (from a root *rebû*), ‘quarterland’, referring to the section of an area, and notes that Akkadian *epēru* (cognate with Hebrew ‘*āpār*) can mean ‘territory, soil; area, volume’ and that similar meanings are attested for ‘*āpār* in Rabbinic Hebrew. It should further be noted that A. Guillaume, ‘A Note on Numbers xxiii 10’, VT 12 (1962), pp. 335-37, rendered ‘Who can count the warriors of Jacob, and who can number the people of Israel?’, connecting *rōba* ‘with Arabic *rab*’, ‘the people of a house or tent, a large number of people, tribes, or encampment’, and ‘*āpār* with Arabic ‘*ifr*, ‘strong, powerful’, and ‘*ifirrīn*, ‘bold, resolute, strong man’. However, this view has gained no support at all.

98. J.L. Kugel, ‘Qohelet and Money’, CBQ 51 (1989), pp. 32-49 (46), claims that in addition to Prov. 31.11, *šālāl* means ‘wealth’ in Ps. 119.162 and Prov. 1.13. However, these latter two examples do not appear compelling. On the other hand, there is no reason to favour the translation ‘spoil’ in Prov. 31.11 with B.K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs Chapters 15–31* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 2005), p. 510, since it is difficult to see how the hardworking wife here leads her husband to obtain literal spoil or booty as opposed to mere financial gain or wealth.

Thomas,⁹⁹ appealing, as often, to Arabic—here to the word *talla*, ‘wool’—finds a reference to the woman preoccupied with spinning, which, he notes, was a highly esteemed womanly virtue in the ancient world. Against this, however, it may be noted that, apart from the fact that this word is attested only in vocabulary-rich Arabic, wool is subsequently referred to in v. 13 by the usual Hebrew word *šemer* (cf. vv. 19, 22, 24), and there seems no reason why this should be anticipated in v. 11, since vv. 10-11 appear to be speaking of the value of the woman in general terms before getting down to particulars in vv. 13-28.

More recently R.A. Kassis¹⁰⁰ has noted that the Arabic word to which Thomas appealed, *talla*, can also mean a small flock of sheep, and that *tulla* means a group of people. He then suggests that Prov. 31.11 is saying either that the man will have no need for a small flock of sheep or for people’s help, since his wife provides him with the wealth that he needs. However, Kassis’s proposal is weak and speculative. Not only is it based on Arabic alone again, but if Kassis’s suggestion for the meaning of *šālāl* is correct, the text would actually be saying that the man ‘will not lack a small flock of sheep’ or ‘will not lack a group of people’, whereas what Kassis wants it to mean is that he ‘will not need a small flock of sheep/a group of people’, which is something quite different.

G.R. Driver,¹⁰¹ however, associated *šālāl* with yet another Arabic word *salil*, ‘offspring’, and this view has been followed by the NEB and REB. But as W. McKane¹⁰² rightly observes, ‘This weakens the force of v. 11b, where, in agreement with the general tendency of the poem, a reference to the wife’s skill as a domestic economist rather than to her fertility is desiderated’.

In conclusion, therefore, it appears that we should probably retain the traditional rendering ‘gain’ for *šālāl* here, and not resort to the philological proposal of Thomas (or Kassis or Driver).

99. See D.W. Thomas in ‘Textual and Philological Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs’, in M. Noth and D.W. Thomas (eds.), *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley* (VTSup, 3; Leiden: Brill, 1955), pp. 280-92 (291-92) [= no. 23 below], and in ‘Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs’, VT 15 (1965), pp. 271-79 (277-78) [= no. 24 below].

100. R.A. Kassis, ‘A Note on לָשׁ (Prov. xxxi 11b)’, VT 50 (2000), pp. 258-59.

101. As reported in a ‘briefl. Mitteilung’ from Driver cited by B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos* (HAT, Erste Reihe, 16; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2nd edn, 1963), p. 108.

102. McKane, *Proverbs*, p. 667.

Some Place Names

Thomas also wrote several short notes on the etymologies of Israelite place names which will now be considered.

Tabor

One of Thomas's articles on place names concerned Mt Tabor.¹⁰³ The etymology of this name is uncertain and various suggestions have been put forward but Thomas's proposal looks as plausible, and indeed more plausible, than any other, such that it is the only one which *HALAT* (ET *HALOT*) specifically lists.¹⁰⁴ He suggested connecting it with Arabic *nabara*, 'he raised, elevated', a root appearing in the well-known Arabic word for the pulpit of a mosque, *minbar* (so called because of its height), as well as occurring in *nibr*, 'heaps', and *nabrah*, 'anything rising from a thing'. The disappearance of the letter nun may be compared with the place name Tappuah (*tappûah*), from the root *nph*.

Other less plausible views that have been suggested may now be mentioned. Thus J. Lewy¹⁰⁵ proposed that the name Tabor (as well as the epithet of the god Zeus Atabyrios) derives from *ta-bi-ra*, 'metal worker', an epithet of the Babylonian god Tammuz, which also occurs in the variant forms *ti-bi-ra* and *di-bi-ra*. But since the worship of Tammuz is only ever attested in Israel in Ezek. 8.14 during the Neo-Babylonian period, presumably as a result of Babylonian influence at that time, and since Tabor's sacredness as a mountain presumably goes back to Canaanite times, it seems wildly improbable that the name Tabor derives from an epithet of the Babylonian god Tammuz. It is more likely, as O. Eissfeldt¹⁰⁶ suggested, that the cult of the god Zeus Atabyrios, worshipped on the sacred mountain of Atabyrion or Atabyrios on the island of Rhodes and

103. D.W. Thomas, 'Mount Tabor: The Meaning of the Name', *VT* 1 (1951), pp. 229-30 [= no. 25 below].

104. Though without specifically naming them *HALAT* (ET *HALOT*) does refer to A. Schwarzenbach, *Die geographische Terminologie im Hebräischen des Alten Testaments* (Leiden: Brill, 1954), p. 205 for various earlier suggestions that had been made, and these are included in my discussion in the body of the text here, along with others noted by Thomas himself in his article.

105. J. Lewy, 'Tabor, Tibar, Atabyros', *HUCA* 23 (1950-51), pp. 357-86. Curiously, this bizarre view is the only possible etymology referred to by R. Frankel in his recent article, 'Tabor, Mount', *ABD*, VI, pp. 304-305 (305), and he completely fails to mention Thomas's much more plausible proposal.

106. O. Eissfeldt, 'Der Gott des Tabor und seine Verbreitung', *ARW* (1934), pp. 14-41, reprinted in his *Kleine Schriften* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1962-79 [1963]), II, pp. 29-54.

in other places such as Sicily and Crete, is a Phoenician cult deriving from that of the god of Tabor¹⁰⁷ (the name Tabor frequently being called Atabyrion in Greek). Other implausible suggestions are that the name Tabor means ‘cistern place’ (Hebrew *ta* + *bôr*), which is purely fanciful,¹⁰⁸ or that it means ‘pasturage mountain’ (*t* + *dbr*) and is from the same root as Hebrew *midbār*, ‘desert, wilderness, pasturage’,¹⁰⁹ though if this were the case it is surprising that the underlying dalet is not preserved. Again, it has been suggested that the name Tabor is related to a presumed Hebrew root *tbr*, allegedly meaning ‘to be high’,¹¹⁰ but there is no evidence of the existence of such a root. Similarly, the view that it is derived from a Hebrew root *tbr* = *šbr*, ‘to grieve’,¹¹¹ is also unlikely, for there is likewise no evidence for its existence, and it would, moreover, provide a curious meaning for the mountain. H. Winckler held the word Tabor to be of pre-Semitic origin but also saw a connection with Ethiopic *dabr*, ‘mountain’,¹¹² and G.A. Cooke thought the name was from the same root as the place name Debir, the primitive form of Tabor perhaps being *dbwr*,¹¹³ but an objection to both of these views is the fact that the compared forms have dalet, not tav.

All in all, in the light of the above considerations it may be concluded that Thomas’s proposal is more plausible than any other that has hitherto been put forward.

Mishal

One of Thomas’s early articles¹¹⁴ was on the place name Mishal (*miš’āl*), which occurs in Josh. 19.26 and 21.30 as the name of a location within the tribe of Asher. Thomas suggested, quite naturally, that the underlying root is *š’l*, ‘to ask’, and deduced from this that the name denoted it as the seat of an oracle. The place name Eshtaol, seemingly also meaning ‘place

107. That there was a syncretistic cult on Mt Tabor is suggested by Hos. 5.1, where the people, including the priests, are accused of having been ‘a net spread upon Tabor’.

108. P. Haupt, ‘Die “Eselstadt” Damaskus’, *ZDMG* 69 (1915), pp. 168-72 (168).

109. J. Boehmer, ‘Vom präformierten \square locale’, *ZAW* 47 (1929), p. 79-80 (80).

110. J. Fürst, *Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Bernard Tauchnitz, 1857–61 [1861]), II, p. 514.

111. Fürst, *Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch*, II, p. 514.

112. H. Winckler, ‘Zur phöniciſch-karthagischen geschichte [*sic*]’, in his *Altorientalische Forschungen* (3 vols.; Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1897–1902 [1897]), I, pp 421-62 (423).

113. G.A. Cooke, ‘Tabor’, in T.K. Cheyne and J.S. Black (eds.), *Encyclopaedia biblica* (one-volume edn; London: A. & C. Black, 1914), cols. 4881-86 (4885).

114. D.W. Thomas, ‘The Meaning of the Name Mishal’, *PEFQS* 68 (1936), pp. 39-40 [= no. 26 below].

of asking', to which he further draws attention, could likewise be interpreted along the same lines. This is as good a suggestion as any, and I am not aware of any more plausible view having been put forward.

En-dor, Hammoth-dor and Naphath-dor

Among Thomas's earliest articles were three separate brief pieces on the place names En-dor, Hammoth-dor and Naphath-dor.¹¹⁵ It was characteristic of his work that he did not deal with them all in one article but spread them out among three separate ones, although all three postulated the same basic meaning with regard to 'dor'. That is to say, Thomas held that in all three toponyms the word 'dor' derived from a ritual dance that took place there. This was because, he claimed, the original meaning of Hebrew *dûr* was 'to move in a circle, go about, surround', a verb cognate with Arabic *dāra*, 'went, moved, turned in a circle', and employed in the first and ninth forms of 'encircling' the Ka'aba at Mecca. The fact is, we do not know for certain what 'dor' refers to in these place names. Thomas's view is not impossible, but is also perhaps not the most likely either. We should recall that there is also a place name Dor on the Mediterranean coast, which, like En-dor (1 Sam. 28.7; Ps. 83.11 [ET 10]) and Naphath-dor (Josh. 12.23; 1 Kgs 4.12), is spelled variously with a waw or aleph (*dôr*, Judg. 1.27; *dō'r*, Josh. 17.11), a point not mentioned by Thomas. Of the various suggestions made, the meaning 'dwelling' or 'settlement'¹¹⁶ would appear to be the most inherently plausible for such a place name. One may compare the noun *dôr* in Isa. 38.12, which is generally accepted to mean 'dwelling' (similarly the verb *dûr*, 'to dwell', in Ps. 84.11 [ET 10]). Other suggested interpretations have little to be said for them: 'spring of Douar'¹¹⁷ does not tell us what 'dor' means, 'spring of the assembly'¹¹⁸ implies a meaning for *dr* attested in Ugaritic but not

115. D.W. Thomas, 'En-dor: A Sacred Spring?', *PEFQS* 65 (1933), pp. 205-206 [= no. 27 below]; 'The Meaning of the Name Hammoth-dor', *PEFQS* 66 (1934), pp. 147-48 [= no. 28 below]; 'Naphath-dor: A Hill Sanctuary', *PEFQS* 67 (1935), pp. 89-90 [= no. 29 below].

116. E.g. J. Tropper, *Nekromantie: Totenfragung im alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (AOAT, 223; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, and Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1989), p. 216.

117. P. Reymond, *L'eau, sa vie et sa signification dans l'Ancien Testament* (VTSup, 6; Leiden: Brill, 1958), p. 106.

118. O. Margalith, 'Dor and En-dor', *ZAW* 97 (1985), pp. 109-11; T.J. Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit* (HSM, 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), p. 113 (tentatively).

clearly found in Hebrew,¹¹⁹ while ‘spring of (former) generations’¹²⁰ does not explain why *dôr* is in the singular.

Unlike En-dor, little has been written on Hammoth-dor and Naphath-dor since the time of Thomas’s brief articles. However, it is likely that whatever ‘dor’ refers to in the name of En-dor and Dor itself, the same is true of these other place names too, that is, most likely ‘dwelling’ or ‘settlement’ rather than an allusion to a ritual dance, contrary to Thomas’s understanding, but we cannot be certain.

Two Nouns from an Exegetical Point of View

Thomas’s articles on the following two nouns are of lexicographical interest, though he studied them more from an exegetical than a philological point of view.

’ôpān, ‘Wheel’ (Proverbs 20.26)

Proverbs 20.26 reads, ‘A wise king winnows the wicked, and drives the wheel over them’ (RSV, NRSV). The meaning of the second half of the verse has been debated, and here Winton Thomas lends his support to the view that the wheel refers to the threshing wheel of a cart drawn by horses,¹²¹ such as is referred to in Isa. 28.27-28, ‘Dill is not threshed with a threshing sledge, nor is a cart wheel rolled over cummin; but dill is beaten out with a stick, and cummin with a rod. Does one crush bread grain? No, he does not thresh it for ever; when he drives his cart over it with his horses, he does not crush it.’ This understanding was not original to Thomas, though unlike most earlier scholars he saw the imagery as referring to the discriminating power of the king rather than to a punishment. The view that agricultural imagery is in view here had earlier been suggested by Ibn Ezra and by commentators like Franz Delitzsch,

119. F.J. Neuberg, ‘An Unrecognized Meaning of Hebrew *DÔR*’, *JNES* 9 (1950), pp. 215-17, and P.R. Ackroyd, ‘The Meaning of Hebrew דֹר Considered’, *JSS* 13 (1968), pp. 3-10 (4), unconvincingly try to find this meaning in Amos 8.14, reading *dôr^ekā*, ‘your assembly’ (i.e. pantheon), for MT *derek*, ‘way’, as well as in some other biblical passages. So far as Amos 8.14 is concerned, the original text probably read *dôd^ekā*, ‘your beloved’, referring to a deity.

120. J. Ebach and U. Rütterswörden, ‘Unterweltsbeschwörung im Alten Testament I’, *UF* 9 (1977), p. 59 n. 14.

121. D.W. Thomas, ‘Proverbs XX 26’, *JIS* 15 (1964), pp. 155-56 [= no. 30 below]. This method of threshing is discussed by O. Borowski, *Agriculture in Iron Age Israel* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987), p. 65, with reference to Isa. 28.27-28, but he fails to note Prov. 20.26.

G. Wildeboer, W. Frankenberg and C.H. Toy,¹²² and was clearly implied by RV's 'threshing wheel'. It has also been followed by most commentators subsequent to Thomas's article¹²³ and is made explicit in translations such as the NAB and NIV. This verse clearly parallels Prov. 20.8, 'A king who sits on the throne of judgment winnows all evil with his eyes', and alludes to the judicial role of the king in distinguishing the wicked from the righteous, just as a farmer separates the grain from the straw and the grain from the chaff by means of threshing and winnowing respectively (cf. Ps. 1.4; Jer. 15.7). The objection of D.C. Snell¹²⁴ that winnowing and threshing are not the same thing is surely an invalid argument, as M. Franzmann¹²⁵ pointed out, since it is entirely appropriate to mention the complementary actions of winnowing and threshing in parallelism. Franzmann further points to a passage in the *Odes of Solomon* 23.11-16 which appears to use the same agricultural imagery of the wheel. However, Snell's own appeal¹²⁶ to certain rather obscure Hittite references to a wheel as an object used in punishment seems unlikely, as this is nowhere else encountered in the Old Testament.

Three other main ways of understanding Prov. 20.26 have received a certain following. One was proposed by D.W. Thomas's teacher, G.R. Driver,¹²⁷ who held that the wheel is the wheel of fortune, a view followed in both the NEB and REB, but against this stands the fact that this

122. Franz Delitzsch, *Das salomonische Spruchbuch* (Biblicher Kommentar über die poetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments, 3; Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1873), p. 330, ET *Biblical Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon* (trans. M.G. Easton; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1875), II, p. 57; G. Wildeboer, *Die Sprüche* (KHAT, 15; Freiburg i.B.: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]), 1897), p. 60; W. Frankenberg, *Die Sprüche* (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898), p. 119; Toy, *Proverbs*, p. 395.

123. Cf. McKane, *Proverbs*, p. 545; Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia)*, p. 239; Whybray, *Proverbs*, p. 302; Clifford, *Proverbs*, p. 186; Murphy, *Proverbs*, p. 153; L. Alonso Schökel and J. Vilchez, *Proverbios* (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1984), pp. 392-93; Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs, Chapters 15-31*, pp. 156-57; Fox, *Proverbs 10-31*, p. 676.

124. D.C. Snell, 'The Wheel in Proverbs xx 26', *VT* 39 (1989), pp. 503-507 (503).

125. M. Franzmann, 'The Wheel in Proverbs xx 26 and Ode of Solomon xxiii 11-16', *VT* 41 (1991), pp. 121-23 (122).

126. Snell, 'The Wheel in Proverbs xx 26', pp. 504-505.

127. G.R. Driver, 'Problems in the Hebrew Text of Proverbs', *Bib* 32 (1951), pp. 173-97 (184). Driver refers to a Sophocles fragment which states, 'Fortune revolves on the frequent wheel of the god'. This is fragment 871, lines 1-2, in A.C. Pearson (ed.), *The Fragments of Sophocles* (3 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917), III, pp. 70-71.

concept is found nowhere else in the Old Testament. Alternatively, it has been proposed by A.B. Ehrlich,¹²⁸ *BHK*, *BHS* and JB that we should emend 'ôpān, 'wheel', to 'ônām, 'their wickedness' (cf. Ps. 94.23), but this has no versional support, and in view of the points made above it seems unnecessary; the view of Thomas and others that we have agricultural imagery here is to be maintained. (NJB in fact reverts to 'wheel' in this agricultural sense.) Finally, R.B.Y. Scott has claimed that the reference is to the practice of a victorious king driving his chariot over his prostrate enemies.¹²⁹ However, since the reference in Prov. 20.26 to winnowing or scattering takes up agricultural imagery and is clearly metaphorical (cf. Prov. 20.8), this should likewise be the case with the action of the wheel as well.

keleb, 'Dog'

In 1960 Thomas published a most valuable study of the noun *keleb*, 'dog'.¹³⁰ Unlike many of his other articles this is not a philological contribution in the strict sense, since he was not seeking to discover some new Hebrew root on the basis of comparative Semitic philology, but is rather exploring the origin, usage and associations of a well-known word. Thomas plausibly regards it as most likely that the word *keleb* is onomatopoeic in origin (cf. German *kläffen*, 'to bark', for example). He goes on to note various instances in which human beings are compared either by themselves or by others to a dog, *keleb*, and its Akkadian cognate, *kalbu*, as a way of referring to their subordinate or submissive status, something found as far back as the Mari¹³¹ and El-Amarna letters (e.g. 60.6-7; 61.2-3; 71.17-18; 75.41-42; 85.64),¹³² and down to the Lachish letters (2.3-4; 5.3-4; 6.2-3). However, Thomas focuses especially on expressions of this kind found in the Old Testament. Here we find, for example, *keleb*, 'dog', heightening the force of 'ebed, 'servant' (2 Kgs 8.13), which mirrors the Lachish letters and the frequent pairing of *kalbu*, 'dog', and *ardu*, 'servant', in the El-Amarna letters. However, we also find individual people being referred to as a 'dead dog' (1 Sam. 24.15;

128. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, VI, p. 119.

129. Scott, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes*, p. 122.

130. D.W. Thomas, 'Kelebh "Dog": Its Origin and Some Usages of It in the Old Testament', *VT* 10 (1960), pp. 410-27 [= no. 31 below].

131. G. Dossin, *Archives Royales de Mari*, I: Lettres (Textes cunéiformes, 22; Paris: P. Gauthner, 1946), no. 27, line 28.

132. On these expressions in the El-Amarna letters, see J.M. Galán, 'What is He, the Dog?', *UF* 25 (1993), pp. 173-80. For other disparaging references to the dog (*kalbu*) in Akkadian, see *CAD*, VIII (K), p. 72.

2 Sam. 9.8; 16.9), which heightens the sense even more. There is additionally the phrase ‘dog’s head’ (2 Sam. 3.8), which Thomas follows G. Margoliouth¹³³ in thinking refers to a ‘dog-faced baboon’, though there seems to me no reason why this expression should differ from the previous ones and not refer to a literal dog.¹³⁴

However, perhaps most striking is what follows from Thomas’s discussion of Deut. 23.19 (ET 18), ‘You shall not bring the hire of a harlot or the price of a dog into the house of the Lord your God for any vow’. He argues that there is no pejorative sense in the use of the word ‘dog’ here (used of a male hierodule), contrary to what has often been asserted. He notes that *klbm*, ‘dogs’ is the name of a class of servants in the temple of Astarte at Kition in Cyprus (KAI 37 B10), which cannot refer to literal dogs, since they are mentioned as receiving payments.¹³⁵ The title for a cultic functionary here can hardly be a dishonourable one (cf. *qādēš*, ‘holy one’, a similarly honourable title in itself in Deut. 23.19, ET 18).¹³⁶ Moreover, in Phoenician the personal name *klb’lm*, ‘dog of the gods’ corresponds to *’bd’lm*, ‘servant of the gods’, and Akkadian

133. G. Margoliouth, ‘Abner’s Answer to Ishbosheth (2 Sam. iii.8-11)’, *The Expositor* (8th series) 10 (1915), pp. 155-62.

134. So too J.M. Hutton, “‘Abdi-Aširta, the Slave, the Dog’: Self-Abasement and Invective in the Amarna Letters, the Lachish Letters, and 2 Sam 3:8”, *ZAH* 15 (2002), pp. 2-17 (3), though I concluded this independently several years before reading Hutton’s article. But the main conclusion of Hutton’s article is that in 2 Sam. 3.8 *rō’š keleb* should be translated not ‘dog’s head’ but ‘the slave, the dog’, understanding *rō’š* to be cognate with Akkadian *rēšu*, which can mean ‘slave’ as well as ‘head’. However, the generally accepted translation is more probable, since it seems perfectly acceptable and we have no evidence elsewhere in Hebrew that *rō’š* can mean ‘slave’.

135. The idea that they are literal dogs has been unconvincingly revived by L.E. Stager, *Ashkelon Discovered: From Canaanites and Philistines to Romans and Moslems* (Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991), p. 35. On the other hand, more recently, O. Margalith has sought to extend the number of references to *kēlābīm* as temple servants in the Old Testament and he takes this to be a homonym of *keleb*, ‘dog’, not a metaphorical use of it. See Margalith’s articles ‘Concerning the Dogs of Ahab’, in B.Z. Luria (ed.), *Sefer Dr. Baruch Ben-Yehudah* (Tel Aviv: Haḥevrâ l’ḥēqer hammiqrâ b’yisrā’el b’šitūp haggimnasyâ “Ḥeršliyyâ” û“bêt hatt’nak” b’tel-’ābīb, 1980), pp. 248-58 (Hebrew); *idem*, ‘*Keleb*: Homonym or Metaphor?’, *VT* 33 (1983), pp. 491-95; *idem*, ‘The *kēlābīm* of Ahab’, *VT* 34 (1984), pp. 228-32. However, this too is unconvincing; see the critiques of Margalith by G. Brunet, ‘L’hébreu *kēlèb*’, *VT* 35 (1985), pp. 485-88, and M.A. Zipor, ‘What are the *kēlābīm* in Fact?’, *ZAW* 99 (1987), pp. 423-28.

136. Cf. J. Day, ‘Does the Old Testament Refer to Sacred Prostitution and Did it Actually Exist in Ancient Israel?’, in C.M. McCarthy and J.F. Healey (eds.), *Biblical and Near Eastern Essays: Studies in Honour of Kevin J. Cathcart* (JSOTSup, 375; London: T. & T. Clark, 2004), pp. 2-21.

theophoric names such as Kalbi-Sin, Kalbi-Marduk and Kalbi-Shamash are also attested. Such names must be honourable. Accordingly, Thomas suggests that in religious contexts such as these ‘dog’ has come to mean a devoted follower of the god. Although Thomas does not highlight the point, these expressions testify to the fact that the dog was sometimes kept domestically in the ancient Near East, a situation in which it would have been expected to be loyally submissive to its owner.¹³⁷ However, Thomas does note El-Amarna letter 60.6-9, where Abdi-Ashirta says to the Pharaoh, ‘I am the servant of the king and the dog of his house, and the whole of the land of Amurru I watch for the king, my lord’, implying that he is Pharaoh’s faithful watch dog.¹³⁸ All this needs to be borne in mind amid all the negative overtones surrounding the dog as a wild, scavenging beast that books about the biblical world tend to emphasize (cf. Ps. 59.7, 15 [ET 6, 14]). Such domestic keeping of the dog is also attested by the verses in the book of Tobit where a dog accompanies Tobias on his journey (Tob. 6.2 [ET 1]; 11.4), the references to the little dogs under the household table in Mk 7.28, and by Philo, *Praem. poen.* 89, and in *b. ‘Abod. Zar.* 54b, passages which Thomas does not note. However, these references are admittedly late, subsequent to the Old Testament, Thomas’s primary concern, and could conceivably reflect Hellenistic influence. But the domestic keeping of the dog is also implied much earlier by the pairing of the words for ‘dog’ and ‘servant’ in the El-Amarna and Lachish letters and 2 Kgs 8.13 alluded to above, though curiously Thomas attributes the dog reference in 2 Kgs 8.13 to a scavenger dog background, which does not seem appropriate, since these wild dogs were not obedient servants like a household dog but a law to themselves!¹³⁹

A recent article by G.D. Miller,¹⁴⁰ which contains some useful information pointing to a more positive attitude to the dog in the ancient Near East than has sometimes been supposed, opens by citing Thomas’s article as representative of those scholars who hold that a very negative attitude

137. Cf. M.S. Smith, ‘Terms of Endearment: Dog (*klbt*) and Calf (*’gl*) in KTU 1.3 III 44-45’, in M. Dietrich and I. Kottsieper (eds.), “*Und Mose schrieb dieses Lied auf*”: *Studien zum Alten Testament und zum Alten Orient. Festschrift für Oswald Loretz zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1998), pp. 713-16 (716), who also notes evidence that the word for ‘calf’ was similarly used in a comparable way with divine names.

138. Thomas, ‘*Kelebh*, “Dog”’, p. 424.

139. Thomas, ‘*Kelebh*, “Dog”’, p. 414.

140. G.D. Miller, ‘Attitudes towards Dogs in Ancient Israel: A Reassessment’, *JSOT* 32 (2008), pp. 487-500.

towards the dog prevailed. However, Miller¹⁴¹ curiously distorts Thomas's viewpoint, quoting only a part of the latter's sentence referring to the dog as 'that lowly animal...despised and generally wretched', although Thomas's sentence actually continues, 'yet, as we have seen, in religious circles, in prayer and worship, not without honour'. Another recent paper, by John Crawford, entitled 'Judah's Best Friend: The Name and Meaning of Dog', which was presented to the Annual Meeting of the SBL at Atlanta, Georgia on 23 November, 2003, argued among other things that the Hebrew name Caleb should be added to the list of personal names using the word 'dog' to express loyalty to a deity (here Yahweh). However, against this it may be argued that if the name simply meant 'dog', we should expect it to be vocalized *keleb*, not *kālēb*, the latter appearing rather to correspond to the Arabic *kalibu*, 'furious like a dog', as opposed to *kalbu*, 'dog'.¹⁴²

Summary

For a summary of the main conclusions of this chapter, please see the overall summary of the book in Chapter 6.

141. Miller, 'Attitudes towards Dogs', pp. 487-88, (mis)quoting Thomas, '*Kelebh*', p. 427.

142. M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (BWANT, 3.10; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928), p. 230.

4

SOME VERBAL ROOTS

'hb, 'to Love'

Thomas devoted a brief article to the verb *'hb*, 'to love'.¹ Having noted various views as to its etymology, he proposed to revive the suggestion of A. Schultens in his Proverbs commentary of 1748² that *'hb* is in origin a biliteral root *hb*, cognate with Arabic *habba*, 'to breathe heavily'. On this understanding *'hb* belongs to a category of words whose original meaning was 'to breathe, pant', but which came to denote desire (cf. to breathe, pant > pant after, desire). Thomas³ cites examples of verbs in various Semitic languages illustrating this, including *š'p*, 'to gasp' (of a woman in travail), in Isa. 42.14; 'to gasp, pant with desire', in Ps. 119.131 (cf. Job 7.2; 36.20). This view of *'hb* appears to be accepted by HALAT (ET HALOT) and H.H. Hirschberg⁴ stated that this is the usual view (even though he advocated another). Since it was not the usual opinion when Thomas wrote his article in 1939 it would appear that his view has been influential.

ḥdl, 'to Be Fat' (1 Samuel 2.5, etc.)

Thomas wrote an article⁵ on the verb *ḥdl* in which he rightly noted that the meaning is not always exactly 'ceased', but that it can mean 'held back from, left, forsook'. However, he went further and postulated that, in addition to this well-attested verb, there is also a second root *ḥdl* meaning 'to be fat', cognate with Arabic *ḥadula*, 'to become plump, fleshy in the

1. D.W. Thomas, 'The Root חב "Love" in Hebrew', ZAW 57 (1939), pp. 57-64 [= no. 32 below].

2. A. Schultens, *Proverbia Salomonis* (Leiden: J. Luzac, 1748), pp. 7, 73-74, as well as in the unpaginated Index under חב .

3. Thomas, 'The Root חב ', p. 62.

4. H.H. Hirschberg, 'Some Additional Arabic Etymologies in Old Testament Lexicography', VT 11 (1961), pp. 373-85 (373).

5. D.W. Thomas, 'Some Observations on the Hebrew Root חדל ', in *Volume du Congrès: Strasbourg 1956* (VTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), pp. 8-16 [= no. 33 below].

limbs'.⁶ He proposed that this verb is found in the Song of Hannah in 1 Sam. 2.5, *šēbē'im balleḥem niškārū ūr'ēbīm ḥādēlū 'ad-*. As has frequently been proposed, he reads *'ōd* for *'ad* and ignores the *athnaḥ* in *ḥādēlū*. He then renders, 'they that were full have hired themselves out for bread, while the hungry have grown plump again'. Thomas claims that this meaning, which fits the context well—dealing as it does with a series of contrasting fates—can claim some support from the ancient Versions, for the Peshitta renders by '[they] have [food] left over', the Vulgate by '[they] are full', and Symmachus by '[they are] in want of nothing', though I would observe that none of these means exactly '[they] have grown plump'. Thomas also noted that it has been suggested that the Akkadian personal name *Ḥudultu* and the Hebrew personal name *Ḥadlay* (2 Chron. 28.12) derive from this root ('fatty').

Thomas's view about the meaning of *ḥdl* in 1 Sam 2.5 had already been suggested in the eighteenth century by E. Scheidius, as Thomas himself noted.⁷ Interestingly, at about the same time as Thomas was resurrecting the idea, the same notion about a second Hebrew root *ḥdl* occurred independently to P.J. Calderone,⁸ who published an article on this without being aware of Thomas's earlier contribution,⁹ though he also proposed some further examples of the occurrence of this alleged root in Hebrew in addition to 1 Sam. 2.5 which had not occurred to Thomas. After Thomas drew his attention to his own article Calderone wrote a further piece on this verb suggesting yet further examples.¹⁰ Altogether Calderone claimed to find this new root in the following verses: 1 Sam. 2.5; Job 14.6; Prov. 19.27; 23.4; Isa. 38.11; 53.3. However, M.L. Chaney,¹¹ in an unpublished dissertation, showed clearly how weak Calderone's additional proposals were, but instead still claimed to find this new root in Judg. 5.7 and Deut. 15.11, in addition to 1 Sam. 2.5.

Thomas has gained considerable support for his understanding of 1 Sam. 2.5 from modern scholars and Bible translations, including

6. Thomas, 'Some Observations on the Hebrew root *ḥdl*', pp. 14-15.

7. E. Scheidius, *Dissertatio philologico-exegetica ad Cantum Hiskiae, Ies. XXXVIII*, 9-20 (Leiden: Le Mair, 1769), p. 55. Cf. Thomas, 'Some Observations on the Root *ḥdl*', p. 15.

8. P.J. Calderone, 'Ḥdl-II in Poetic Texts', *CBQ* 23 (1961), pp. 451-60.

9. Cf. D.W. Thomas, 'ḤDL-II in Hebrew', *CBQ* 24 (1962), p. 154 [= 34 below].

10. P.J. Calderone, 'Supplementary Note on ḤDL-II', *CBQ* 24 (1962), pp. 412-19.

11. M.L. Chaney, 'ḤDL-II and the "Song of Deborah": Textual, Philological, and Sociological Studies in Judges 5, with Special Reference to the Verbal Occurrences of *ḤDL* in Biblical Hebrew' (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1976), pp. 1-89. I wish to thank Professor Jo Ann Hackett for kindly sending me a photocopy of this unpublished dissertation.

N.K. Gottwald, P.K. McCarter, R.P. Gordon,¹² *HALAT* (ET *HALOT*), NAB, NEB, REB and NRSV, although some have remained sceptical, for example, JB, NJB and NIV. Indeed, T.J. Lewis¹³ has written an article in which he suggests that the whole attempt to find a second Hebrew verb *ḥdl*, ‘to be fat’, is misguided. Besides pointing out that the Arabic verb *ḥadula* is attested specifically with the meaning ‘to become fat in the shanks and forearms’,¹⁴ rather than growing fat with food, he shows convincingly that the verb *ḥdl* I in the Old Testament does not only mean ‘to cease’ but also in some instances ‘to cease from doing *something*’, where the *something* is the preceding verb in question. For example, Judg. 20.28 means ‘Shall I yet again go out to battle...or shall I cease (from going out to battle)’, and Ezek. 2.5; 3.11 implies ‘Whether they listen or cease (from listening)’; similarly Jer. 40.4; Zech. 11.12. In the light of this, Lewis notes that it is perfectly natural to translate 1 Sam. 2.5 as ‘Those who are full hire themselves out for bread, but those who are hungry cease (from hiring themselves out)’. In other words, ‘Those who are full hire themselves out for bread, but the hungry do not do so any-more’. Such an understanding had already been suggested long ago by Kimhi, Ralbag (Rabbi Levi ben Gershon) and Mešudat David, and succeeds in giving the expected reversal of meaning without postulating a new verb *ḥdl* II.

The passage gathering the next amount of support for a verb *ḥdl* II is Judg. 5.7, where *ḥādēlû p’rāzôn b’eysrā’el ḥādēlû* is rendered by a number of scholars as ‘the peasantry grew fat, in Israel they grew fat on booty’, the word ‘*ad*’ being added on at the end and rendered ‘booty’, transposed from the beginning of the next line (generally rendered ‘until’).¹⁵ However, since the previous verse undoubtedly uses the verb *ḥdl* in its meaning ‘to cease’ (‘In the days of Shamgar son of Anat, in the days of Jael, caravans ceased [*ḥādēlû*], and travellers kept to the byways’), there is every reason to believe that this is the case also in v. 7. The rendering of

12. N.K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250–1050 B.C.E.* (London: SCM Press, 1979), pp. 505; P.K. McCarter, *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (AB, 8; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980), pp. 67, 69, 72; Gordon, *1 and 2 Samuel*, pp. 80, with p. 333 n. 43.

13. T.J. Lewis, ‘The Songs of Hannah and Deborah: *ḥdl*-II (“Growing Plump”)', *JBL* 104 (1985), pp. 105–108.

14. Cf. Lane, *Arabic–English Lexicon*, II, p. 711.

15. In addition to Chaney, ‘HDL-II and the “Song of Deborah”’, pp. 11–31, cf. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh*, pp. 504–507; NRSV. R.G. Boling, *Judges: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (AB, 6A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), pp. 102, 109, renders ‘The warriors grew plump, In Israel they grew plump again’.

p^erāzôn as ‘peasantry’ is also far from certain, and from the context (‘until you, Deborah, arose, arose as a mother in Israel’) one might more plausibly conjecture ‘leaders’, ‘warriors’ or ‘champions’ (cf. too Hab. 3.14, where *p^erāzāyw* is generally agreed to mean ‘his warriors’ or ‘his leaders’). We should thus rather translate, ‘The leaders ceased in Israel, they ceased, until you, Deborah, arose, arose as a mother in Israel’. The verse thus describes the plight of Israel before Deborah’s action rather than the bounty that flowed from her actions, and, as E.W. Nicholson has pointed out, ‘Understood in this traditional way, the overall structure of the poem is similar to that of other narratives of threat and deliverance in the book of Judges’.¹⁶

There is one final passage in which Chaney thinks it quite possible that *ḥdl* has the sense of ‘be fat’, namely Deut. 15.11.¹⁷ Traditionally, this has been rendered, ‘For the poor will never cease (*yehdal*) from the midst of the land; therefore I command you, “You shall open wide your hand to your brother, to the needy and the poor in your land”’. Chaney, however, suggests the translation, ‘For the poor from the midst of the land do not grow fat (*yehdal*); that is why I am commanding you, “You shall surely open your hand to your brother, to your poor and your needy in your land”’. Chaney’s interpretation is driven by the fact that Deut. 15.4 has just declared that there will be no poor in the land, which would appear to contradict v. 11 on the usual rendering of *yehdal*. However, v. 4 is surely better seen as reflecting the ideal, whereas v. 11, like v. 7 (‘If there is a poor man among you...’), recognizes the reality. Moreover, it should be noted that v. 5 issues the caveat that absence of poverty depends on the nation being obedient to Yahweh.

In conclusion, the evidence in favour of there being a verb *ḥdl* II, ‘to be fat’, seems insufficient to make its existence probable.

ḥlq (Hiphil), ‘to Lay a Snare’ (Proverbs 29.5)

Proverbs 29.5 is normally rendered, as in RSV, ‘A man who flatters his neighbour spreads a net for his feet’ (*geber maḥ^alîq ‘al-rē‘ēhû rešet pôrēs ‘al-p^e‘āmāyw*). The word *maḥ^alîq* makes perfectly good sense as a reference to a flatterer and this can be set alongside other allusions to flattery

16. E.W. Nicholson, ‘Israelite Religion in the Pre-Exilic Period: A Debate Renewed’, in J.D. Martin and P.R. Davies (eds.), *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane* (JSOTSup, 42; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), pp. 3-34 (32 n. 64; cf. 16).

17. Cf. Chaney, ‘ḤDL-II and the “Song of Deborah”’, pp. 32-36.

in Proverbs (esp. Prov. 28.23; cf. Prov. 2.16; 7.5) which employ the hiphil of the verb *hlq*. Although it is debated whether the ‘feet’ that are ensnared here refer to those of the flatterer or of his neighbour, I feel it is more natural to envisage that they are the flatterer’s own. One may compare Prov. 28.23, where ‘he who flatters with his tongue’ is judged less successful than one offering reproof.¹⁸ Thomas,¹⁹ however, suggested a completely original understanding of *maḥ^alîq* according to which it does not refer to flattery but is rather cognate with Arabic *ḥalaqa*, which Dozy²⁰ states can mean ‘prendre, envelopper dans les rets, dans les filets’. Thomas thus translates:

A man who layeth a snare for his neighbour
Spreadeth a net for his own feet.

On this understanding there would accordingly be a reference to a snare not only in the second half but also in the first half of the verse.

Although superficially attractive, this translation has not been followed by any Bible translations or commentaries on Proverbs that I have seen. Indeed, surprisingly, none of the commentaries on Proverbs even refers to Thomas’s view, not even that of McKane, who is otherwise assiduous in documenting his views. It is indeed improbable, for the following reasons. First, the text makes good sense on the traditional rendering; secondly, Thomas’s alleged new meaning of *hlq* (hiphil) here is attested nowhere else in Biblical Hebrew; thirdly, Arabic is such a rich language that it is hazardous to rely on its evidence alone. So, although not totally impossible, Thomas’s case here is weak.

kpr, ‘to Be an Unbeliever’ (Psalms 34.11 [ET 10];
35.17; 58.7 [ET 6])

In *The Revised Psalter* there are several places where Thomas rejects the usual translation of *k^epîrîm* as ‘young lions’ with reference to the psalmists’ opponents, and either retaining the MT or emending it to *kōp^erîm*, takes it as cognate with the well-known Arabic verb *kafara*, ‘became an

18. In Prov. 26.28 we read, ‘A lying tongue hates its victims and a flattering tongue (*peh ḥālāq*) works ruin’. Although the parallelism might suggest that the flatterer works ruin on others, the context of the previous proverbs suggests that he brings ruin on himself.

19. D.W. Thomas, ‘The Interpretation of Proverbs xxix.5’, *ExpTim* 59 (1948), p. 112 [= no. 35 below].

20. R. Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2nd edn, 1927), I, p. 316.

unbeliever'. Thomas finds this meaning in Pss. 34.11 (ET 10), 35.17 and 58.7 (ET 6), where he renders 'Those who do not trust in him' in the first and 'the ungodly' in the latter two passages.²¹ The only modern Bible translation to follow this suggestion is the NEB, which renders 'unbelievers' in all three passages, though a footnote allows the possibility of 'lions' in Ps. 58.7 (ET 6). So far as Ps. 34.11 (ET 10) is concerned, Thomas's proposal had previously been put forward by B. Duhm²² and R. Gordis²³ and *BHK* alludes to it in its apparatus to Ps. 34.11 (ET 10). Moreover, although Thomas does not mention it, it is clear that this view had been proposed even earlier in the nineteenth century, as Gordis mentions Tzvi Chajes and Franz Delitzsch as having rejected it then (though without telling us where) on the basis that this meaning was a Post-Biblical Hebrew development. Though Thomas does not mention it, the Arabic verb *kafara* was derived from Aramaic *kpr*, 'to deny', whence it was likewise also taken up into Post-Biblical Hebrew.

Moreover, the contextual evidence for Thomas's proposal is weak, since there are undoubtedly other places where the psalmists' human opponents are referred to as lions: Ps. 22.22 (ET 21) has 'aryēh and Ps. 57.5 (ET 4) has *l̥bā'im* (cf. Ps. 17.12, *k̥'aryēh...w̥kik̥p̥îr*). Again, Ps. 58.7 (ET 6) specifically mentions the enemies' teeth, which is appropriate for lions: 'O God, break the teeth in their mouths; tear out the fangs of the *k̥p̥îrîm*', just as Ps. 57.5 (ET 4) singles out teeth with regard to the *l̥bā'im*, which Thomas does not deny refers to (metaphorical) lions: 'I lie in the midst of lions (*l̥bā'im*) that greedily devour the sons of men; their teeth are spears and arrows...' It is likely that both Pss. 35.17 and 58.7 (ET 6) are using the image of the lion metaphorically to denote the psalmists' oppressive enemies (just as Jer. 2.15 uses the singular form *k̥p̥îr* to describe Israel's foreign oppressive enemies). However, in Ps. 34.11 (ET 10), it is more likely that literal lions are meant: 'The young lions suffer want and hunger, but those who seek the Lord lack no good

21. See *The Revised Psalter*, *ad loc.* In *The Text of the Revised Psalter: Notes*, p. 12 (cf. pp. 13, 22), while insistent that the word is cognate with Arabic *kafara*, Thomas is unsure whether to retain MT's *k̥p̥îrîm* or to emend to *kōp̥̣rîm*, but in D.W. Thomas, 'The Revised Psalter', *Theology* 66 (1963), pp. 504-507 (506) [= no. 36 below], he rejects the imputation of J.R. Porter, 'The Revised Psalter', *Theology* 66 (1963), pp. 359-66 (362-63), that he is emending the text.

22. B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen* (KHAT, 14; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1922), p. 137, 138.

23. R. Gordis, 'Studies in the Relationship of Biblical and Rabbinical Hebrew', in *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (English section; New York: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1945), pp. 173-99 (180-81).

thing'. Although at first sight the contrast between young lions and those who seek the Lord might seem a little strange, J.J.M. Roberts²⁴ has rightly noted that something comparable is found in Job 4.7-11, where, the lions, including young lions, are included amongst the wicked that can die for lack of food. In contrast to the other Psalms passages referred to above, there is therefore no need to suppose that *kēpîrîm* in Ps. 34.11 (ET 10) is a metaphor for wicked humans, nor is it necessary to emend *kēpîrîm* to *kabbîrîm* or *kēbēdîm*, proposals sometimes made on the basis of LXX's 'rich', let alone to follow Thomas's unsubstantiated 'unbelievers'.

mkr (hithpael), 'to Show Oneself Deceitful'
(1 Kings 21.20, 25; 2 Kings 17.17; Ecclesiasticus 47.24)

There are four places in the Old Testament where the verb *mkr* occurs in the hithpael, namely Deut. 28.68, 1 Kgs 21.20, 25 and 2 Kgs 17.17, and this has traditionally been rendered 'to sell oneself'. Thomas accepts that this is the case in Deut. 28.68, where it is a case of people literally selling themselves as slaves, but in the other three instances the verb is followed by *la'āšôt hāra' bē'ênê Yhwh*, 'to do evil in the sight of the Lord'. In these latter passages Thomas feels that it would be odd to speak of people selling themselves to do evil and believes it more natural to connect the root with Arabic *makara*, 'to practise deceit, guile', and render the hithpael of *mkr* as 'to show oneself deceitful'.²⁵

However, on balance it seems probable that this view should be rejected. Not only does the hithpael of *mkr* undeniably mean 'to sell oneself' in Deut. 28.68, but it seems fairly easy to comprehend how the expression 'to sell oneself to do evil' could have been used metaphorically to mean 'to surrender oneself to do evil'. Moreover, none of the ancient Versions lends support to Thomas's suggestion: the LXX and Vulgate both support the traditional rendering, while the Targum and Peshitta render as 'planned' and 'thought' (mostly) respectively, which

24. J.J.M. Roberts, 'The Young Lions of Psalm 34:11', *Bib* 54 (1973), pp. 265-67, reprinted in J.J.M. Roberts, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Collected Essays* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), pp. 263-65. Roberts also compares certain Babylonian texts.

25. D.W. Thomas, 'The Root מִכַּר in Hebrew', *JTS* 37 (1936), pp. 388-89 [= no. 37 below]; 'A Further Note on the Root מִכַּר in Hebrew', *JTS* NS 3 (1952), p. 214 [= no. 38 below]. In 'The Root מִכַּר in Hebrew', p. 389 n. 6, Thomas raised the possibility that *mkr* in these instances is not a completely separate root, noting that 'The oriental seller habitually tries to deceive the buyer'.

can be seen as a paraphrase. Furthermore, it seems unwise to appeal solely to vocabulary-rich Arabic in support of the meaning ‘practised deceit, guile’, a translation, moreover, which J.A. Emerton²⁶ points out does not fit the two 1 Kings 21 references involving Ahab and Naboth, as there is no evidence of deceit being involved. It is not surprising, therefore, that Thomas’s view appears to have gained little support, though E. Ullendorff²⁷ seems to accept it. Nevertheless, J.C. Greenfield²⁸ agreed with Thomas that the translation ‘to sell oneself [to do evil]’ is problematic, but preferred to translate ‘to take counsel to do evil’, seeing *mkr* II as cognate with the root *mlk*, ‘to counsel’, which is attested in Akkadian, Aramaic and Hebrew (in Biblical Hebrew only in Neh. 5.7, but frequently in Mishnaic Hebrew). This suggestion, however, has the double disadvantage of presupposing the occurrence of both a metathesis and a change of a lamedh into a resh.

ml’ (piel), ‘to Assemble Together’ (Jeremiah 4.5)

Jeremiah 4.5 has traditionally been rendered, ‘Blow the trumpet through the land; cry aloud and say, “Assemble and let us go into the fortified cities”’ (cf. RSV). Here ‘cry aloud’ renders *qir’e’û mal’e’û*, the two imperatives being regarded as an asyndetous construction, and we are to understand that *qôl*, ‘voice’ is implied following *mal’e’û*, literally ‘make full (the voice)’. Winton Thomas,²⁹ however, put forward a new proposal that *mal’e’û* is to be rendered ‘assemble together’. He points out various pieces of evidence, including the fact that the hithpael of *ml’* is agreed to mean ‘mass together’ in Job 16.10 and that in Isa. 31.4 *m’lô’ rô’îm* clearly refers to ‘a mass, multitude of shepherds’, comparable to the Arabic noun *mala’*, ‘assembly’. Moreover, Thomas thinks the verb *ml’* here is a technical military term implying mobilization of forces.

26. Emerton, ‘The Work of David Winton Thomas as a Hebrew Scholar’, p. 300. It may be also pointed out that there is nothing to specifically suggest deceit in the Hebrew of Ecclus 47.24, where Thomas similarly found this new meaning. Here it is said of Israel, *wtgdl h’tm m’d lkl r’h htmkrw*, which is most naturally rendered, ‘their sin increased greatly, they sold themselves to every evil’.

27. Ullendorff, ‘The Contribution of South Semitics to Hebrew Lexicography’, p. 194.

28. J.C. Greenfield, ‘Etymological Semantics’, *ZAH* 6 (1993), pp. 26-37 (32-33), reprinted in Paul, Stone and Pinnick (eds.), *‘Al kanfei yonah*, II, pp. 821-32 (827-28).

29. D.W. Thomas, ‘מל’ in Jeremiah iv 5: A Military Term’, *JJS* 3 (1952), pp. 47-52 [= no. 39 below].

Thomas's new proposal has gained some support, for example, from the NEB ('sound the muster'), NAB ('summon the recruits!') and W.L. Holladay³⁰ ('form up'). J.A. Emerton,³¹ while not being certain, nevertheless feels Thomas has made a good case, and D.R. Jones³² also feels his proposal is possible, and although W. McKane³³ prefers the traditional rendering, he does not totally rule out that Thomas might be right.

My own view is that Thomas is probably right in rejecting the view that *qir^e'û mal^e'û* means 'cry aloud' and preferring to see *mal^e'û* as a verb parallel in meaning to *hē'ās^epû*, 'gather together'. Thus, on the one hand, the closest alleged parallel to the former meaning in Jer. 12.6 has *qār^e'û 'aḥ^areykā mālē*, 'they are in full cry after you', *mālē* being an adjective rather than a verb (though Thomas interprets this passage differently), and on the other hand there is sufficient evidence, as noted by Thomas (see above), to suggest that the verb *ml'* (piel), literally 'fill', was capable of meaning something like 'assemble, amass, mass together'. This seems likely in Jer. 4.5, where it forms a reasonable parallel to '*sp* (niphāl), 'gather together'. (Interestingly, the AV already rendered 'gather together'.) On the other hand, I feel doubtful whether Thomas is right in understanding *mal^e'û* in Jer. 4.5 to be a technical military term implying mobilization of forces. The context in Jer. 4.5-6 makes it clear that the prophet is speaking of the people of the land coming together to flee for safety to the fortified cities in the face of the coming judgment, not actually mobilizing themselves for battle.

nḥm, 'to Breathe' (Job 16.2; 21.34; Zechariah 10.2 [piel];
Genesis 27.42 [hithpael])

Thomas noted with regard to the Hebrew verb *nḥm* (piel), 'to comfort', that the Arabic cognate *naḥama* means 'to breathe pantingly or hard' (of a horse), and he believed that G. Dalman was probably right in thinking that the Syriac root *nḥm* originally meant 'to draw a deep breath (of relief), breathe again', and that the meaning 'to comfort' derived from this. Thomas argued that the original meaning of the verb is reflected in

30. W.L. Holladay, *Jeremiah* (2 vols.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986-89 [1986]), I, pp. 140, 152.

31. Emerton, 'The Work of David Winton Thomas as a Hebrew Scholar', p. 299.

32. D.R. Jones, *Jeremiah* (NCB; London: Marshall Pickering, and Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1992), p. 110.

33. W. McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986-96 [1986]), I, p. 91.

four passages of the Hebrew Bible where *nḥm* occurs, namely Job 16.2, 21.34, Zech. 10.2 (piel) and Gen. 27.42 (hithpael).³⁴

Job 16.2 contains words of Job addressed to his three friends which have traditionally and famously been rendered ‘miserable comforters (*m^enaḥ^amê ‘āmāl*) are you all’. Again, Job 21.34 also contains words of Job to his three friends and he is similarly generally understood to say, ‘How then will you comfort me with empty nothings (*t^enaḥ^amûnî hābel*)? There is nothing left of your answers but falsehood.’ However, in the light of the underlying postulated root meaning, Thomas prefers to render *m^enaḥ^amê ‘āmāl* in Job 16.2 not as ‘miserable comforters’ but rather as ‘breathers out of trouble’, that is, mischief-makers. Likewise in Job 21.34 he translates ‘How do ye breathe mere breath at me!’ (also taking *hābel* in its literal meaning of ‘breath’), that is, they are ‘windbags’. However, it does not seem likely that Thomas is correct. Not only is it a fact that all the other instances of *nḥm* (piel) in Job clearly mean ‘comfort’ in view of their contexts (Job 2.11; 7.13; 29.25; 42.11), but in Job 2.11 this verb is specifically used with regard to what Job’s three friends were supposed to be doing when they came to see him: ‘They made an appointment together to come to condole with him and comfort him (*ûl^enaḥ^amô*)’. It is entirely natural, therefore, to suppose that this is also the sense intended by *nḥm* in Job 16.2 and 21.34.³⁵

Now interestingly, the same phrase as in Job 21.34 occurs also in Zech. 10.2, where having said that ‘the teraphim utter nonsense, and the diviners see lies’, the prophet goes on to declare that ‘the dreamers tell false dreams, and *hebel y^enaḥ^amûn*’, traditionally rendered as ‘give empty consolation’. However, in Job 21.34 Thomas wishes to translate ‘they breathe mere breath’, that is, they talk nonsense. Since, however, it has been shown that the same phrase in Job 21.34 refers to comforting in vain, this must surely also be the case in Zech. 10.2. Moreover, such a view makes excellent sense in the light of the parallelism, since the reference there to the dreamers telling false dreams presumably implies

34. D.W. Thomas, ‘A Note on the Hebrew Root נחם’, *ExpTim* 44 (1933), pp. 191-92 [= no. 40 below]; ‘Job’s “Comforters”’, *Durham University Journal* 28 (1933), pp. 276-77 [= no. 41 below]; ‘A Note on the Meaning of מנחם in Genesis xxvii.42’, *ExpTim* 51 (1940), p. 252 [= no. 42 below]. Cf. D.W. Thomas, ‘A Study in Hebrew Synonyms: Verbs Signifying “to Breathe”’, *Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete* 10 (1935), pp. 311-14 [= no. 43 below].

35. D.J.A. Clines, *Job 1-20* (WBC, 17; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989), p. 369, already noted this with regard to Job 16.2, but the same point occurred to me independently.

that their visions of hope fail to come to pass, with the result that they disappoint and fail to comfort.

There is one final place where Thomas rejects the traditional rendering of *nḥm*, namely Gen. 27.42. Here the verb is in the hithpael, which characteristically means ‘to comfort oneself’, and the words of Rebekah to Jacob have traditionally been translated, ‘...Your brother Esau is consoling himself with regard to you (*mitnaḥēm lēkā*) [intending] to kill you’. Thomas, however, wishes to render rather, ‘...Your brother Esau is breathing pantingly for (after) you to kill you’. But in the light of both the well-attested meaning ‘comfort’ and the absence of support for Thomas’s understanding elsewhere, noted above, there is every reason to retain the traditional rendering in this passage too. It should be observed that the hithpael of *nḥm* is similarly attested of someone in the context of taking vengeance, seemingly referring to the satisfaction gained thereby, in two other passages (Isa. 1.24; Ezek. 5.13).

n‘r (niphāl), ‘to Show Oneself Angry’ (Judges 16.20)

In the account of Samson and Delilah in Judg. 16.20 Thomas argued that we should render Samson’s words as ‘I will go out as at other times and show myself angry (*‘innā‘ēr*)’, taking the niphāl of *n‘r* as cognate with the Arabic verb *naḡara*, ‘to boil, be in violent commotion, be very angry’.³⁶ However, there are objections to Thomas’s proposal. First, it should be noted that whatever the niphāl of *n‘r* means, it has to be equivalent to what Samson has done on the previous occasions recounted (*kēpa‘am bēpa‘am*, Judg. 16.20) However, not a word has been said previously about Samson getting angry but only about him getting free from his situations. Secondly, as in some of Thomas’s other proposals, the required meaning is attested only in Arabic. Most likely the traditional rendering ‘shake free’ should be retained. The closest parallel appears to be in Isa. 52.1, where the hithpael of *n‘r* is used of Israel’s shaking off the dust, which in the context refers to its being liberated from captivity. Thomas claims that Samson had not been bound on this occasion, so shaking himself free would be irrelevant. This, however, appears to be mistaken, since Judg. 16.19 specifically states that on this occasion, following the cutting of Samson’s hair, Delilah began to subdue him (*lē‘annōtō*), a verb previously used with this meaning in vv. 5 and 6 in connection with Samson’s being bound (root *‘sr*; cf. Ps. 105.18 of

36. D.W. Thomas, ‘A Note on the Hebrew Text of Judges 16,20’, *AfO* 10 (1935), pp. 162-63 [= no. 44 below]. Cf. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, VIII, p. 2817.

Joseph's fetters).³⁷ There is every likelihood, therefore, that Thomas's proposal is to be rejected and that we should continue to maintain the traditional understanding.

šhr (*p^ealal*), 'to Be Bewitched' (*Psalms 38.11 [ET 10]*)

In Ps. 38.11 (ET 10) *libbî s^eharḥar* is normally translated as 'my heart palpitates/throbs' or the like, *s^eharḥar* being taken as the *p^ealal* of *šhr*, meaning 'to go around', hence 'to palpitate'. Thomas,³⁸ however, argued rather for the translation 'My mind is bewitched'. He connects the Hebrew root *šhr* here with Akkadian *saḫāru* and Arabic *saḥara*, 'to enchant', noting that this root had already been detected in Isa. 47.15, with *sōḥ^arayik* being translated as 'your sorcerers'. This rendering in Isa. 47.15 has indeed been followed by many scholars.³⁹ However, although the root *šhr* in Isa. 47.15 does most naturally refer back to the magicians who have been alluded to in the previous verses, it must be noted that another Hebrew root starting with a different sibilant is widely accepted to be cognate with Akkadian *saḫāru* only a few verses earlier in Isa. 47.11 ('But evil shall come upon you, which you cannot *charm away*'). The MT here has *šahrāh*—often emended to *šaḥ^arāh*—with the letter shin, making it unlikely that the prophet would use the same verb with a different sibilant in v. 15. As a matter of fact, the Akkadian letter *s* does not normally correspond to Hebrew shin but rather to sin or samekh, making it likely that we should actually read *šaḥ^arāh* in v. 11. As for v. 15, most naturally we should follow the many Bible translations and scholars that render,⁴⁰ 'Such are those with whom you have laboured, who have *trafficked with you from your youth*'. This gives the root *šhr* its normal meaning in Hebrew, which also has the support of the ancient Versions. Moreover, the root *šhr* is found elsewhere in Deutero-Isaiah in Isa. 45.14 in the form of the noun 'merchandise', where it appears parallel

37. Some scholars emend *wattāḥel l^e 'annôtô*, 'and she began to subdue him', to *wayyāḥel lē 'ānôt*, 'and he began to be weakened', on the basis of LXX^{AL} but the active form is supported by v. 6.

38. D.W. Thomas, 'A Note on לִבִּי סָהַרְהַר in Psalm xxxviii 11', *JTS* 40 (1939), pp. 390-91 [= no. 45 below].

39. E.g. G.R. Driver, 'Linguistic and Textual Problems: Isaiah xl-lxvi', *JTS* 36 (1935), pp. 396-406 (400-401); Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66* (NCB; Oliphants, 1975), p. 125; Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah*, p. 275; Goldingay and Payne, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 40-55*, II, p. 112; KB and HALAT (ET HALOT).

40. E.g. C.R. North, *The Second Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), pp. 169, 173; RV, RSV, NRSV, NJPSV, NIV. J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39* (AB, 19; New York: Doubleday, 2000), p. 278, speaks of *double entendre* here.

with a noun from the root *yḡ* ‘, to toil’, just as *šhr* in Isa. 47.15 is associated with the verb *yḡ* ‘, to toil, labour’. This point, which I have not seen made before, surely clinches the argument. The reference to trafficking will then be to the money-making associated with the various types of sorcerers proffering their services. It is not impossible that there is also word play here with the root alluded to above which is attested in v. 11 (cf. the remark of Blenkinsopp in n. 40).

The case for a Hebrew verb *šhr*, ‘to bewitch’, is thus not fully made out and there is even less reason to postulate this meaning for *s^eharḥar* in Ps. 38.11 (ET 10). The normal translation ‘palpitates, throbs’, which makes excellent sense, may be maintained and seems to be universally followed. Thomas’s view seems to have gained no support, not even in the NEB.

‘*qd* (piel), ‘to Divine’ (1 Samuel 2.5)

Part of the second line of Isa. 2.6 is widely believed to be corrupt. The MT reads, *kî māl^e’û miqqedem w^e’ōn^enîm kapp^elištîm*, ‘For they are full from the east (*miqqedem*), and soothsayers like the Philistines...’⁴¹ Both Qumran Isaiah scrolls, 1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b, and all the ancient Versions imply the same Hebrew text. Winton Thomas⁴² argued that the Hebrew verb ‘*qd*, elsewhere attested with the meaning ‘to bind’ (cf. Gen. 22.9), could mean ‘to divine’ in the piel, thus reading *m^e’aq^edîm*, ‘diviners’, instead of *miqqedem*, ‘from the east’, in Isa. 2.6. He argued for this on the basis of Arabic ‘*aqada*, ‘to tie’, from which were derived *mu’aqqid*, ‘enchanter, charmer’, and ‘*āqidāt*, ‘witches’.⁴³ This was an ingenious suggestion, since graphically the consonantal text of *miqqedem* and *m^e’aq^edîm* are close. However, this particular meaning is only a secondary meaning of the Arabic. Moreover, other plausible suggestions have been made which avoid creating an otherwise unknown meaning for a Hebrew

41. Watts curiously prefers to retain the MT and this translation, though it does not make sense.

42. D.W. Thomas, ‘A Lost Hebrew Word in Isaiah ii. 6’, *JTS* NS 13 (1962), pp. 323-24 [= no. 46 below]. Shortly afterwards, Thomas published another article on this verse, ‘The Text of Jesaia II 6 and the Word קפץ’, *ZAW* 75 (NF 34, 1963), pp. 88-90 [= no. 47 below]. Here he plausibly argued that the verb *yašpîqû* means ‘they abound’ (cf. the parallel *māl^e’û*, ‘they are full of’), but in my view more questionably saw both ‘like the Philistines’ and ‘with the children of foreigners’ as later glosses. For a full discussion of this latter passage see H.G.M. Williamson, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 1–27. I. Commentary on Isaiah 1–5* (ICC; London: T. & T. Clark, 2006), pp. 193-94.

43. Cf. Lane, *Arabic–English Lexicon*, pp. 2104-2107; Hava, *Arabic–English Dictionary*, p. 487; de Biberstein Kazimirski, *Dictionnaire arabe–français*, II, pp. 311-14.

word. Thus, because of the poetic parallelism with ‘soothsayers’ (*‘ōn^enîm*), who either as *‘ōn^enîm* or *m^e‘ōn^enîm* are mentioned closely alongside *qōs^emîm* in Deut. 18.10, 14 and Jer. 27.9, and because of the relatively close graphic similarity to *miqqedem*, most scholars plausibly conjecture that we should envisage either *miqsām* (or less likely, *qesem*), ‘divination’, or *qōs^emîm*, ‘diviners’, as having originally been in the text, either instead of *miqqedem* (cf. JB, NAB, H.G.M. Williamson⁴⁴) or as an additional word prior to *miqqedem* that later fell out of the text (cf. Wildberger, Clements, Blenkinsopp, Childs, RSV, NRSV, ‘diviners’; NIV, ‘superstitions’).⁴⁵ Since *miqsām*, ‘divination’ is graphically the closest to *miqqedem*, the original text probably read either ‘For they are full of divination from the east, and soothsayers like the Philistines’ or ‘For they are full of divination, and soothsayers like the Philistines’. Of these two broad possibilities, it might be argued in favour of the former that there are two other occasions, both in Isaiah, where ‘Philistines’ and *miqqedem*, ‘from the east’, appear in parallel parts of a poetic verse (Isa. 9.11 [ET 12]; 11.14).⁴⁶ However, on balance, in favour of the latter it seems to me more likely that it was the very presence of ‘Philistines’ that led to *miqsām* becoming corrupted to *miqqedem* by way of parallel.⁴⁷

‘*śh*, ‘to Cover’ (Genesis 6.14; Numbers 15.24, etc.)
and ‘to Turn’ (Ruth 2.19; 1 Samuel 14.32)

Winton Thomas wrote an article in which he argued that the verb ‘*śh*, normally meaning ‘to do’ or ‘to make’, is also capable of meaning ‘to cover’ and ‘to turn’ in a minority of cases, and is there cognate with the

44. Williamson, *Isaiah 1–5*, pp. 189, 191–92, prefers *miqsām*, probably rightly.

45. Wildberger, *Jesaja Kapiel 1–12*, pp. 91, 93, ET *Isaiah 1–12*, pp. 97, 99; R.E. Clements, *Isaiah 1–39* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980), pp. 43–44; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*, pp. 192–93; B.S. Childs, *Isaiah* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), pp. 23, 27.

46. Incidentally, this is also an argument against the little-followed view (but cf. NJB and P. Auvray, *Isaïe 1–39* [Sources bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1972], p. 54, following LXX) which takes *miqqedem* in Isa. 2.6 in its other meaning of ‘from of old’. Another objection to this latter view is that it would require deletion of the waw found in all Hebrew manuscripts before *‘ōn^enîm*, ‘soothsayers’.

47. Williamson, *Isaiah 1–5*, pp. 192–93, emends *kapp^elištîm*, ‘like the Philistines’, to *kaššāpîm*, ‘sorcerers’, and thinks that *miqsām*, ‘divination’, was corrupted to *miqqedem*, ‘from the east’, after this corruption took place. However, it seems to me more likely that *kapp^elištîm* was original, thus encouraging the corruption of *miqsām* to *miqqedem* by way of parallel. *Contra* Williamson, I think 2 Kgs 1 does suggest a special concern of the Philistines with divination, since here an Israelite king, Ahaziah, actually feels bound to consult a god of Ekron in Philistia rather than a deity in Israel.

Arabic verbs *ǧašā* and *ʿašā* respectively.⁴⁸ The instances of the former are in Gen. 6.14; Num. 15.24; Isa. 32.6; Ezek. 17.17; Obad. 6; Pss. 9.16 [ET 15]; 139.15; Prov. 13.16; 26.28; Job 15.27, and for the latter in Ruth 2.19; 1 Sam. 14.32; 1 Kgs 20.40; Job 23.9; 1 Chron. 4.10 respectively. I will not go through all these alleged examples one by one here, but will merely say that, having analysed them all, I do not find any of them really compelling.

šlh (hiphil), 'to Practise Deceit'
(Daniel 8.25; Contrast Jer. 5.28)

In 1945 Winton Thomas published a short article on Jer. 5.28.⁴⁹ However, contrary to what one might imagine, he did not offer a new philological solution to a problem in that verse but was rather responding to an even briefer article on Jer. 5.28 by T.H. Gaster,⁵⁰ which did offer a new philological proposal. In this verse the prophet is complaining about the failure of the powerful to ensure justice among the poor and needy, and declares that they do not make the cause of the orphan prosper. Gaster proposed seeing not the common Hebrew verb meaning 'to be successful, prosper' here but rather a homonym cognate with the Ethiopic verb *ṣalhawa*, 'to deceive, defraud, cheat'. He thus translated the passage as 'In the case of the fatherless they cheat, and mete out no justice to the poor'. Thomas, however, pointed out that it was perfectly possible to make sense of the passage on the assumption that we have here the verb *šlh*, 'to be successful, prosper', rendering 'They defend not the right, the right of the fatherless, that they may prosper; and the cause of the needy they do not judge'. Thomas notes that the subject of this verb could be either the wicked, referring to their gaining an unfair advantage, or the fatherless, referring to their being successful in their cause. Most assume the latter to be the case.

However, having rightly made this point, Thomas tentatively suggested that there might nevertheless exist a Hebrew cognate of the Ethiopic verb in Dan. 8.25, where the object of the verb *hišlīaḥ* is *mirmā*, 'deceit', so that *w^ehišlīaḥ mirmā*, referring to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, might be translated 'he shall practise deceit' (lit. 'he shall deceive with deceit') rather than the generally accepted 'he shall cause treachery to prosper'.

48. D.W. Thomas, 'Translating Hebrew *ʿāsāh*', *BT* 17 (1966), pp. 190-93 [= no. 48 below].

49. D.W. Thomas, 'Jeremiah v. 28', *ExpTim* 57 (1945), pp. 54-55 [= no. 49 below].

50. T.H. Gaster, 'Jeremiah v. 28', *ExpTim* 56 (1944), p. 54.

One may rightly feel, however, that it is safer to accept the presence of the well-known Hebrew verb here when this makes perfectly good sense, rather than create an entirely new meaning on the basis of a verb attested only in Ethiopic.

šn‘, ‘to Act Prudently, Carefully, Wisely’
(Micah 6.8; cf. Proverbs 11.2)

In the Hebrew Bible the root šn‘ occurs only twice, in Prov. 11.2 and Mic. 6.8, but it is also found four times in Ecclesiasticus and three times in the Qumran Community Rule. Proverbs 11.2 has traditionally been rendered, ‘When pride comes, then comes disgrace, but with the humble (š^enû ‘îm) is wisdom’ (e.g. RSV). Similarly, Mic. 6.8, famous for being regarded as a succinct summary of prophetic religion (or, at any rate, a liberal Protestant interpretation of it!), has traditionally been translated, ‘He has showed you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly (hašnēa‘) with your God?’ (e.g. RSV). However, if one looks at commentaries on the book of Micah as well as discussions devoted to this root over the last half century and more,⁵¹ one notes that it is now widely accepted that a

51. Subsequent to D.W. Thomas’s article (see next footnote), cf. J.P. Hyatt, ‘On the Meaning and Origin of Micah 6:8’, *AThR* 34 (1952-53), pp. 232-39; H.-J. Stoebe, ‘Und demütig vor deinem Gott: Micha 6, 8’, in C. Maurer (ed.), *Wort und Dienst. Jahrbuch der Theologischen Schule Bethel als Festschrift für P.D. Wilhelm Brandt zum 65. Geburtstag* 6 (1959), pp. 180-94 (I am indebted to Professor Christoph Bultmann for kindly sending me a copy of this work); T. Lescow, *Micha 6,6-8: Studien zu Sprache, Form und Auslegung* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1966), p. 56. The attempt of S. Dawes, ‘Walking Humbly: Micah 6:8 Revisited’, *SJT* 41 (1988), pp. 331-39, to defend the traditional rendering ‘humbly’ is unconvincing. Commentators following the new understanding include W. Rudolph, *Micha–Nahum–Habakuk–Zephania* (KAT, 13.3; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1975), p. 107; L.C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah* (NICOT; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1976), p. 363; A.S. van der Woude, *Micha* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament; Nijkerk: G.F. Callenbach, 1977), p. 219; B. Renaud, *La formation du livre de Michée: tradition et actualisation* (EBib; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1977), pp. 299-300; H.W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheten 4: Micha* (BKAT, 14.4; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), pp. 137, 155-56, ET *Micah: A Commentary* (trans. G. Stansell; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990), pp. 164, 181-82; D.R. Hillers, *Micah* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), pp. 75 and 76 note t; F.I. Andersen and D.N. Freedman, *Micah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 24E; New York: Doubleday, 2000), p. 530, appear to support a rendering like ‘prudently’, ‘thoughtfully’, ‘wisely’ in their discussion, so it is curious that in their actual translation they inconsistently render ‘humbly’; B.K. Waltke, *A Commentary on Micah* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 2007), pp. 343, 364-66;

more accurate translation of the hiphil of the root *šn* ‘ would be something like ‘to act prudently, circumspectly, carefully, attentively, thoughtfully, wisely’. Interestingly, so far as I am aware, Thomas’s article on the subject⁵² seems to have been the first work that drew attention to this fact.

Part of Thomas’s evidence for the meaning of the root *šn* ‘ comes from Ecclesiasticus, where we find two instances of the hiphil of *šn* ‘ (Ecclus 16.25; 35.3 [LXX 32.3]), comparable to Mic. 6.8, and two of the passive qal form *šānûa* ‘ (Ecclus 34.22 [LXX 31.22]; 42.8), comparable to Prov. 11.2.

In Ecclus 16.25 Thomas renders:

I will pour out my spirit in due measure,
And with due care (*ûb^ehašnēa* ‘) will I show my knowledge.

The word *ûb^ehašnēa* ‘ here stands parallel to ‘in due measure’ (*b^emišqāl*), thus requiring a translation such as Thomas gives; the LXX likewise has *en akribeia*, ‘with exactness, precision’. Clearly ‘in humility’ would be inappropriate here.

The other most obvious example with regard to the meaning of this root in Ecclesiasticus is Ecclus 42.8, where *šānûa* ‘ stands parallel to *zāhîr*, ‘careful’. Thomas translates:

And so thou shalt be truly careful,
And a discreet man (*w^e’îš šānûa* ‘) before all living.

Again, the translation ‘humble’ would not be so appropriate.

Comparable meanings should therefore be given to the other examples of this root in Ecclesiasticus. In Ecclus 35.3 (LXX 32.3) Thomas renders:

Speak, old man, for it becomes thee,
Being careful as to the sense (*w^ehašnēa* ‘ *śekel*), and hinder not song.

Jörg Jeremias, *Die Propheten Joel, Obadja, Jona, Micha* (ATD, 24.3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), pp. 198, 204. The only recent major commentary which I have seen that rejects the newer interpretation is W. McKane, *Micah: Introduction and Commentary* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998), pp. 187-89, 191, who argues for modestly/humbly (though preferring the rendering ‘modestly’ because he says ‘humbly’ is suggestive of humbug!). Both KB and HALAT (ET HALOT) support Thomas’s proposal; similarly NEB, which renders ‘wisely’ in Mic. 6.8 and NJPSV margin has ‘prudent’, but other modern English Bible translations tend to favour ‘humbly’ (cf. NJPSV ‘modestly’), probably in deference to the fact that this traditional rendering is so well known.

52. D.W. Thomas, ‘The Root צָנַע in Hebrew, and the Meaning of קָדַרְנִית in Malachi iii, 14’, *JJS* 1 (1948-49), pp. 182-88 (see 182-86) [= no. 50 below].

For *haṣnēa* ‘*śkl*’ the LXX has *en akribēi epistēmēi*, ‘with exact (or accurate) knowledge’. Finally, in Ecclus 34.22 (LXX 31.22) Thomas likewise translates:

In all thy works be careful (*ṣānuā*)
And no trouble shall touch thee.

Further evidence in support of Thomas’s view and against the translation ‘humble, humbly’ has emerged subsequent to the time he wrote his article from study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, where the expression *haṣnēa* ‘*leket*’ occurs three times in the Community Rule (1QS 4.5; 5.4; 8.2) in lists of ethical qualities. In the first two lists a word for ‘humility’ (‘*anāwā*’) already occurs (1QS 4.3; 5.3), suggesting that ‘walking humbly’ is not what *haṣnēa* ‘*leket*’ means.⁵³

With regard to *ṣānūa* Thomas believes that the meaning ‘humble’ may have come about as a secondary development, humility being the appropriate reaction of one who is circumspect towards God. Thomas therefore did not dissent from the traditional rendering of Prov. 11.2:

When pride comes, then comes disgrace,
but with the humble is wisdom.

However, I would argue that the contrast between *zādôn*, ‘pride’, and *ṣenū’îm* need not require the directly opposite translation ‘humble’ for the latter. Some such rendering as ‘prudent’, suggested by the later wisdom passages in Ecclesiasticus and other evidence (considered above), would be equally acceptable. Such a conclusion is supported by Prov. 13.10, another proverbial passage involving *zādôn*:

By insolence (*b^ezādôn*) the heedless make strife,
but with those who take advice (*nô’āṣîm*)⁵⁴ is wisdom.

‘Taking advice’ may be regarded as a part of what circumspect and prudent behaviour requires (cf. Lk. 14.31), and since ‘pride’ and ‘insolence’ are not so different in meaning, the parallelism between ‘insolence’ and ‘those who take advice’ in Prov. 13.10 would lend support to the idea that ‘pride’ and ‘the prudent’ could stand in opposition in Prov. 11.2.

In order to account for the meaning ‘circumspect, prudent’ for the Hebrew root *ṣn* Thomas proposed that it was cognate with Jewish Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew *ṣn* meaning ‘to guard, hold back’. To be

53. Cf. Hyatt, ‘On the Meaning and Origin of Micah 6:8’, p. 237; Stoebe, ‘Und demütig vor deinem Gott: Micha 6, 8’, p. 193.

54. The proposal has occasionally been made that we should here emend *nô’āṣîm* to *ṣenū’îm*, but this is without support and unnecessary.

guarded is to be circumspect and prudent, and similarly to act guardedly is to act circumspectly and prudently. Such an explanation of the origin of the root is quite possible. However, as J.A. Emerton has pointed out,⁵⁵ it is more open to question when Thomas wishes to associate the Biblical Hebrew root also with Epigraphic South Arabian *ṣn* ‘and Ethiopic *ṣan* ‘a, ‘to strengthen’.

Finally, it should be observed that Thomas notes that there is versional support for his proposal. Significantly, not one of the ancient Versions renders *haṣnēa* ‘in Mic. 6.8 by ‘humbly’, whereas support for Thomas’s proposal is found in Quinta’s *phrontizein*, ‘consider, reflect, pay attention’, and the Vulgate’s *sollicitum*, ‘carefully, punctiliously’.⁵⁶ He also claims that the LXX’s rendering *hetoimon einai*, ‘to be ready’ (similarly Peshitta), might be explained on the basis of his etymological proposal, since one who is ‘on guard’ is ready for action.

šdd (piel), ‘to Expel’ (Proverbs 19.26)

Proverbs 19.26 has traditionally been translated in some such way as follows: ‘He who does violence to his father and chases away his mother is a son who causes shame and brings reproach’ (cf. RSV). The verb rendered ‘does violence to’ is *m^ešaddēd* (the piel participle of *šdd*). Thomas,⁵⁷ however, has argued that we should relate the verb here to Ethiopic *sadada*, ‘to expel’,⁵⁸ which would thereby provide an exact parallel to *yabrîḥ*, ‘chases away’.

Although we cannot categorically disprove Thomas’s suggestion, and it was perhaps worth putting forward as a possibility, it has gained only a little support,⁵⁹ and most seem rightly to reject it as unnecessary. The verb

55. Emerton, ‘The Work of David Winton Thomas as a Hebrew Scholar’, pp. 297-98.

56. Jeremias, *Die Propheten Joel, Obadja, Jona, Micha*, p. 204, is mistaken in saying that the Vulgate translates as ‘humbly’.

57. Thomas, ‘Textual and Philological Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs’, in Noth and Thomas (eds.), *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East*, p. 289.

58. Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae*, col. 396. Incidentally, Whybray, *Proverbs*, p. 286, mistakenly says that Thomas appeals to an Arabic verb *sadada* meaning ‘to expel’. Further, as Kevin Cathcart kindly points out to me, Thomas failed to note that, in addition to other meanings, the Akkadian verb *šadādu* can mean ‘to drag down, carry away’ and ‘to remove a person forcibly to another place’, which are somewhat similar; see CAD, XVII (Š/1), pp. 25-27.

59. Thomas’s view appears to be followed by the REB, and E. Ben Zvi, *A Historical-Critical Study of the Book of Zephaniah* (BZAW, 198; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1991), p. 436, thinks it is possible.

šdd is well attested in the sense of ‘despoil, devastate, maltreat’, and the one other occurrence of the piel of this verb in the Old Testament (clearly with this meaning) is also to be found in the book of Proverbs, namely Prov. 24.15. Though not exact, this sense provides a sufficiently good parallel to *yabrîah*, ‘chase away’, to make it unnecessary to envisage an otherwise unattested meaning here. Thomas fails, in fact, to point out that the Ethiopic verb *sadada*, to which he appeals for his new meaning, is actually cognate with Hebrew *šdd*, ‘to despoil, devastate, maltreat’ (as BDB notes), so even if we were to follow Thomas’s view it would not be a case of envisaging a totally different root but rather a particular nuance of meaning in the already well-known verb. Further, it should be noted that the ancient Versions all support the traditional rendering of *šdd* here.

In a separate, later article,⁶⁰ Thomas drew attention to Zeph. 2.4, ‘For Gaza shall be deserted, and Ashkelon shall become a devastation; Ashdod’s people shall be driven out at noon, and Ekron shall be uprooted’. It will be noted that there are two genuine word plays here, namely in the case of the first and last mentioned Gaza (‘azzâ ‘azûbâ) and Ekron (w^e‘eqrôn tē‘āqēr); in the case of Ashkelon (w^e‘ašqelôn lišēmāmā) and Ashdod (‘ašdôd...y^egārēšûhā) there is only one letter, shin, in common between the place name and the verb. However, in the case of Ashdod, which is to be driven out (root *grš*), Thomas suggests that y^egārēšûhā could be a deliberate pun on the name of Ashdod if the latter was associated with the meaning ‘to expel, drive away’. Thomas is right that we should not emend y^egārēšûhā in order to gain closer connection with the name Ashdod, as the MT is supported by the ancient Versions. However, the suggestion of a pun here is very problematic, since, as has already been seen above, the very existence of Hebrew *šdd* in the sense of ‘to expel’ is questionable.

šnh, ‘to Be High, Exalted’ (Proverbs 5.9; 24.21-22, etc.)

The Hebrew verb *šnh* normally means ‘to change’, but Thomas has plausibly argued that there is another root *šānâ* with the meaning ‘to be high, exalted’. This meaning is attested for the Arabic verb *saniya* and there is also in Syriac a noun *šanā*, ‘sublimity, majesty, great honour’. The existence of this root in Ugaritic is debated. It is now widely agreed that El’s epithet *ab šnm* means ‘Father of years’ rather than

60. D.W. Thomas, ‘A Pun on the Name Ashdod in Zephaniah ii.4’, *ExpTim* 74 (1962), p. 63 [= no. 51 below].

‘Father of exalted ones’, which was once sometimes suggested,⁶¹ and G.R. Driver’s rendering of *šnt* as ‘loftiness’⁶² in *KTU* 1.16.VI.58 is plausible but uncertain.

In his first contribution to the subject⁶³ Thomas concentrated on Prov. 24.21-22. The MT reads:

*y^erā’-’et-Yhwh b^enî wāmelek ‘im šônîm ‘al tit ‘ārāb
kî-pit’ôm yāqûm ‘êdām ûpîd š^enêhem mî yôdēa’*

Literally this could be rendered:

My son, fear the Lord and the king,
and do not meddle [or associate] with those who change;
for disaster from them will rise suddenly,
and who knows the ruin that will come from them both.

Clearly the rendering *šônîm* as ‘those who change’ yields poor sense. Thomas, however, connected it with his postulated root *šnh*, ‘to be high, exalted’. He thus translates:

My son, fear thou the Lord and the king,
But meddle not with those of high rank.

In the following verse Thomas goes on to emend *š^enêhem*, ‘both of them’, to *šônîm*, the same word that appears in v. 21, thus rendering:

For their calamity shall rise suddenly,
And who knoweth the destruction of those of high rank.

Others who have followed Thomas’s new understanding of the root *šnh* in vv. 21-22 include G.R. Driver, L. Kopf and J.A. Emerton, and those who follow this meaning in v. 21 only include W. McKane, B.K. Waltke, NEB, REB and *HALAT* (ET *HALOT*).⁶⁴

61. Primarily by M.H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (VTSup, 2; Leiden: Brill, 1955), p. 33. As I note in Day, *God’s Conflict*, p. 161, there is other evidence showing that El was an aged god, thus supporting the traditional rendering ‘father of years’.

62. G.R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Old Testament Studies, 3; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956), p. 47.

63. D.W. Thomas, ‘The Root שָׁנָה = سَنَى in Hebrew’, *ZAW* 52 (1934), pp. 236-38 [= no. 52 below].

64. Driver, ‘Problems in the Hebrew Text of Proverbs’, p. 189; McKane, *Proverbs*, pp. 249, 405-406; L. Kopf, ‘Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch’, *VT* 9 (1959), pp. 247-87 (280-83); J.A. Emerton, ‘Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs’, *JTS* NS 20 (1969), pp. 202-20 (209-11); ‘The Work of David Winton Thomas as a Hebrew Scholar’, pp. 301-302; Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs, Chapters 15-31*, pp. 279-80, 287. It should be noted that in v. 22 Kopf reads *š^enîhem*, ‘their high rank’.

I would draw attention to the fact that there is an interesting parallel to this verse in the *Wisdom of Ahiqar* which has hitherto gone unnoticed:

'm zy rm mnk 'l t'br bn[syn]

Do not be enraged⁶⁵ in di[spute] with one higher than yourself

This is interesting because *rm*, 'high', is similar in meaning to *šônûm*, as understood by Thomas ('those who are high'), and moreover, the use of the verb *t'br* from '*br*, 'to be enraged', here perhaps encourages us to read *tit'abbār* for MT *tit'ārāb* in Prov. 24.21. It has often been supposed that *tit'abbār* is presupposed in the LXX's rendering ('Do not disobey either of them'⁶⁶), and the hithpael of '*br* is also used elsewhere in connection with the king in Prov. 20.2:

The dread wrath of a king is like the growling of a lion;
he who provokes him to anger (*mit'abb^erā*) forfeits his life.

One might therefore render Prov. 24.21-22 as follows:

My son, fear the Lord and the king,
and do not provoke to anger those on high;
for disaster from them will rise suddenly,
and who knows the ruin that will come from them both [or 'from those on high']?

In a further article⁶⁷ Thomas found several other examples of this root in the Hebrew Bible. One of the more plausible is in Prov. 5.9. As traditionally rendered, this verse, which advises against consorting with the loose woman, reads: 'lest you give your honour (*hōdekā*) to others and your years (*š^enōtēkā*) to the merciless'. However, 'years' provides a poor parallel to 'honour'. On Thomas's understanding we should read not 'your years' but 'your dignity' (whether reading *š^enōt^ekā* or *š^enāt^ekā*; cf. Syriac *šanā*, 'sublimity, majesty, great honour'), which provides perfect parallelism. Although Thomas does not note it, the theme of forfeit of

65. So A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), p. 217, and I. Kottsieper, *Die Sprache der Ahiqarsprüche* (BZAW, 194; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1990), p. 9, but J.M. Lindenberger, *The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar* (The Johns Hopkins Near Eastern Studies; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), p. 142, reads *t'bd*.

66. Fox, *Proverbs 10–31*, pp. 1040, 1104, goes all the way with the LXX here and renders Prov. 24.21 as 'Fear the Lord, my son, and the king. Do not anger either of them'. However, while this provides a nice translation, it may be argued that MT's *šōnim* offers the harder reading, in contrast to *š^enēhem*, and should be preferred.

67. D.W. Thomas, 'The Root שָׁנָה = سنى in Hebrew II', ZAW 55 (1937), pp. 174-76 [= no. 53 below].

honour for the young man who consorts with the loose woman is attested also in Prov. 6.33, 'Wounds and dishonour will he get, and his disgrace will not be wiped away'. The reference to 'wounds' here might also be an allusion to revenge by the loose woman's angry husband (cf. Prov. 6.34-35), who is doubtless also intended by 'the merciless' in Prov. 5.9. While the latter might inherit the adulterer's 'dignity', it is difficult to see how he could be given his 'years'. Anyway, Thomas's translation has been followed by such scholars as G.R. Driver, W. McKane, J.A. Emerton, and B.K. Waltke⁶⁸ as well as by the NEB and REB.

The Hebrew of Prov. 14.17 reads: *qēšar-'appayim ya'aśeh 'iwwelet wē'iš mēzimmôt yiśśānē*'. How is this to be interpreted? There have been three main proposals. First, one could retain the MT (with NIV, NJB, NRSV and commentators such as O. Plöger, R.N. Whybray, R.E. Murphy, R.J. Clifford, B.K. Waltke and M.V. Fox⁶⁹) and render, 'One who is quick-tempered acts foolishly, and the schemer is hated'. This does make sense and has the advantage that it gives *'iš mēzimmôt* the negative meaning it has in the one other example of the expression in Prov. 12.2 (cf. too Prov. 24.8, *ba'al-mēzimmôt*). It might be argued against this that it results in synonymous rather than antithetic parallelism, the latter being particularly frequent within Proverbs 10–15. However, synonymous parallelism is not unknown in this section of Proverbs, especially Proverbs 14 (cf. vv. 13, 19, 26).⁷⁰ A second proposal is to follow the LXX (cf. RSV, JB, C.H. Toy⁷¹). This presupposes reading *yiśśā*, 'bears', in the sense of 'is patient', thus resulting in the translation, 'A man of quick temper acts foolishly, but a man of discretion is patient'. A variant of this view emends *yiśśānē*, 'is hated', to *yiś'anān*, 'remains tranquil', claiming the support of the Peshitta, a view followed by B. Kuhn.⁷² This rendering makes sense and produces antithetic parallelism, which is normal in this

68. G.R. Driver, 'Ecclesiasticus: A New Fragment of the Hebrew Text', *ExpTim* 49 (1937), pp. 37-39 (38); McKane, *Proverbs*, pp. 217, 316; Emerton, 'The Work of David Winton Thomas as a Hebrew Scholar', p. 302; Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs, Chapters 1–15*, pp. 303, 312. Earlier still, in 1913, Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, VI, p. 27, had rendered 'your splendour', comparing Hebrew *šānī*, 'scarlet'.

69. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia)*, pp. 166-67; Whybray, *Proverbs*, p. 218; Murphy, *Proverbs*, pp. 100, 102; Clifford, *Proverbs*, pp. 141, 145-46; Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs 1–15*, p. 580; Fox, *Proverbs 10–31*, p. 579 (cf. p. 1002).

70. Further, Fox, *Proverbs 10–31*, p. 579, points out that Prov. 14.17 does nevertheless speak of two antithetical types (the short-tempered impulsive person and the guarded, scheming individual).

71. Toy, *Proverbs*, p. 294.

72. G. Kuhn, *Beiträge zur Erläuterung des salomonischen Spruchbuches* (BWANT, 3.16 [57]; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1931), p. 33.

section of Proverbs, but at the cost of emending the MT and giving 'iš *m^ezimmôt* a different sense from what it has in Prov. 12.2 (cf. 24.8). This brings us to the third proposal, made by Winton Thomas,⁷³ emending *yîššānē* to *yîšne*, which is then seen as a variant of *yîšneh* from *šnh* II, resulting in a rendering such as 'Impatience runs into folly; distinction comes by careful thought' (NEB; cf. REB, W. McKane⁷⁴). This makes sense, involves no emendation except of the vocalization and changing the letter sin to shin, and it yields antithetic parallelism, which is normal in this chapter/section. However, it gives 'iš *m^ezimmôt* a different sense from what it has in Prov. 12.2. On balance I prefer (1), because of the negative sense of *m^ezimmôt* elsewhere in Proverbs 10–29 (similarly *zimmâ* in Prov. 10.23; 21.27; 24.9), which tends to tell against (2) and (3).

Another passage where Thomas saw this root *šnh* is in Isa. 11.11. The MT reads *w^ehāyâ bayyôm hahû' yôšîp 'adōnāy šēnît yādô liqnôt 'et-še'ār 'ammô*. This has traditionally been rendered, 'In that day the Lord will set his hand yet a second time to recover the remnant which is left of his people...' There are some who still follow such a translation, including a majority of modern Bible translations.⁷⁵ It has to be admitted, though, that if this is correct the word order is a little strange and *šēnît* seems redundant. Before *yādô*, 'his hand', we should more naturally expect a verb in the infinitive construct rather than *šēnît*. A number of scholars have therefore suggested emending *šēnît*, 'second time', to *še'ēt*, 'to raise', which makes good sense, and Isa. 49.22 has been compared.⁷⁶ Winton Thomas, however, strove to achieve a comparable translation with less radical emendation by reading *šannôt*, which he took as the piel infinitive construct of *šnh*.⁷⁷ Opinion is somewhat divided between these three possibilities and certainty is not possible.

A further passage where Thomas's interpretation is probably correct according to J.A. Emerton,⁷⁸ this time outside the Bible, is in the Babylonian Talmud in *Shabb.* 10b, *l'wlm 'l yšnh 'dm bnw byn hbnym*, which Thomas⁷⁹ renders, 'Let no man exalt [show special honour to] one son

73. Thomas, 'Textual and Philological Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs', p. 286.

74. McKane, *Proverbs*, pp. 232, 468.

75. E.g. RSV, NRSV, JB, NJB, NIV, REB.

76. E.g. H.G.M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 250–51.

77. Thomas, 'The Root שָׁנָה = سنى II', pp. 175–76.

78. J.A. Emerton, 'The Meaning of *šēnā*' in Psalm cxxvii 2', *VT* 24 (1974), pp. 15–31 (27).

79. Thomas, 'The Root שָׁנָה = سنى', p. 237.

above his other children'. Thomas's rendering makes excellent sense in the context. The only thing that gives one cause for caution is the fact that this Talmudic reference stands chronologically isolated in that it is hundreds of years later than the biblical allusions, and it is not impossible that it should be rendered 'A man should not distinguish (or single out) one son among his other sons', as Marcus Jastrow and I. Epstein suggested.⁸⁰ Those who adopt this latter translation would maintain that we have here an extension of the usual meaning of the piel of *šnh*, 'to change, vary, modify'.

J.A. Emerton has also argued for two further instances of the root *šnh*, 'to be high' in the Hebrew Bible which had previously been overlooked. The first is in Ps. 127.2.⁸¹ Traditionally this verse has been rendered, 'It is in vain that you rise up early and go late to rest, eating the bread of anxious toil; for he gives to his beloved sleep (*šēnā*)'. However, 'sleep' certainly seems inappropriate here, as Emerton convincingly demonstrates. The context provided by the previous lines makes it clear that the psalmist is emphasizing that human effort alone is insufficient and that divine help is also essential for complete success in a venture. The immediately preceding words, 'It is in vain that you rise up early and go late to rest, eating the bread of anxious toil', therefore lead one to expect that what God gives is what one hopes to achieve as the result of hard work. Dahood's suggestion of 'prosperity' (comparing Syriac *šaynā*, 'prosperity', and Ethiopic *sene*, 'peace') was the most appropriate meaning previously proposed,⁸² but Emerton pointed out that the lack of an aleph between the shin and the nun is a disadvantage to this view, since the proposed word would be cognate with the Hebrew adjective *ša'anān* and noun *ša'anān*. Emerton therefore proposed, on the basis of *šnh* II, that we render 'Surely he gives high estate/honour to him whom he loves'. We must conclude that this proposal (supported by L.C. Allen⁸³) is the most plausible so far suggested for this difficult passage, though certainty is not possible.

80. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, II, p. 1605; I. Epstein (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Mo'ed: Shabbath I* (London: Soncino Press, 1938), p. 38.

81. Emerton, 'The Meaning of *šēnā*' in Psalm cxxvii 2'.

82. M.J. Dahood, *Psalms III: 101–150* (AB, 17A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970), pp. 222, 223–24.

83. L.C. Allen, *Psalms 101–150* (WBC, 21; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), p. 177.

The second instance⁸⁴ is in the Gideon story in Judg. 6.25-28, where on the traditional rendering we keep reading (vv. 25, 26, 28) of Gideon's offering 'the second bull' (*par haššēnî* or *happār haššēnî*), although no other bull appears to be present. Emerton surveys critically other suggestions that have been made and concludes that we should rather see a reference to 'the finest bull', taking *šēnî* to be derived from *šnh*, 'to be high'. Again, this is the most plausible suggestion hitherto proposed for this difficult passage, but certainty is not possible.

Finally, it should be noted that closely related to Arabic *saniya*, 'to be high', is Arabic *sanā*, 'to be bright',⁸⁵ and Thomas⁸⁶ pointed out that the Greek text of Ben Sira seems to be aware of this meaning for the Hebrew root *šnh* when it (wrongly) translates *šnwt lb ṭwb* as *lampra kardia kai agathē*, literally 'a bright and good heart' (Ecclus 33.13 [LXX 30.25]). This plausible suggestion avoids the necessity of supposing that the LXX curiously failed to translate *šnwt* but rendered *ṭwb* twice. Harmonious with Thomas's suggestion but overlooked by him is the fact, pointed out by J.A. Emerton,⁸⁷ that Hebrew *šānî*, 'scarlet', has been associated with the Arabic root *saniya* since the time of J.D. Michaelis and W. Gesenius.

Overall, there is sufficient evidence to make probable Thomas's suggestion of a Hebrew root *šnh*, 'to be high'.

Summary

For a summary of the main conclusions of this chapter, please see the overall summary of the book in Chapter 6.

84. J.A. Emerton, 'The "Second Bull" on Judges 6:25-28', in M. Haran (ed.), *Eretz-Israel* 14 (H.L. Ginsberg Volume) (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in Cooperation with the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978), pp. 52*-55*.

85. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, IV, p. 1448.

86. D.W. Thomas, 'The LXX's Rendering of שְׁנוֹת לֵב טוֹב in Ecclus. xxxiii 13', *VT* 10 (1960), p. 456 [= no. 54 below].

87. Emerton, 'The Meaning of *šēnā*' in Psalm cxxvii 2', p. 26; 'The Work of David Winton Thomas as a Hebrew Scholar', p. 302.

5

THE VERB *yd'*

The subject on which Thomas wrote the largest number of articles was the verb *yd'*, and this deserves a chapter to itself. Unlike some scholars, who would gather all their ideas together on a particular subject in one place, Thomas wrote many small articles on particular verses or groups of verses over the course of over thirty-five years, in which he claimed to find a considerable number of biblical passages in which *yd'* did not mean 'know' but had certain other meanings paralleling the Arabic verb *wadu'a*. These included not only 'to be at peace, rest, still' (form 1), 'to lay down, deposit' (forms 4 and 10), 'to say farewell to' (forms 2, 3 and 6), 'to leave alone' (form 1) and 'to care for, keep in mind' (seemingly from form 10), but also most notably 'to be humiliated', which Thomas deduced from Arabic *mawdū'* and *mūda'*, cited in J.G. Hava's dictionary as 'submissive' (of a horse), that is 'made quiet, tractable'.¹ A major turning point came when William Johnstone² wrote an important article displaying brilliant detective work in which he demonstrated that the Arabic evidence for the meaning 'to be humiliated', on which Thomas relied, had been misinterpreted. Thomas's error resulted from relying on Hava's dictionary, rather than studying Arabic usage in its original context.

Sometimes, scholars have misunderstood Johnstone's conclusions: it is not the case that he is claiming that all Thomas's alternative translations of *yd'* II are in principle impossible in the light of the Arabic evidence, but that this is simply the case with the meaning 'to be humiliated'. Thus, J. Kaltner wrongly claimed that Johnstone had disproved the existence of a second root *yd'* altogether, and R.N. Whybray and B.K. Waltke both mistakenly claimed that Johnstone had challenged the meaning 'be quiet, still' for *yd'* on the basis of Arabic *wadu'a*.³ Johnstone's case has been

1. J.G. Hava, *Arabic-English Dictionary*, p. 860.

2. W. Johnstone, '*Yd'* II, "Be Humbled, Humiliated?"', *VT* 41 (1991), pp. 49-62.

3. J. Kaltner, *The Use of Arabic in Biblical Hebrew Lexicography* (CBQMS, 28; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1996), p. 106; Whybray, *Proverbs*, pp. 86-87; B.K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs 1-15*, p. 302 n. 15.

generally accepted, including by those who had previously accepted a number of Thomas's proposals, such as J.A. Emerton.⁴ However, Emerton pointed out that the question of the correct interpretation of the Old Testament passages involving *yd'* to which Thomas referred still needed to be addressed. Both Johnstone and Emerton have discussed some of these passages, but hitherto no one has undertaken a thorough examination of all the passages since Johnstone's refutation of part of Thomas's evidence. This is what I propose to do here.

'Be Humiliated'

Cases Where yd', 'to Know', May Be Maintained

Since *yd'*, 'to know', is an extremely common Hebrew verb and it encompasses a wide range of nuances, it is worth exploring whether there are cases where this traditional rendering should be retained. This seems to be the case in the following instances.

Genesis 18.21. In this verse, speaking of Sodom and Gomorrah, the Lord says (as traditionally rendered), 'I must go down and see whether they have done altogether according to the outcry that has come to me; and if not I will know (*'ēdā'āh*)'. Thomas,⁵ following J. Fürst,⁶ however suggested that the meaning is not 'know' but 'punish' and that the verb should be repointed as hiphil (*'ōdī'āh*). However, it is difficult to see any advantage in this suggestion, quite apart from the fact that its philological support has now disappeared.

Judges 16.9. A key passage in Thomas's argument⁷ for a verb *yd'* II was Judg. 16.9, where Delilah has been seeking to find out the secret of Samson's strength. After the first abortive attempt to discover it we are informed that 'his strength was not *nōda*'. As Thomas pointed out, it is a bit odd to be informed that Samson's strength was not known, for it was

4. Compare J.A. Emerton, 'A Further Consideration of D.W. Thomas's Theories about *yāda*', *VT* 41 (1991), pp. 145-63, with his earlier article, 'A Consideration of Some Alleged Meanings of יד' in Hebrew', *JSS* 15 (1970), pp. 145-80.

5. D.W. Thomas, 'Julius Fürst and the Hebrew Root יד', *JTS* 42 (1941), pp. 64-65 [= no. 61 below].

6. J. Fürst, *Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Bernard Tauchnitz, 1857-61 [1857]), I, p. 489.

7. D.W. Thomas, 'The Root יד' in Hebrew', *JTS* 35 (1934), pp. 298-306 (302) [= no. 55 below].

very much known! He therefore suggested that the verb here is *yd' II* and that we should render 'his strength was not brought to submission' (cf. NEB, REB). In the absence of philological support for this meaning, however, we are driven to finding an alternative understanding. Most Bible translations have got round the problem by rendering 'the secret of his strength was not known', that is, his strength was not fathomed, explained, understood. Although there is no other place in the Hebrew Bible where *yd'* means 'to fathom, explain, understand' (but cf. 'to discover' in 1 Sam. 22.6 below), it would appear to do so here. As James Barr already observed before Thomas's view had been disproved, 'the sense "know" is more probable, for the repeated asking of Delilah implies that *knowing* or *understanding* the source or nature of Samson's strength is the real issue at stake; cf. the repeated question בַּמָּה בַּחֵךְ גִּדּוּל (vv. 5, 6, 15; cf. 10, 13)'.⁸

Isaiah 8.9. As it stands in the MT Isa. 8.9 declares, 'Be broken (*rō'û*), you peoples, and be dismayed; give ear, all you far countries; gird yourselves and be dismayed; gird yourselves and be dismayed'. The LXX, however, clearly read *daleth*, not *resh*, that is, *dē'û*, 'know', as its rendering (*gnōte*) shows. Thomas⁹ accepted the reading *dē'û* but suggested that we take this as being from his *yd' II* so as to translate, 'Be humiliated, you peoples'. With the loss of philological support for this meaning, however, we have to resort to some other translation. The most plausible view is that we should accept the LXX's rendering, understanding 'know' in the sense of 'take note', a meaning which this verb sometimes has. Some such view is the one most commonly found in modern Bible translations (cf. NAB, NEB, REB, JB, NJB) and has the advantage that 'take note' provides a good parallel to 'give ear' (*ha'azînû*), something which is not the case with the alternative suggested renderings 'make an uproar' (RV) or 'raise the war cry' (NIV), from the verb *rû'a* (a meaning, in any case, never attested in the qal), 'band together' (NRSV), from the verb *r'h*, or the MT's 'be broken' (RSV), from *r'c*.

Isaiah 9.8 (ET 9). Isaiah 9.7-8 (ET 8-9) is generally rendered in some such way as the following: 'The Lord has sent a word against Jacob and it will fall on Israel; all the people will know it (*wēyādē'û*), Ephraim and the

8. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*, p. 21 n. 1.

9. D.W. Thomas, 'The Root ידע in Hebrew, II', *JTS* 36 (1935), pp. 409-12 (410) [= no. 56 below].

inhabitants of Samaria...’ Thomas,¹⁰ however, followed by G.R. Driver,¹¹ translated as follows: ‘and all the people... shall be humiliated’ (cf. NEB, ‘shall be humbled’). However, this rendering not only now lacks philological support but seems uncalled for. The traditional rendering may be maintained.

Isaiah 53.3. In this verse the suffering servant is said to be *wîdûa’ ḥôlî*, traditionally rendered ‘and acquainted with grief’. Thomas,¹² however, proposed to render, ‘and brought low by sickness’, following G.R. Driver¹³ in seeing it as the passive participle of *yd’* II, a view which gained a certain following.¹⁴ Now that the philological support for this has disappeared, we may either understand the first word as a paul form meaning ‘knowing’ (GKC §50f), or follow 1QIs^a in reading it as an active participle (*wywd’*), as J.A. Emerton has noted.¹⁵

Jeremiah 31.19. In this verse we read, ‘For after I had turned away I repented; and after *hiwwāde’î* I struck my thigh; I was ashamed, and I was dismayed because I bore the disgrace of my youth.’ Understanding the

10. D.W. Thomas, ‘A Note on the Meaning of יד’ in Hosea ix.7 and Isaiah ix.8’, *JTS* 41 (1940), pp. 43-44 (44) [= no. 60 below].

11. G.R. Driver, ‘Hebrew Notes on Prophets and Proverbs’, *JTS* 41 (1940), pp. 162-75 (162).

12. D.W. Thomas, ‘More Notes on the Root יד’ in Hebrew’, *JTS* 38 (1937), pp. 404-405 (404) [= no. 58 below]; ‘The Language of the Old Testament’, in H.W. Robinson (ed.), *Record and Revelation*, pp. 374-402 (394) [= no. 2 below]; ‘A Consideration of Isaiah liii’, pp. 79, 82-83, also published in H. Cazelles (ed.), *De Mari à Qumrân*, pp. 119, 122-23.

13. G.R. Driver, ‘Linguistic and Textual Problems; Isaiah i-xxxix’, *JTS* 38 (1937), pp. 36-50 (49).

14. Cf. NEB, REB; Emerton, ‘A Consideration of Some Alleged Meanings of יד’’, pp. 175-76; R.N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1975), p. 174; J. Day, ‘*Da’at* “Humiliation” in Isaiah liii 11 in the Light of Isaiah liii 3 and Daniel xii 4, and the Oldest Known Interpretation of the Suffering Servant’, *VT* 30 (1980), pp. 97-103 (98); Gelston, ‘Notes on Second Isaiah’, *VT* 21, p. 525; ‘Isaiah 52:13-53:12: An Eclectic Text and a Supplementary Note on the Hebrew Manuscript Kennicott 96’, *JSS* 35 (1990), pp. 187-211 (194, 201).

15. Emerton, ‘A Further Consideration of D.W. Thomas’s Theories about *yāda’*’, p. 160. Similarly A. Gelston, ‘Knowledge, Humiliation or Suffering: A Lexical, Textual and Exegetical Problem in Isaiah 53’, in H.A. McKay and D.J.A. Clines (eds.), *Of Prophets’ Visions and the Wisdom of Sages: Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on his Seventieth Birthday* (JSOTSup, 162; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 126-41 (129-34).

verb as *yd'* II Thomas¹⁶ suggested translating, 'after I was submissive', which was followed by NEB and REB, but as there is no longer philological support for this view it must be rejected. It seems best to keep to the traditional understanding that we have here the niphal of *yd'*, 'to know', and to translate 'after I was brought to know' (W.L. Holladay) or 'after I had come to my senses' (W. McKane).¹⁷

Hosea 9.7. The first part of Hos. 9.7 is commonly translated in some such fashion as follows: 'The days of punishment have come, the days of recompense have come. Let Israel know it (*yēda'e'û*).'¹⁸ Thomas,¹⁸ however, proposed translating 'Israel shall be humiliated', connecting with *yd'* II. He notes that the LXX here has *kakōthēsetai*, 'shall be afflicted', and thought that this may even reflect knowledge of *yd'* II. We now know, of course, that there is no philological support for this meaning. Moreover, as J.A. Emerton¹⁹ earlier pointed out, it is clear from Hatch and Redpath²⁰ that *kakoun* and other forms of the stem *kako-* often represent the verb *r'*, which the LXX must have understood to be present here. Nor is the proposal of Van Hoonacker likely,²¹ followed especially by some German commentators (e.g. Wolff²²), that the original Hebrew had *yāri'û*, presupposing the translation 'Israel cries', to be taken as introducing the quotation in v. 8, since, as A.A. Macintosh²³ notes, this verb is elsewhere used in the rather different sense of 'raise a shout', whether in battle, triumph or joy, etc. Most likely we should retain the MT and render 'Let Israel know it' or 'Israel shall know it', as most Bible translations and commentaries continue to hold. Compare Isa. 9.8 (ET 9) above.

16. Thomas, 'The Root *יד* in Hebrew', *JTS* 35 (1934), p. 304.

17. Cf. W.L. Holladay, *Jeremiah* (2 vols.; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1986–89 [1989]), II, pp. 153, 189; W. McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986–96 [1996]), II, pp. 796, 801.

18. Thomas, 'A Note on the Meaning of *יד* in Hosea ix.7 and Isaiah ix.8', pp. 43–44.

19. Emerton, 'A Consideration of Some Alleged Meanings of *יד* in Hebrew', pp. 152–53.

20. E. Hatch and H.A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* (2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1897), II, pp. 709–11.

21. A. Van Hoonacker, *Les douze petits prophètes* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1908), p. 89.

22. H.W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheton*, I. *Hosea* (BKAT, 14.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd edn, 1965), pp. 192–93, ET *Hosea* (trans. G. Stansell; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), p. 150.

23. A.A. Macintosh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997), p. 351.

Psalm 138.6. Psalm 138.6 has generally been rendered by some such translation as, 'For though the Lord is high, he sees the lowly; but the haughty he knows from afar'. Thomas,²⁴ however, proposed to render, 'For exalted is the Lord, yet he regardeth the lowly, but the proud he reduces to submission (humiliates) from afar'. But the traditional rendering seems perfectly satisfactory: the verbs 'sees' and 'knows', both implying perception, provide reasonable parallels to each other.

Job 21.19. In Job 21.19 the words of Job to Zophar are traditionally rendered, '[You say,] "God stores up their iniquity for their sons". Let him recompense it to himself, that he may know it.' Thomas,²⁵ however, prefers to translate the latter part of this verse as, 'he requites (punishes) him and he is submissive'. This is part of a section in Job's third speech in which he is querying the proper functioning of the act-consequence relationship in the world; here specifically he finds it unsatisfactory for retribution to be meted out merely on the wicked person's children rather than on the wicked person himself. There is, in fact, no need to reject the traditional translation, 'Let him recompense it to himself, that he may know it'. Quite apart from the lack of philological support for Thomas's view, the traditional rendering makes perfectly good sense, the words 'that he may know it' highlighting the need for the one who is wicked himself to experience retribution.

Cases Where Daleth Should Be Emended to Resh

Proverbs 10.9. Taken literally, the MT of Prov. 10.9 reads as follows: 'He who walks in integrity walks securely, but he who perverts his ways will be known'. Those who follow the MT tend to understand 'known' in the sense of 'found out', although such an understanding does not provide quite the contrast with the first half of the verse that one would expect, since both the preceding and following verses (Prov. 10.7-8, 10) contain proverbs in which the wicked are not merely seen for what they are but punished. Thomas²⁶ sought to overcome this problem by seeing his verb *yd'* II here and translating, 'but he who perverts his ways is made submissive'. Such an understanding is followed by the NEB's 'crooked ways *bring* a man *down*', and the REB's 'but one whose ways are wicked

24. D.W. Thomas, 'The Root ידע in Hebrew, II', p. 409.

25. Thomas, 'The Root ידע in Hebrew, II', p. 412.

26. Thomas, 'The Root ידע in Hebrew', pp. 303-304.

is brought low'. However, with the loss of philological support for Thomas's view it seems better to achieve a similar meaning by the simple expedient of emending *daleth* to *resh* (*yêrôa*'), and translating 'but he who perverts his ways will suffer harm'.²⁷ Such an emendation is supported by the parallel passage in Prov. 11.15, where this verb is similarly used in contrast to the fate of one who is secure (*bôtēah*; cf. *betah* in Prov. 10.9). Compare too Prov. 13.20, where *yêrô'a* is again used in connection with the fate of the wicked.

Proverbs 14.33. Taken literally the MT of Prov. 14.33 appears to state, 'Wisdom abides in the mind of a man of understanding, and is known in the midst of fools'. However, we most certainly would not expect wisdom to be found in the midst of fools, which probably explains why the LXX and Peshitta added the word 'not' here, stating that wisdom 'is not known in the midst of fools' (followed by the RSV, NRSV). Thomas's philological proposal²⁸ seemed a way out of this problem by translating, 'In the heart of the prudent resteth wisdom, but in the heart of fools it is made submissive'. However, as there is no longer philological support for this it seems likely that we should achieve the same kind of meaning by emending *daleth* to *resh* and rendering 'Wisdom abides in the mind of a man of understanding, but suffers harm in the midst of fools'.²⁹ Proverbs 13.20 supports this emendation, as it similarly makes reference to suffering harm in connection with fools. On this latter verse see below.

Isaiah 53.11. In this verse the expression *bēda'tô* has caused problems. This seems to mean 'by his knowledge' and most likely it goes with the following words, resulting in the translation 'by his *da'at* my servant will justify many, and he shall bear their iniquities' (omitting *šaddîq* as a dittography). But it is difficult to make any sense of the word 'knowledge' in this context. We would more naturally expect a reference to the Servant's suffering at this point. Hence the attraction of Thomas's suggestion³⁰ to translate *da'at* as 'humiliation', connecting it with his *yd'*

27. Cf. Emerton, 'A Further Consideration of D.W. Thomas's Theories about *yāda*', p. 161.

28. Thomas, 'The Root 𐤃𐤕 in Hebrew', pp. 302-303.

29. Cf. Emerton, 'A Further Consideration of D.W. Thomas's Theories about *yāda*', pp. 161-62.

30. Thomas, 'The Language of the Old Testament', p. 394; 'A Consideration of Isaiah liii', pp. 80, 86 (= 120, 126).

II, a view which gained a fair amount of following.³¹ However, with the loss of philological support for this view an alternative explanation is necessary. A reference to suffering is most naturally achieved if we emend to *b^erā'ātô*, 'by his evil plight/misery/distress'. This was already suggested by R. Kittel in *BHK* and, with the demise of Thomas's understanding, has recently been reargued by J.A. Emerton and A. Gelston.³²

Daniel 12.4. On the face of it this verse states, 'But you Daniel, shut up the words of the book, until the time of the end. Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge (*haddā'at*) shall increase'. But a reference to knowledge increasing seems rather odd here, since from the context we should rather expect something negative, the words 'many shall run to and fro' being a quotation from Amos 8.12, where the context is clearly negative. Thomas³³ proposed to translate 'and *humiliation* will increase', which provides good sense in this apocalyptic context. However, with the loss of philological support for this meaning, an alternative rendering must be found. A comparable meaning may be obtained if we follow the LXX, which appears to have read *rā'ôt*, 'evils', here.³⁴ In view of the parallels between Isaiah 52–53 and Daniel 11–12—the latter arguably representing the earliest known interpretation of the suffering servant³⁵—it is attractive to see the reference to *rā'ôt* as echoing *b^erā'ātô* in Isa. 53.11 (on which see above), just as *maṣḏîqê hārabbîm* in Dan. 12.4 clearly echoes *yaṣḏîq lārabbîm* in Isa. 53.11 and *maškîlîm* in Dan. 12.4 probably reflects *yaškîl* in Isa. 52.13.

31. E.g. NEB, REB; Emerton, 'A Consideration of Some Alleged Meanings of עָדַף in Hebrew', pp. 174–75; Day, 'Da'at', Whybray, *Isaiah* 40–66, p. 180; Gelston, 'Notes on Second Isaiah', pp. 524–27; 'Isaiah 52.13–53.12: An Eclectic Text', pp. 195, 201.

32. Emerton, 'A Further Consideration of D.W. Thomas's Theories about *yāda'*', pp. 160–61; Gelston, 'Knowledge, Humiliation or Suffering', pp. 134–41. It should be noted that H.G.M. Williamson, 'Da'at in Isaiah liii 11', *VT* 28 (1978), pp. 118–22, translated 'he will be satisfied with *his rest*' (*yišba' b^eda'tô*). The basis of this meaning in Arabic *wadu'a* was not overthrown in Johnstone's study, but, as will be seen below, the evidence for the existence of this meaning of the root *yd'* in Biblical Hebrew is insufficient.

33. D.W. Thomas, 'Note on עָדַף in Daniel xii.4', *JTS* 6 (1955), p. 226 [= no. 69 below].

34. Cf. J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), p. 399.

35. On Dan. 11–12 as the earliest known interpretation of the suffering servant, see H.L. Ginsberg, 'The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant', *VT* 3 (1953), pp. 400–404; Day, 'Da'at'. While continuing to see Dan. 11–12 as the first known interpretation of the suffering servant, I retract my support for Thomas's interpretations of Isa. 53.3, 11 expressed in the latter article.

A Case Where the Evidence Supports Some Other Emendation of the Masoretic Text

Judges 8.16. In Judg. 8.16 the MT states of Gideon that ‘he took thorns of the wilderness and briers and with them taught (*wayyōda*) the men of Succoth’ (cf. AV, RV, RSV). Although one could take this to mean that he taught them a lesson (so explicitly in the NIV), the form of expression is odd. Thomas,³⁶ not surprisingly, saw advantage in finding his verb *yd*’ II here and rendered it, ‘and he made quiet (submissive) therewith the men of Succoth’. One imagines that the NEB and REB followed Thomas, but their renderings (‘disciplined’, and ‘inflicted punishment’ respectively) are ambiguous in that regard. However, the correct approach is surely rather to emend *wayyōda* to *wayyādoš*, ‘and he threshed/flailed/trampled’, since this verb actually occurs only a few verses earlier in Judg. 8.7 (*wedaštî*) in connection with this very punishment. Gideon there declares, ‘I will flail (*wedaštî*) your flesh with the thorns of the wilderness and with briers’. In the fulfilment of the threat in Judg. 8.16 it is therefore appropriate to read that Gideon ‘took thorns of the wilderness and briers and with them flailed (*wayyādoš*) the men of Succoth’ (cf. NJB, NRSV). This view is also supported by the LXX, Vulgate and Peshitta. It is clearly preferable to the proposal of W. Johnstone³⁷ to emend *daleth* to *resh* so as to read *wayyārōa*’.

4. Cases Where Thomas’s View Involves Unnecessary Emendation

There are several instances which are particularly weak, since not only do we now know that they have no philological support, but Thomas has to emend the Hebrew text (*resh* to *daleth*) in order to obtain a verb from the root *yd*’.

Jeremiah 2.16. The MT reads, ‘Moreover, the people of Memphis and Tahpanhes will pasture (*yir’ûk*) the crown of your head’, but ‘pasture’ (from *r’h*) is clearly inappropriate here. Some Hebrew manuscripts, supported by the LXX, have *yedā’ûk*, ‘(they) have known’, which also fails to provide a good sense, but it led Thomas³⁸ to suggest that it was his *yd*’ II here, ‘(they) caused to be submissive (humiliated) the crown of your head’. However, since there is no longer any philological support for this

36. Thomas, ‘The Root עד in Hebrew’, pp. 304-305; ‘More Notes on the Root עד in Hebrew’, pp. 404-405.

37. Johnstone, ‘*Yd*’ II, “Be Humbled, Humiliated”?’ , p. 61.

38. Thomas, ‘The Root עד in Hebrew, II’, pp. 410-11.

view, this is unsatisfactory too. The best suggestion is the slight emendation to *y^erō'ûk*, from *r''* (Aramaic form of *ršš* 'to crush'; cf. Jer. 15.12), hence '(they) shall break the crown of your head'.

Jeremiah 15.12. The MT reads, 'Can iron break (*h^ayārōa*) iron from the north and bronze?' This makes perfectly good sense and may be retained. We recall Ps. 2.9, where we read of the king, 'You shall break them (*r^erō'ēm*) with a rod of iron'. Thomas's postulation of *yd'* II here³⁹ is unnecessary as well as unsubstantiated.

Proverbs 13.20. As it stands the MT reads, 'Whoever walks with the wise becomes wise, but the companion of fools suffers harm (*yērōa*)'. Thomas⁴⁰ proposed the verb at the end could be emended to *yiwwādēa*, 'shall be made submissive, subdued' (cf. LXX *gnōsthēsetai*, which presupposes *daleth* rather than *resh*). Since, however, the MT makes perfect sense, it may be retained.

Job 20.26. Job 20.26 is part of Zophar's second speech in which he is describing the fate of the wicked: 'Utter darkness is laid up for their treasures; a fire fanned by no one will devour them; *yēra' šārîd b^e'oh^olô*'. Various proposals for dealing with *yēra'* have been put forward. Thomas⁴¹ emends it to *yēda'* (which is in fact found in some Hebrew manuscripts) and renders 'every survivor in his tent is brought to humiliation/disgrace'. However, since this view now lacks philological support we are left with three main options. Reading *yērōa* 'one might translate, 'His remnant will fare ill in his tent'.⁴² Alternatively, one could take it as *yārōa*, from *r''* = *ršš*, 'to break, smash'.⁴³ But the view with most support is to understand the verb as deriving from *r'h*, 'to graze', hence 'to feed on, consume'.⁴⁴ The root *r'h* provides a good parallel to '*kl*'; the change of gender does not

39. D.W. Thomas, 'Additional Notes on the Root *ד'ר* in Hebrew', *JTS* NS 15 (1964), pp. 54-57 (55) [= no. 73 below].

40. Thomas, 'Additional Notes on the Root *ד'ר* in Hebrew', pp. 55-56.

41. Thomas, 'The Root *ד'ר* in Hebrew, II', p. 412.

42. E.g. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob* (KAT, 16; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1963), pp. 324, 326; Pope, *Job: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, p. 150.

43. Cf. de Wilde, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 222, who lists this as one possibility, in addition to the possibility mentioned in the next footnote.

44. Cf. Dhorme, *Le Livre de Job*, pp. 276-77, ET *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, pp. 304-305; Gordis, *The Book of Job*, pp. 212, 221; Hartley, *The Book of Job*, p. 303; Clines, *Job 1-20*, pp. 472, 479.

matter, since not only can 'ēš be masculine as well as feminine, but it is clearly so here anyway already, for it is accompanied by the masculine verb *nuppāh*.

Ecclesiasticus 7.20. Thomas⁴⁵ noted that the Hebrew text given by R. Smend⁴⁶ reads 'l tr' 'bd 'wbd b'mt, 'do not ill-treat a servant who serves faithfully', which is supported by the Greek. Smend, however, also noted a variant reading with *td'* for *tr'*. Thomas tentatively suggested that behind this might lie his *yd'* II (reading *tōda'*, hiphil jussive), so that the meaning might be 'do not humiliate...' However, with the disappearance of philological support for *yd'* II this must be rejected, and 'do not ill-treat' may be retained.

'At Peace, Rest, Still'

Cases Where the Root yd', 'Know' May be Maintained

Jeremiah 14.18. *Jeremiah* 14.18 begins by referring to the sword and famine coming upon the people. Taken literally, it then continues, 'For both prophet and priest wander around⁴⁷ to a land, and have no knowledge'. However, Thomas proposed⁴⁸ rather to translate the phrase *w'elō' yādā'û* at the end as '...and have no rest' (similarly NEB, REB). He was aware that elsewhere in *Jeremiah* (Jer. 15.14; 16.13; 17.4; 22.28) similar expressions occur clearly meaning 'a land they do not know', with reference to exile, but he notes that in Jer. 14.18 a *waw* is present in the expression, suggesting that it refers here to the priest and prophet. However, many Hebrew manuscripts lack the *waw* and this absence is also implied in the LXX, Vulgate and the Targum in Codex Reuchlinianus. Moreover, significantly, a few verses later in Jer. 15.2 we find reference to those destined for the sword, famine and exile, which adds support to

45. Thomas, 'The Root עד' in Hebrew', p. 305.

46. R. Smend (ed.), *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach: Hebräisch und Deutsch* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1906), p. 7.

47. Hebrew *sāh'rû*. Although the participle of this verb can mean 'trader', more likely the verb here has its fundamental meaning of 'wander around', 'journey', which fits the context better, including the fact that it is followed by 'el, 'to' here. On this meaning of *shr*, see E.A. Speiser, 'The Verb *shr* in Genesis and Early Hebrew Movements', *BASOR* 164 (1961), pp. 23-28, reprinted in E.A. Speiser (eds. J.J. Finkelstein and M. Greenberg), *Oriental and Biblical Studies: Collected Writings of E.A. Speiser* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1967), pp. 96-105.

48. D.W. Thomas, 'A Note on ידע' in *Jeremiah* xiv 18', *JTS* 39 (1938), pp. 273-74 [= no. 59 below].

the view that exile is what is in mind also in Jer. 14.18. Probably, therefore, we should translate 'For both prophet and priest wander around to a land they do not know'. There seems no reason at all why the verb *yd'* should here mean 'rest'.

Psalm 35.15. Psalm 35.15 reads, 'But at my stumbling they gathered in glee, they gathered together against me; *nēkîm w^elō' yāda'î* tore at me without ceasing'. There are some problems over the precise translation of the transliterated words. The word *nēkîm* means 'cripples' (lit. 'smitten ones'), which is somewhat surprising in the context. Some scholars have emended to *nokrîm*, 'strangers', though the previous verses suggest that the opponents were known to the psalmist, while others have proposed *k^enokrîm*, 'like strangers', though this is a more radical emendation. Quite likely we should understand 'smilers', whether by emending to *makkîm*, as Thomas proposes, or in some other way (root *nkh*). However, there is no reason to reject the traditional understanding that the following words *w^elō' yāda'î* mean 'and I knew not' in preference to Thomas's view⁴⁹ that *w^elō' yāda'î* should be rendered 'and I had no rest'. The only question is whether 'and I knew it not' refers to the suddenness of the attack, hence 'unawares' (cf. v. 8) or to the psalmist's not knowing the reason for the attack. Of course, on the less likely hypothesis that one should emend to 'strangers' or 'like strangers', the following words would be rendered 'whom I did not know'.

Proverbs 5.6. Proverbs 5.6 speaks of the loose woman, and is traditionally rendered, 'She does not take heed to the path of life; her ways wander, and she does not know it'. Thomas,⁵⁰ however, prefers to render the second half of this verse as 'her ways are unstable, she is not quiet'. However, there is every reason to continue accepting the usual translation 'she does not know' for *lō' tēda'* here, since other passages within Proverbs 1–9 similarly speak of the wicked's lack of knowledge about their fate (Prov. 4.19; 7.23; 9.18). Literally the verb states 'she does not know' without an object, but there are plenty of parallels to indicate that what is not known is that which is referred to in the previous words (cf. Job 8.9; 9.5; 14.21; 37.5), i.e. her wandering from the path of life.

49. D.W. Thomas, 'Psalm xxxv, 15f.', *JTS* NS 12 (1961), pp. 50-51 [= 72 below].

50. D.W. Thomas, 'A Note on יָדָעָה in Proverbs v 6', *JTS* 37 (1936), pp. 59-60 [= 57 below].

Proverbs 9.13. Proverbs 9.13 is traditionally rendered, 'The foolish woman is loud; she is simple (lit. simplicity) and knows nothing (*ûbal-yāde'â*)'. Thomas, however, made the original suggestion to understand *ûbal-yāde'â* rather as 'is ever restless', connecting with *yd'* II.⁵¹ But against this stands the fact that 'knowledge' (*da'at*) is frequently found in verses that also refer to 'the simple', by way of contrast (e.g. Prov. 1.4, 22; 19.25; 21.11), so Thomas's suggestion seems uncalled for.

Job 9.5. Traditionally this verse from Job's speech has been rendered in some such fashion as follows: 'He moves mountains, though they do not know it; he overturns them in his wrath'. Thomas,⁵² however, proposed that instead of 'though they do not know it' we should render 'so that they are no longer still', connecting it with his *yd'* II in the sense of 'be at rest, peace, still'. However, this seems uncalled for. There are several other places in the Hebrew Bible where the expression 'they do not know it' also occurs with reference to people being taken unawares by a sudden event (Ps. 35.8; Isa. 47.11; Jer. 50.24) and this would appear to be the case likewise with the mountains here.

Job 20.20. This verse, part of Zophar's second speech in which he is expatiating on the fate of the wicked, is generally regarded as opening with the words, 'Because he has known no quietness in his belly...', that is, he was insatiable. Thomas⁵³ proposed, however, that the word *šālēw*, 'quietness'⁵⁴ is an explanatory gloss on the preceding word *yāda'*, which he understands as he meaning 'he was quiet'. This seems unnecessary, as the text makes perfect sense as it stands, and the phrase *lō' yāda' šālôm*, 'he has not known peace', in Isa. 59.8, may be compared.

51. D.W. Thomas, 'A Note on בָּל־יָדַעַת in Proverbs 9¹³', *JTS* NS 4 (1953), pp. 23-24 [= 66 below].

52. Thomas, 'Additional Notes on the Root יָדַע in Hebrew', pp. 54-55.

53. Thomas, 'The Root יָדַע in Hebrew', II', p. 411. This was followed by G.R. Driver, 'Glosses in the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament', *Orientalia et biblica lovaniensia* 1 (1957), pp. 123-61 (137).

54. It is generally supposed that *šālēw*, strictly an adjective meaning 'quiet', is here used substantively, though some emend to the noun *šalwâ*. Thomas, however, claims that the fact it is an adjective supports his view that it is really a gloss, but it is not clear why a verb should be glossed by an adjective rather than another verb.

Job 37.7. There is a fairly wide consensus that this verse in the last Elihu speech should be translated in some such fashion as follows: ‘He seals up every man so that all men may know (*lāda* ‘at) his work’.⁵⁵ Taken in isolation these words may seem strange, but their meaning becomes clear when read in context. The previous verse has been speaking of God’s power over nature in bringing torrential rain and snow, and the following verse alludes to animals staying in their lairs and dens as a consequence. Verse 7 is thus referring to humans similarly being forced to stay indoors during inclement weather, and as a consequence being made aware of the power of God in nature. Thomas does not dispute that the verse refers to humans being kept indoors because of the winter weather but offers a different rendering of the second half of the verse: ‘so that every man (all men) may rest from his (their) work’ (cf. NEB, REB).⁵⁶ This involves taking *lāda* ‘at as literally ‘to rest’, from *yd*‘ II, and emending *ma* ‘*ašēhû* to *mimma* ‘*ašēhû*, but it is difficult to see that this has any advantage over the traditional rendering.

Ecclesiastes 10.20. This verse has generally been rendered, ‘Even in your thought, do not curse the king, nor in your bedchamber curse the rich; for a bird of the air will carry your voice, or some winged creature will tell the matter’. On Thomas’s understanding,⁵⁷ *maddā*‘ or perhaps rather *mōdā*‘ means ‘repose’, thus providing a more direct parallel to ‘bed-chamber’. Others have occasionally attempted to find a similar meaning by emending *maddā*‘ to *maššā*‘, ‘couch’,⁵⁸ or by relating *maddā*‘ to the sexual sense of *yd*‘, ‘know’.⁵⁹ There is, however, no versional support for such an understanding, and the presumed development of meaning in the latter case is particularly unlikely. However, that *maddā*‘ can mean ‘mind’ or ‘thought’ is supported by several occurrences of the word at Qumran (1QS 6.9; 7.3, 5) and in Aramaic (e.g. Targum to Ps. 34.1).

55. Emending, as is widely done, *b^eyad* to *b^e‘ad* and ‘*an^ešê* to ‘*aⁿāšîm*; for the former cf. Job 9.7, where in the reference to God’s sealing up the stars the verb *ḥtm* similarly takes *b^e‘ad*.

56. D.W. Thomas, ‘Note on 𐤠𐤓𐤕𐤕 in Job 37⁷’, *JTS* NS 5 (1954), pp. 56-57 [= no. 67 below].

57. D.W. Thomas, ‘A Note on 𐤠𐤓𐤕𐤕 in Eccles. x.20’, *JTS* 50 (1949), p. 177 [= no. 64 below].

58. F. Perles, *Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments* (Munich: Ackermann, 1895), pp. 71-72.

59. KB, for example, regards this as a possibility.

Although ‘thought’ might not be regarded as providing such a direct parallel to ‘bedchamber’ here, it does have in common with ‘bedchamber’ the fact that it is something hidden away, and thus seems perfectly appropriate here.

Cases Where Thomas’s View Involves Unnecessary Emendation

Isaiah 15.4. In this verse, part of an oracle against Moab, the MT literally reads, ‘Heshbon and Elealeh cry out, their voices are heard as far as Jahaz; the armed men of Moab cry aloud, his soul trembles’. Many scholars follow the LXX and emend ‘armed men’ (*ḥ^aluṣê*) to ‘loins’ (*ḥalṣê*), which appears to provide a better parallel to ‘soul’ (*nepeš*), and it is often also thought that ‘cry aloud’ (*yārî’û*) is corrupt, since elsewhere this verb is used in shouts of joy or triumph, whereas here the context is one of anguish. It is not necessary to go into detail about all these questions here.⁶⁰ The point is that Thomas⁶¹ proposed emending *yārê’â*, ‘trembled’, at the end of the verse to *yādê’â* on the basis of the LXX’s *gnōsetai*, except that whereas the LXX understood the verb as being ‘to know’ Thomas postulated *yd’ II* with the meaning ‘to be quiet, subdued’. However, his translation ‘his soul shall be quiet, subdued unto him’ does not seem appropriate in the context, which is clearly speaking of Moab’s anguish at the disaster coming upon it. ‘Trembles’ (*yārê’â*) is surely to be maintained, and it doubtless forms a word play with the immediately preceding verb, whether we retain *yārî’û* or emend it to something else.

Amos 3.3. Amos 3.3 has often been translated, ‘Do two walk together, unless they have met?’ or ‘Do two walk together, unless they have made an appointment?’⁶² The verb at the end is *nô’ādû*, the niphal of *y’d*, which is capable of both meanings. The former, however, is preferable, since it is manifestly the case that people will not be found walking together unless they have met, whereas they need not have made a formal appointment, because people do sometimes bump into each other by

60. See the various commentaries on Isaiah, e.g. Wildberger, Kaiser, Clements and Blenkinsopp, as well as B.C. Jones, *Howling over Moab: Irony and Rhetoric in Isaiah 15-16* (SBLDS, 157; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), pp. 203, 206.

61. Thomas, ‘Additional Notes on the Root *יָד* in Hebrew’, p. 55.

62. Most modern Bible translations presuppose the latter rendering but the former translation is rightly supported by a number of commentators, e.g. S.M. Paul, *Amos* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), pp. 104, 109. The niphal of *y’d* is clearly attested with the meaning ‘meet’ in Exod. 25.22; 30.6, 36.

chance. Thomas's proposal⁶³ to read *nôd^e 'û* and translate, 'Will two walk together unless they are at peace with one another?', seems uncalled for, since it involves emendation when the text makes good sense as it stands.

Proverbs 10.21. The MT of this verse reads as follows, 'The lips of the righteous nourish (*yir'û*) many, but fools die for lack of sense'. This rendering is followed by most commentators and Bible translations. However, the renderings of LXX (*epistatai*) and Vulgate (*erudiunt*) indicate that they read *yd'w*, a reading also found in a few Hebrew manuscripts, and this has led to the suggestion that we should understand the first half of the verse as 'The lips of the righteous instruct (*yōdi'û*) many' (cf. NEB). Thomas⁶⁴ accepted the reading *yōdi'û* but proposed that we should translate rather 'The lips of the righteous bring tranquillity to many', understanding the verb as the hiphil of *yd'* II. Thomas also offers an alternative suggestion according to which the verb would be the root *r'h*, an Aramaizing form of Hebrew *rsh*, meaning 'to appease, pacify'. However, it is simplest to accept the reading of the MT, which makes perfectly good sense. It is also arguable that a reference to the lips of the righteous offering nourishment provides a more direct contrast with death, the fate of the fools.

A Case Where the Evidence Supports Emendation of the Masoretic Text 1 Samuel 6.3. Part of 1 Sam. 6.3 has often been translated, 'Then you will be healed and you will know why his hand has not been lifted from you'. However, Thomas⁶⁵ proposed that *w^enôda' lākem* should rather be translated 'then rest shall be granted to you', seeing *yd'* II here, and then continuing with a question, as in the LXX and Targum, 'Why should not then his hand turn away from you?' The latter question sentence is preferable since the verb *tasûr* is in the imperfect. However, Thomas's view that *w^enôda' lākem* reflects the postulated verb *yd'* II is to be rejected. The LXX's words *kai exilasthēsetai humin* 'and atonement shall be made for you', are represented in 4QSam^a as *nkpr l[km]*,⁶⁶ that is,

63. D.W. Thomas, 'Note on נִשְׁדָּה in Amos iii.3', *JTS* NS 7 (1956), pp. 69-70 [= no. 70 below].

64. Thomas, 'Additional Notes on the Root ידע in Hebrew', p. 55.

65. D.W. Thomas, 'A Note on נִשְׁדָּה לְכֶם in I Samuel vi.3', *JTS* NS 11 (1960), p. 52 [= no. 71 below].

66. See F.M. Cross, D.W. Parry, R.J. Saley and E. Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4. XII. 1-2 Samuel* (DJD, 17; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), pp. 51-52.

nikkappēr lākem, just as O. Thenius had already conjectured in the nineteenth century.⁶⁷ We must therefore suppose that *w^enôda* ‘ is a corruption of *w^enikkappēr*.

‘Lay Down, Deposit’

A Case Where Thomas’s View Involves Unnecessary Emendation

Jeremiah 24.1. Jeremiah 24.1 is generally translated, ‘The Lord showed me two baskets of figs set (*mû ‘ādîm*) before the temple of the Lord’. In form the verb translated ‘set’ appears to be a hophal participle from *y ‘d*, but Thomas⁶⁸ claimed that the meaning ‘set’ is alien to the fundamental meaning of this verb. He proposed that the Hebrew text originally had *mûdā ‘îm*, a hophal participle of *yd*‘, which he regarded as cognate with the Arabic verb *wadu ‘a*, ‘lay down, deposit’. Against this, however, stands the fact that all the ancient Versions rendered the word as ‘set’, and all the evidence suggests that the word they had in front of them was *mû ‘ādîm*, since there is no manuscript evidence for *mûdā ‘îm* or other readings. This same point tells against alternative emendations suggested in the past, *mo ‘mādîm*, ‘placed’, or *‘ôm ‘dîm*, ‘standing’.⁶⁹ The basic meaning of the verb *y ‘d* is ‘to appoint’, and there seems no reason why the hophal, attested here and in one other place in Ezek. 21.21 (ET 16), should not mean ‘set’.

A Case Where the Root yd ‘, ‘Know’, May be Maintained

Job 38.33. In a later article Thomas⁷⁰ found a further example of *yd*‘ in the sense of ‘lay down, deposit’ in Job 38.33, and in this he was following F. Wutz.⁷¹ Here he translated, ‘Do you lay down the ordinances of the heavens?’, instead of the usual rendering ‘Do you know the ordinances of the heavens?’ It is true that the verb in the parallel line might be held to

67. O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels* (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament; Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 2nd edn, 1864), p. 25, but not J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871), and S.R. Driver, *Studies on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Samuel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890), in this instance.

68. D.W. Thomas, ‘A Note on מִנִּקְּפֵר in Jeremiah 24,1’, *JTS* NS 3 (1952), p. 55 [= no. 65 below].

69. Cf. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia* (HAT, 1.12; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1947), p. 134, who leaves open the possibility of either of these readings.

70. Thomas, ‘Additional Notes on the Root ידע in Hebrew’, p. 56.

71. F. Wutz, *Das Buch Job* (Eichstätter Studien, 3; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1939), p. 138.

cohere with this ('Can you establish [*tāšîm*] their rule on earth?'), but the common meaning of *yd'* as 'know' is surely to be preferred, since there are other examples of hectoring questions involving *yāda'tā*, 'do you know?', in this second divine speech both before and after this verse. Compare Job 38.4, 'Tell me, if you know understanding'; 38.18, 'Declare, if you know all this'; 39.1, 'Do you know when the mountain goats give birth?'; and 39.2, 'Do you know the time when they give birth?'

'Say Farewell To'

A Case Where Emendation of MT Is Necessary

1 Samuel 21.3 (ET 2). In *1 Sam. 21.3 (ET 2)* we read, 'David said to the priest Ahimelech, "The king has charged me with a matter and said to me, 'No one must know anything of the matter about which I send you, and with which I have charged you'. *yōda'tî* the young men to such and such a place"'. Thomas⁷² followed I. Eitan⁷³ in taking *yōda'tî* as the poel of *yd'*, comparing Arabic *wadu'a*, which means 'to say farewell to, take leave of' in the second, third and sixth forms.⁷⁴ He thus translates, 'and I said farewell to the young men (bidding them meet me) at so and so's place' (cf. NEB, REB). However, it should be noted that 4QSam^b reads *yā'adtî*, 'I appointed',⁷⁵ which accounts for the renderings in the LXX and Vulgate and should presumably be followed (cf. NRSV, NAB, which had knowledge of the Qumran reading), and which was already favoured by S.R. Driver⁷⁶ and the RSV in pre-Qumran days.

2. Case Where the Root yd', 'Know' May Be Maintained

1 Samuel 22.6. Speaking of the period when David was an outlaw, the beginning of this verse starts with words that, taken literally, state, 'Now Saul heard that David was known (*nōda*)...', which is usually taken to mean 'Now Saul heard that David was discovered...' Thomas⁷⁷ feels

72. D.W. Thomas, 'A Note on יָדָע in *1 Samuel* xxii.6', *JTS* NS 21 (1970), pp. 401-402 (401) [= no. 75 below].

73. I. Eitan, *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography* (Contributions to Oriental History and Philology, 10; New York: Columbia University Press, 1924), pp. 48-50.

74. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, Supplement, p. 3051.

75. See Cross, Parry, Saley and Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4. XII. 1-2 Samuel*, pp. 231, 235.

76. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. 137. Earlier still Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, p. 121, had recognized that the original text had some form of the verb *y'd* but preferred the poal *yō'adtî*.

77. Thomas, 'A Note on יָדָע in *1 Samuel* xxii.6', pp. 401-402.

there is no real evidence that this verb was capable of meaning ‘discovered’, but S.R. Driver⁷⁸ had already pointed to verses like Exod. 2.14, where this is clearly the correct understanding. Such a meaning makes excellent sense in this context, referring as it does to the period when David was an outlaw in hiding from Saul. There seems no reason to follow Thomas in translating ‘Now Saul heard that David, with the men who were with him, had taken leave (of the king of Moab)’. The NEB and REB failed to follow Thomas here, unlike in 1 Sam. 21.3 (ET 2).

‘Leave Alone’

Cases Where the Root yd‘, ‘Know’, May Be Maintained

Exodus 3.7. Exodus 3.7 has been generally translated in some such fashion as follows: ‘Then the Lord said, “I have observed the misery of my people who are in Egypt; I have heard their cry on account of their taskmasters. Indeed, I know (*yāda‘tî*) their sufferings”.’ Thomas,⁷⁹ however, finds here *yd‘* II in the sense of ‘to leave alone, neglect’ (cf. *wadu‘a*, form 1), and renders the end of the verse ‘for I have left his pains alone’, that is, had nothing to do with them. But apart from the fact that the evidence for the existence of this root in Biblical Hebrew is very sparse (Thomas himself found it only in this verse and in Prov. 14.7, discussed below), it has to be said that this meaning reads somewhat oddly in the context. In this passage the Lord is emphasizing his awareness of Israel’s suffering and determination to deliver them, so a reference to his having neglected their suffering here strikes one as a bit odd, and the traditional rendering ‘know’ may be maintained.

Proverbs 14.7. Literally the MT of this verse reads, ‘Go from the presence of a foolish man, and you have not known (*ûbal yāda‘tā*) lips of knowledge’. Taken absolutely literally the second half of the verse reads a bit oddly. Thomas,⁸⁰ however, claims that proper sense may be obtained if we find here *yd‘* II in the sense of ‘leave alone’, thus reading ‘Betake thyself from the presence of a foolish man, but leave not alone (do not neglect) lips of knowledge’. There is, though, insufficient evidence for the existence of this sense of *yd‘* in Biblical Hebrew, and if Thomas’s understanding is correct we should have expected the verb to be in the imperfect rather than the perfect. Attempts at emendation seem

78. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. 142.

79. Thomas, ‘Additional Notes on the Root ידע in Hebrew’, p. 56.

80. Thomas, ‘Additional Notes on the Root ידע in Hebrew’, p. 56.

unsatisfactory, as, for example, B. Gemser and W. McKane's emendation of *ûbal yāda'tā* to *w^e'al taddah 'et*, resulting in 'But do not repulse knowledgeable lips', which seems too radical.⁸¹ Most modern Bible translations accept the MT and agree about the basic meaning of the text, though they tend to translate rather paraphrastically. The best analysis seems to come from B.K. Waltke,⁸² who renders the second half of the verse as 'for you will not have known lips of knowledge', citing references to linguistic evidence for reading 'for' with the future perfect.

'Care for, Keep in Mind'

Cases Where the Root yd', 'Know', May Be Maintained

Exodus 2.25. Following on from *Exod. 2.24*, where speaking of the Israelite oppression in Egypt we read that 'God heard their groaning, and God remembered his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob', *Exod. 2.25* goes on to say, if we translate literally, that 'God looked upon the Israelites and God knew (*wayyēda' 'lōhīm*)'. It has sometimes struck scholars as a bit odd that there is no object here to the verb 'knew', and some⁸³ have therefore preferred to follow the LXX, which reads *egnōsthē autois*, 'he was made known to them', implying Hebrew *wayyiwwāda' 'lēhem*. But a divine revelation to the Israelites seems a little premature at this point. Thomas,⁸⁴ however, on the basis of one of the meanings of Arabic *wadu'a*, 'to care for, keep in mind', suggests translating 'and God cared for (them)' or 'God kept (them) in mind'. Bearing in mind that *yd'* and *r'h* occur parallel to one another a number of times in the Old Testament, and that 'know' and 'see' both imply perception, it would seem more natural to assume that *yd'* here reflects some form of the verb 'to know' rather than a completely different root cognate with Arabic *wadu'a*. Since *yd'* can mean 'take note', it is perhaps natural to think that what is being said is that 'God took note (of them)'. Such a meaning is not so different from Thomas's understanding in terms of meaning.

81. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos*, p. 66; McKane, *Proverbs*, p. 464.

82. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs Chapters, 1-15*, p. 577.

83. E.g. W.H. Propp, *Exodus 1-18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 2; New York: Doubleday, 1999), pp. 177-78.

84. D.W. Thomas, 'A Note on אֵלֹהִים יָדַע in *Exod. ii.25*', *JTS* 49 (1948), pp. 143-44 [= no. 63 below]. In neither this nor the following example does Thomas state which form of the verb *wadu'a* he is basing this on, but presumably it is form 10, from which is derived, for example, the noun *wadiy'ah*, 'a thing committed to the trust and care of a deposit; a trust; a deposit' (Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, p. 3051).

Psalm 31.8 (ET 7). Translated literally, Ps. 31.8 (ET 7) declares, ‘I will exult and rejoice in your steadfast love, because you have seen my affliction; you know (*yāda‘tā*) my adversities’. Thomas,⁸⁵ however, in keeping with one of the meanings of Arabic *wadu‘a*, again suggests that the verb *yd‘* here rather means ‘care for’, hence translating ‘...thou hast cared for my soul in adversities’. However, rather than importing a new verb here, there seems no reason why we should not simply accept that we have a particular nuance of the well-known verb *yd‘*, ‘to know’, appropriately paralleling another verb of perception, ‘to see’, as elsewhere (cf. Ps. 138.6 above). Perhaps we might render, ‘you take note of my adversities’ (cf. similarly Pss. 1.6; 37.18).

Brief Conclusion

In the light of the above detailed study of all the instances of the root *yd‘* in the Hebrew Bible where Winton Thomas sought some meaning other than ‘know’ on the basis of Arabic *wadu‘a*, it has been concluded that none of his proposals is correct. This pertains not merely to alleged instances of the meaning ‘be humiliated’, where William Johnstone had already shown that the Arabic philological support claimed is invalid, but also in the cases of other proposed meanings which are not disqualified by the Arabic. For the first time since William Johnstone’s significant article I have attempted an examination of every single passage where Winton Thomas found a cognate to *yd‘* II and indicated the most likely translations to be followed.

Summary

For a more detailed summary of the main conclusions of this chapter, please see the overall summary of the book in Chapter 6.

85. Thomas, ‘The Root יד׳ in Hebrew’, p. 301.

6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In Chapter 1 I gave a brief outline of the career of Winton Thomas, which sets the scene for the volume's primary task, to analyse his main lexicographical proposals, and these were discussed in Chapters 2–5. As I have already emphasized, it has unfortunately not been possible to analyse every single philological proposal that Thomas put forward, but I believe that all his most important suggestions have been considered, and I shall now endeavour to summarize the results of my study here.

Chapter 2

In Chapter 2 I considered an adjective, *ra* ^a*nān*, and various expressions which allegedly convey what Thomas called a superlative sense (though 'intensive' would often be more appropriate), in addition to the noun *šalmāwet*, which Thomas argued derives from one of these expressions.

With regard to the adjective *ra* ^a*nān*, there is no doubt that Thomas made a decisive contribution to the understanding of the word. Prior to Thomas's article the dominant view was that this meant 'green', as in the phrase 'under every green tree'. Subsequent to his article, however, there has been a much greater recognition that its real meaning is 'luxuriant, leafy, spreading'. This can claim the support of the ancient Versions and the fact that it was used of human beings in the meaning of 'flourishing' or 'prospering' (e.g. Dan. 4.4 [ET 1] Aramaic). Thomas plausibly connected this with the Arabic root *lgn*, meaning 'to be tangled' (of plants), and in the eleventh form denoting 'to be long and tangled' (of plants) or 'to be long and thick/burly, to the point of being intertwined'.

Thomas discussed a number of expressions, either with the divine name, or with *māwet*, 'death' or *lāmūt*, 'to die' or with Sheol, which he held had what he called a superlative sense. However, intensive rather than superlative often conveys better the sense of Thomas's actual translations, since he tends to render the divine name by such expressions as 'mighty' and 'fine' rather than 'mightiest' and 'finest', and *māwet* by words like 'very', 'extremely' or 'frightful', rather than truly superlative

expressions, though in the case of *māwet* he does occasionally use genuinely superlative terms. The suggestion of his which has most plausibility is that there could be intensive (or as Thomas would call it, superlative) use of the word *māwet* or *lāmût*, just as in English we can speak of something being ‘deadly boring’. Compare Judg. 16.16, where we read of Samson that ‘his soul was vexed to die’ as a result of Delilah’s questions, although he was not literally on the point of death. Another good example is in Eccles 37.2, ‘Is it not a grief verging on death when a bosom friend becomes changed into an enemy?’, though several of Thomas’s other examples seem less convincing.

Derivative from this is the noun *šalmāwet*, as Thomas plausibly argued. Literally, the word means ‘shadow of death’, as confirmed by the ancient Versions, including the LXX, but the contexts show that the word is simply used as a synonym for ‘deep darkness’, and an underworld context is present in only a couple of instances (Job 10.21-22; 38.17). Accordingly, some scholars have proposed that the word should be repointed as *šalmût*, ‘darkness’, and seen as cognate with Akkadian *šalāmu*, Arabic *ṣalima* IV and Ethiopic *šalma*, ‘to be dark’. However, it would be unprecedented for the pronunciation of a word to be changed because of popular etymology from *šalmût* to *šalmāwet*. Moreover, significantly there is no evidence of a verb *šlm*, ‘to be dark’, or any other related words meaning having to do with ‘dark’ in Hebrew, or indeed any other North-West Semitic language, which would be odd if the word was really *šalmût*, which as an abstract noun would betoken ‘having the quality of *šlm*’. In contrast, *šēl*, ‘shadow’ and *māwet*, ‘death’, are both common. Although compound words are admittedly rare in Hebrew, Thomas’s suggestion therefore seems probable.

Less convincing, in my view, were the other examples of alleged superlative (or better intensive) usage of the divine name (whether Yahweh, Elohim or El) and of Sheol. With regard to the alleged intensive use of the divine name, which a number of scholars have found in the Hebrew Bible both before and after Thomas, I pointed out that in every instance one can make a good case that the divine name was simply being used literally and not as an intensive or superlative. Similarly, with regard to the much smaller number of alleged instances involving Sheol, the evidence suggested a literal rather than an intensive or superlative usage. Finally, Thomas was wrong in thinking that *(lā)neṣaḥ* sometimes functioned as a superlative; rather it always meant ‘for ever’, as Thomas himself conceded was the case in other instances of the word.

Chapter 3

In Chapter 3 I considered Thomas's proposals regarding various nouns. Here there are a number of instances in which Thomas appears to have made a positive contribution. First, we may note his study of various place names, beginning with the famous Mt Tabor, for which he compared Arabic *nabara*, 'to raise, elevate', well known from the Arabic noun *minbar*, 'pulpit' (in a mosque). This has since turned out to be the most commonly accepted etymology and all other suggestions seem far-fetched in comparison. Another place name Thomas studied was Mishal (Josh. 19.26; 21.30), for which he proposed the verb *š'l*, 'to ask', as the root and interpreted it as 'place of asking', implying the site of an oracle (cf. too Eshtaol). No better etymology has been suggested.

The noun *zîz* occurs twice in the Hebrew Bible, in Pss. 50.11 and 80.14 (ET 13), both of which refer to 'the *zîz* of the field' as the name of some kind of creature(s). Thomas's 1967 article found that the only possible Semitic cognates with an animalic meaning are Akkadian *zizānu*, a kind of locust' and the Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic *zîz*, *zîzā*, 'mite, worm', either meaning 'that which moves' (from *zûz*) or onomatopoeic in origin. Something like 'locusts' or 'worms', both small but destructive creatures, would fit the references in both psalms. Since Thomas wrote this short article his view has gained wide acceptance, including support in R. Whitekettle's fairly recent survey of the subject; *HALAT* (ET *HALOT*), the new Gesenius dictionary and Seybold also cite in support Arabic *zîz*, 'tree cricket', which Thomas did not mention.

Another instance where Thomas made a contribution both original and positive was with respect to the root *hly*, from which he identified the noun *maḥ^alāṣôt* in Zech. 3.4 and Isa. 3.22 as meaning 'clean garments', rather than 'change of garment' or 'rich apparel', on the basis of Arabic *ḥalaṣa*, 'to become clean, pure, genuine, white', and Akkadian *ḥalāṣu*, allegedly 'to purify [oil]', but actually 'to press, squeeze out [of oil, etc.]' and 'to clean by combing'. This has gained a significant following among subsequent scholars and appears to be correct. However, *ḥ^alîṣâ* in Judg. 14.19 probably does not mean the same thing, contrary to what Thomas thought, but rather refers to 'spoil'.

It is generally recognized that Num. 23.10 should be rendered, 'Who can count the dust of Jacob, or number the *rōba* of Israel?' The problem pertains to the meaning of *rōba*. Though traditionally rendered 'fourth part', Thomas was one of the first to understand it to mean 'dust cloud', thus providing a good parallel to *āpār* in the parallel line. In further support Thomas noted the Arabic noun *rabg*, 'very fine dust'. This

rendering has since become common, though Thomas's Arabic evidence has frequently been overlooked.

Although Thomas was one of those who wrongly saw the phrase *lah^aqat hann^ebî'im* in 1 Sam. 19.20 as meaning 'the senior ones among the prophets', he was probably right in finding a word *l^ehîqâ*, 'old age', in Prov. 30.17. This is supported by the rendering of the MT *lîqq^ahat* in three of the ancient Versions, the LXX, Targum and Peshitta by 'old age', which probably attests the existence of a Hebrew cognate of Ethiopic *lâhqa*, 'to be old, senior', and Arabic *lahaqa*, 'to be white' (e.g. of hair), and this has had considerable support amongst commentators and Bible translators.

In 1937 Thomas pointed out that E. Ben-Yehuda in his *Thesaurus* (1911) was the first to argue that *zimrât* in Exod. 15.2 (cf. Ps. 118.14; Isa. 12.2) means not 'song' but 'protection'. Prior to Thomas's article I. Zolli (1935) and T.H. Gaster (1936) had proposed this, but neither knew that Ben-Yehuda had preceded them. He was overlooked because his work was in Modern Hebrew. Ben-Yehuda, like many since, appealed to Arabic *damara*, 'to protect', but since Thomas wrote we also have a Ugaritic text, *KTU* 1.108.24, where *dmrk* is mentioned next to 'zk, 'your strength' (comparable to Exod. 15.2; Isa. 12.2; Ps. 118.24), and must mean 'your protection'; there is no question of translating 'your song' here. There is also much other evidence, and this view now has wide, even if not universal, assent. This root is probably present also in the noun *zimrâ* in Gen. 43.11 (strength = produce), and *z^emirôt* in 2 Sam. 23.1, 'Mighty One/Protector/Guardian' (plural of excellence) and in Job 35.10, 'protection' or 'strength'.

In the case of one word Thomas appears to have been right about the underlying root but was probably wrong about its precise meaning. This is the noun *b^elîya'al* (Belial). Having rejected various unlikely suggestions, he suggested that the word is derived from the verb *bl'*, 'to swallow', hence meaning 'swallower' with reference to the underworld. It is likely that he was on the right lines with this root, but J.A. Emerton has more recently suggested that it derives from *bl'* in its sense of 'to destroy' and this does greater justice to the evidence about its meaning.

Finally, it should be noted that I studied two nouns where Thomas's articles made a positive lexicographical impact, but the approach was not strictly philological. The first was on the expression 'ôpân, 'wheel', in Prov. 20.26, where Thomas argued convincingly that the reference was to a threshing wheel of a cart drawn by horses, as in Isa. 28.27-28, and that the image was used of the judicial role of the king as in Prov. 20.8, which speaks of the king winnowing the wicked. Thomas was not the first to

suggest this but his contribution had the effect of increasing support for this view. The second was on *keleb*, ‘dog’, a word which he argues might be onomatopoeic (cf. German *kläffen*, ‘to bark’). Among other things Thomas produced evidence from extra-biblical sources that the term could be a designation for a humble servant, as in certain personal names containing the name of a deity, thus presenting a more positive image of the dog in the biblical world than had often been supposed.

However, with regard to certain other nouns Thomas appears to have been completely wrong. In two instances the correct solution is probably to be found rather in an extension of the normal meaning of the word in question. Thus, the noun *ḥaṭṭā’t*, which usually means ‘sin’, appears in Prov. 10.16 in contrast to ‘life’, so the normal meaning is inappropriate. There is no textual support for emendation and Thomas suggested the meaning ‘penury’, appealing to Ethiopic *ḥaṭī’at* with this meaning. However, not only is the Ethiopic word extremely rare, but we have evidence from Zech. 14.19 that *ḥaṭṭā’t* could also mean ‘punishment’ (for sin), so it seems better to understand it thus rather than create a *hapax legomenon* in Prov. 10.16. Likewise the noun *šālāl* commonly means ‘booty’ (taken in war), but in Prov. 31.11 this meaning is unsatisfactory, referring to what the husband will not lack in the ideal wife. Here, most see an extension of the normal meaning by translating ‘gain’, which is appropriate in the context. This seems preferable to Thomas’s creation of a *hapax legomenon*, ‘wool’, on the basis of Arabic *ṭalla*, since the usual Hebrew word for ‘wool’ (*šemer*) appears soon afterwards in v. 13, and vv. 10-11 appear to be speaking of the value of the woman in general terms, before getting down to particulars in vv. 13-28.

In one instance that we have examined the correct solution is likely to be found in emending the Hebrew text rather than accepting Thomas’s comparative philological solution. This is the case with his postulation of a Hebrew *hapax legomenon*, *sōd*, ‘protection’, in Job 29.4 on the basis of Arabic *sadda*, ‘to close, stop up’. That the text means something like that is natural from the context, and is supported by the LXX, Symmachus and Peshitta, but this is better achieved by emending *b^esōd* to *b^esōk* (infinitive construct of *sūk*, ‘to hedge or fence in’, or of *sākak*, ‘to cover, protect’), than creating an otherwise unattested Hebrew word. In the square Hebrew script final kaph could quite easily have been corrupted to a dalet.

There were several instances of nouns that I considered in which Thomas had to emend the biblical text in order to make a philological connection. The first was in Isa. 49.9, where he proposed to emend MT *d^erākîm*, ‘tracks’, to *d^ekākîm*, ‘sand-flats’, allegedly cognate with Arabic *dak*, ‘even, level sand’. However, the only reason he felt it desirable to

create this *hapax legomenon* was because he took the parallel Hebrew word *šepayîm* to mean ‘sand dunes’, following G.R. Driver. But *šepî* more likely means ‘track, way’, as witness its parallelism with *derek* in Jer. 3.2 and 4.11. It is therefore uncalled for to emend *d^erākîm* in Isa. 49.9. The second instance where Thomas’s proposal involved emendation was in Job 40.29 (ET 41.5). This is generally translated, ‘Will you play with him [Leviathan] as with a bird or tie him up for your maidens?’ However, at the end Thomas proposed reading *kannō‘ar* (-â, -ôṭ) instead of *l^ena‘arôtêkâ*, and translating ‘like a young sparrow (young sparrows)’, by comparing Arabic *nuġar*, feminine *nuġarah*, ‘a species of sparrows, young sparrows’. He does this because the LXX reads ‘as a sparrow’ (*hōsper strouthion*). However, because *hōsper strouthion* translates *kay^e ‘ēnîm*, ‘like sparrows’, in Lam. 4.3, and *k^ena‘anîm* appears at the end of the following verse, the LXX’s reading is more likely an intrusion from the following verse. Finally, in one verse, Isa. 40.15, in the phrase *k^emar midd^elî* commonly rendered ‘like a drop from a bucket’, Thomas emended both *k^emar* to *k^emur* and *midd^elî* to *madlê* or *midlê* on the basis of alleged Arabic and Ethiopic cognates respectively, thus attaining the reading ‘like the dust of the balances’. However, the fact that Thomas has to postulate two emendations of the MT when the text makes perfectly good sense as it stands tends to go against his proposal.

Two other proposals will now be discussed. Thus, first, Thomas found two places where he thought *da‘at* meant not ‘knowledge’ but ‘law-suit’, cognate with Arabic *da‘way* (‘law-suit’) namely Prov. 22.12 and 29.7, and one place, Prov. 24.14, where he found what he took to be the underlying verb *d’h*, ‘to seek’, cognate with Arabic *da‘ā*, ‘sought, desired, asked, demanded’. In all three cases we found that the noun was better interpreted as *da‘at*, ‘knowledge’, and the verb as *yd‘*, ‘to know’, except that the latter has its specialized meaning ‘to learn’ (cf. Prov. 1.2, etc.). Secondly, Thomas proposed that the noun ‘*nî* in Ps. 107.10 and Job 36.8 and the piel of the verb ‘*nh* in Ps. 105.18 be translated respectively not ‘affliction’ and ‘they afflicted’ but rather by ‘captivity’ and ‘they imprisoned’ in the light of Arabic ‘*aniya*, ‘to take captive’. However, this seems unnecessary, since elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew the noun ‘affliction’ and verb ‘afflict’ in question cover a variety of different contexts, including situations of captivity such as slavery and exile.

Returning to place names, we should note Thomas’s studies of the place names En-dor, Hammoth-dor and Naphath-dor. Here Thomas suggested that ‘dor’ relates to a ritual dance that took place there. The same element appears also in the place simply called Dor, a point not mentioned by Thomas, and although certainty is not possible, it seems

more natural to connect this with the noun *dôr*, ‘dwelling’, attested in Isa. 38.12 and the verb *dûr*, ‘to dwell’ in Ps. 84.11 (ET 10).

Chapter 4

Chapter 4 considered various verbal roots. One verb with regard to which Thomas made a positive contribution is the verb *’hb*, ‘to love’. He successfully revived A. Schultens’s suggestion in 1748 that *’hb* originates from a bilateral root *hb*, cognate with Arabic *habba*, ‘to breathe heavily’. Previously this view had been neglected, but after Thomas’s study it became the standard view.

Another enduring contribution that Thomas made to the study of Hebrew verbs concerned *ʕn* (Mic. 6.8; cf. Prov. 11.2) and his view has been widely followed subsequently. He appears to have been the first to note that its basic meaning is ‘to act prudently, carefully, wisely’ rather than ‘to be humble’. As Thomas noted, this understanding is strongly supported by Ecclesiasticus, where in 42.8 *ʕānûa* ‘is parallel with *zāhîr*, ‘careful’, and in 16.25 *bēhaʕnēa* ‘is parallel with ‘in due measure’, and again in 34.22 (LXX 31.22) the LXX translates *haʕnēa* ‘*ʕkl*’ by ‘with exact knowledge’. In addition there is evidence from Qumran.

Another verb on which Thomas made a significant contribution is *ʕnh*. In the Hebrew Bible this verb commonly means ‘to change’, but Thomas argued that there are occasions where it rather means ‘to be high, exalted’ and is cognate with the Arabic verb *saniya* with this meaning, as well as the Syriac noun *ʕanā*, ‘sublimity, majesty, great honour’, and which is in turn closely related to Arabic *sanā*, ‘to shine, shine brightly, gleam’. There is circumstantial evidence that this latter root existed in Biblical Hebrew, Thomas drawing attention to the LXX’s mistranslation of *ʕnwt* in Ecclus 43.13 (LXX 30.25) as ‘bright’, and J.A. Emerton noting that this root appears to lie behind the Hebrew noun *ʕānî*, ‘scarlet’. As for the root ‘to be high, exalted’, the most convincing passages that Thomas proposed appear to be Prov. 24.21, where *ʕônîm* stands parallel to ‘the Lord and the king’, and Prov. 5.9, where *ʕnôtêkâ* (possibly to be emended to *ʕnârêkâ*) is parallel to *hōdekâ*, ‘your splendour’. J.A. Emerton subsequently developed Thomas’s view further, and found this root to be also present in Ps. 127.2 and Judg. 6.25-28.

In one instance, with regard to the verb *ml*’ in Jer. 4.5, I concluded that Thomas was partly right and partly wrong. He was right in thinking that the verb means ‘assemble, amass, mass together’ (cf. the parallel with the verb *’sp* [niphil], ‘gather together’), but he was wrong in holding that it

was a technical term for the mobilizing of forces, since the context is that of fleeing for safety, not preparing for battle.

There are a number of other proposed new verbs where Thomas simply seems to be wrong. I shall go through these cases alphabetically. Nevertheless, in the case of the first, Thomas's claim has actually gained quite a lot of support, namely that *hdl* in 1 Sam. 2.5 means 'to be plump'; cf. Arabic *hadula*, 'to become plump, fleshy in the limbs'. Thomas also claims some support for this notion from Symmachus, the Vulgate and Peshitta in this verse, but none of these actually translates by 'be plump'. Other scholars have also found this meaning elsewhere, for example, in Judg. 5.7 and Deut. 15.11. However, T.J. Lewis has pointed out that *hdl* can mean not only 'to cease', but also 'to cease (from doing something)', something being the previously mentioned verb. This makes excellent sense in 1 Sam. 2.5. There is also no good reason to reject 'cease' in the examples suggested by others.

With regard to the hiphil of *hlq* (Prov. 29.5), it was concluded that there is no good reason to translate this as 'lay a snare', as Thomas argued on the basis of Arabic *halaqa*. Rather than creating a *hapax legomenon*, we should take the hiphil of *hlq* in its normal sense of 'flatter' (Prov. 28.23; cf. Prov. 2.16; 7.5).

There are three places in the Psalms, Pss. 34.11 (ET 10), 35.17, and 58.7 (ET 6), where Thomas found a Hebrew root *kpr* cognate with Arabic *kafara*, 'to become an unbeliever'. In each case the Masoretic Hebrew text reads *k'pîrîm*, 'young lions'. In the latter two texts reference is made to the psalmists' enemies, but since these are elsewhere in the Psalter sometimes referred to metaphorically as lions, there is no reason to doubt 'young lions' here, especially as Ps. 58.7 (ET 6) refers to teeth. In Ps. 34.11 (ET 1) literal lions are intended (cf. Job 4.7-11).

In 1 Kgs 21.20, 25 and 2 Kgs 17.17 we read of those who 'sold themselves (hithpaël of *mkr*) to do evil'. Finding this an odd phrase, Thomas sought here a cognate in Arabic *makara*, 'to practise deceit, guile'. However, this is to be rejected, since in 1 Kgs 21.20, 25 there is no evidence of deceit being involved, in Deut. 28.68 the hithpaël of *mkr* undoubtedly means 'to sell oneself' in a literal sense, and it is fairly easy to see how 'to sell oneself to do evil' could come to mean 'to surrender oneself to do evil'.

In several places Thomas claimed that *nîm* means not 'to comfort' but 'to breathe out' (cf. Arabic *naḥama*). But two of these (Job 16.2; 21.34) are in Job with respect to his three friends, who are specifically intended to be comforters (cf. Job 2.11—the same verb is used), thus making Thomas's view unlikely, and Zech. 10.2 employs the same phrase as Job

21.34, which has already been disqualified. Since it so lacks support, there is therefore little reason to find it in Gen. 27.42.

In the account of Samson and Delilah in Judg. 16.20 Thomas argued that the niph'al of *n 'r* means 'be angry', cognate with Arabic *nağara*, as opposed to the common translation 'shake free'. Against this, however, it was noted that the verb should represent something that has repeatedly happened (cf. *pa 'am b^epa 'am* in this verse), which does not fit 'be angry' here. The traditional rendering 'shake free' should be retained, and this is comparable to Isa. 52.1, where *n 'r* is similarly used in connection with Israel's captivity. Thomas's proposal was made on the assumption that Samson had not been bound on this occasion, but Judg. 16.19 provides possible evidence to the contrary.

Regarding *šhr* Thomas proposed that *libbî s^eharhar* in Ps. 38.11 (ET 10) means 'My mind is betwitched' rather than the traditional 'My heart palpitates/throbs', associating it with Arabic *sağāru* and Arabic *sağara*, 'to enchant' and with *sōḥ^arayik* in Isa. 47.15, understood as 'your sorcerers'. However, the latter more naturally means 'those who traffic with you', in keeping with the normal meaning (and cf. Isa. 45.14), and the Akkadian and Arabic verb is cognate rather with the verb *šahrāh* (probably to be emended to *šah^arāh*) in v. 11, 'charm (it) away'. In view of all this, there is no real reason to reject the traditional rendering of *s^eharhar* in Ps. 38.11 (ET 10).

On the basis of Arabic *aqada*, 'to tie', Thomas postulated reading *m^e 'aq^edīm*, 'diviners', in Isa. 2.6 instead of MT's *miqqedem*, 'from the east', which is impossible as it stands. However, this is only a secondary meaning of the Arabic, and scholars generally prefer to read *miqsām* or *qesem*, 'divination', or *qōs^emīm*, 'diviners', either instead of *miqqedem* or in addition to it, rather than creating a new Hebrew word. It is graphically simplest to suppose that *miqsām* should be read instead of *miqqedem*.

Thomas proposed that on a number of occasions the verb *'šh* does not mean 'to do' or 'to make' but rather 'to cover' or 'to turn', cognate with Arabic *ğasā* and *āśā* respectively. However, none seems particularly compelling.

Thomas rightly rejected T.H. Gaster's attempt to give the verb *šlh* in Jer. 5.28 the meaning 'deceive' on the basis of Ethiopic *šalhawa*, but he himself tentatively suggested rendering *w^ehišlāh mirmā* in Dan. 8.25 as 'he shall practise deceit'. But it seems more acceptable to follow the traditional rendering 'he shall cause treachery to prosper' than to create a totally new meaning for the Hebrew verb simply on the basis of Ethiopic.

Finally, Thomas proposed that the piel of *šdd* in Prov. 19.26 means 'to expel', cognate with Ethiopic *sadada* with this meaning, thus providing

an exact parallel with *yabrîah*, ‘chase away’, in the adjacent line. However, in the only other occurrence of the piel of this verb in Prov. 24.15 the meaning is ‘to do violence to’, which is also clearly the basic meaning of the root *šdd* generally, and there is no reason to reject this sense in Prov. 19.26. Further, Thomas failed to note that Ethiopic *sadada* is itself cognate with Hebrew *šdd*. Nor is there sufficient reason to support Thomas’s view that there is word play on this verb in the place name Ashdod in Zeph. 2.4.

Chapter 5

In Chapter 5 I undertook the first full examination, since William Johnstone’s refutation of some of Thomas’s claims, of all the passages in which Thomas had suggested new meanings of occurrences of the Biblical Hebrew verb *yd’* in the light of the Arabic verb *wadu* ‘a. Specifically Johnstone’s milestone article had already demonstrated that the basis for a meaning ‘to be humiliated, humbled’ was lacking in the Arabic evidence, but that the Arabic did not rule out in principle the possibility of other proposed meanings for the Hebrew verb. My own detailed analysis showed that none of Thomas’s other proposed meanings is in fact valid in the light of the most natural interpretations of the passages. I also indicated the most likely way in which all the passages should be understood.

With regard to the alleged meaning ‘to be humiliated, humbled’, it was found that the meaning ‘know’ may be retained in Gen. 18.21; Judg. 16.9; Isa. 8.9; 9.8 [ET 9]; 53.3; Jer. 31.19; Hos. 9.7; Ps. 138.6; and Job 21.19. In certain other places it is simplest to assume that the dalet should be emended to resh (Prov. 10.9; 14.33; Isa. 53.11; Dan. 12.4), thereby resulting in a meaning similar to that attained by Thomas’s proposal, while in Judg. 8.16 the correct approach is surely to emend *wayyōda* ‘to wayyādoš, ‘and he flailed’, in keeping with *wedaštî* (‘and I will flail’) a few verses earlier in Judg. 8.7. In other places where Thomas achieved a root *yd’* only by emending the text in the first place, we should revert to the MT readings (Jer. 2.16; 15.12; Prov. 13.20; Job 20.26; Ecclus 7.20).

In certain passages Thomas proposed that *yd’* means ‘to be at peace, rest, still’, but none of the instances proved compelling. In many the meaning ‘know’ may be retained (Jer. 14.18; Ps. 35.15; Prov. 5.6; 9.13; Job 9.5; 20.20; 37.7), the meaning ‘knowledge’ developing into ‘thought’ in the case of the noun *maddā* ‘ in Ecclus 10.20 (cf. 1QS 6.9; 7.3, 5; Targum to Ps. 34.1). In three other places Thomas achieved a reference to *yd’* by emending the text (Isa. 15.4; Amos 3.3; Prov. 10.21), while in

1 Sam. 6.3 the Qumran Samuel text indicates that *w^enôda* ‘is a corruption of *w^enikkappēr*.

In passages where Thomas found the meaning ‘to lay down, deposit’, the rendering ‘know’ may be maintained in one (Job 38.33), while in the other the MT *mû’ādîm*, ‘set’, should be retained and not emended (Jer. 24.1). Again, in passages where Thomas found the meaning ‘say farewell to’, the meaning ‘know’ should be retained in 1 Sam. 22.6, while in 1 Sam. 21.3 (ET 2) the Qumran reading *yā’adtî*, ‘I appointed’, should be followed (in place of MT *yôda’î*). In places where Thomas found the meaning ‘leave alone’, the translation ‘know’ may again be retained (Exod. 3.7; Prov. 14.7). The same is finally true of the places where Thomas suggests the meaning ‘care for, keep in mind’ (Exod. 2.25; Ps. 31.8 [ET 7]).

Overall Conclusions

In the light of the thorough analysis undertaken in this volume it is clear that Winton Thomas has made a positive and enduring contribution to Hebrew lexicography, and it is important that modern scholars do not overlook this. Drawing together disparate points already noted above, Thomas’s positive contribution may be summarized as follows. He rightly pointed out that the adjective *ra’ānān* does not mean ‘green’ but rather ‘luxuriant, leafy, spreading’, and he correctly recognized that the noun *māwet* and verb *lāmût* could on occasion have an intensive sense, as in the noun *šalmāwet*. Again, Thomas successfully identified the most likely etymologies of the place names Tabor and Mishal, as well as the meanings of the noun *zîz*, as a small but destructive creature, possibly ‘locust’ or ‘worm’, *maḥ^alāšôt* as ‘clean clothes’, and *rôba* ‘as ‘dust’. He was one of the first to note that *zimrāt* means ‘protection’ rather than ‘song’ and he pointed out that E. Ben-Yehuda was the actual overlooked first person to suggest this. He also correctly identified that behind the noun *b^elîya’al* stood the verbal root *bl’*, though this was more likely in the sense of ‘to destroy’, as J.A. Emerton has subsequently argued, rather than ‘to swallow’ with reference to Sheol as Thomas supposed. In addition, Thomas wrote useful studies, though less philological in character, of the noun *keleb*, ‘dog’, and of *’ôpān*, ‘wheel’, in Prov. 20.26. He showed that there was evidence for a more positive understanding of the role of the dog in the biblical world than had often been supposed, and that the wheel referred to a threshing wheel of a cart drawn by horses, emphasizing the judicial role of the king. Coming to verbs, Thomas made a good case for the existence of a verb *šnh*, ‘to be high, exalted’, a verb *šn* ‘meaning ‘to

act prudently, carefully, wisely' rather than 'to be humble', and *ml*' (piel), 'to assemble, amass, mass together'. He also showed that '*hb*', 'to love', originated from a biliteral root *hb*, cognate with Arabic *habba*, 'to breathe heavily'.

On the other hand, it has also become abundantly clear that Thomas was too prone to appeal to cognate Semitic languages in the search for new meanings of Biblical Hebrew words when this was unnecessary, and in particular he was excessively dependent on vocabulary-rich Arabic. In certain instances other alternative interpretations should have been explored more thoroughly, such as acknowledging a wider range of nuances of an already well-attested Hebrew word or occasionally embracing a text-critical solution if the evidence for this was strong. On the other hand, there were a few instances where Thomas could only identify an allegedly new Hebrew word by implausibly emending the Masoretic text in the first place. Again, in the case of *yd'* allegedly meaning 'to be humiliated', as William Johnstone showed, Thomas should have paid attention to the actual Arabic usage of *wadu'a* rather than merely relying on Arabic dictionaries. Overall, in spite of the care with which Thomas approached his work, it must be concluded that he was more often wrong than right. However, it must be granted that even when Thomas was wrong, his drawing attention to apparent problems and presentation of the evidence can be helpful and his work can often act as a spur to us to find a more compelling explanation.

Finally, overall this study does confirm that there is still a role for the comparative Semitic philological method to play with respect to Biblical Hebrew, even if we have to be still more cautious than Winton Thomas, let alone Sir Godfrey Driver or Mitchell Dahood, when applying it. The strictures of James Barr in this regard are well taken.

THE LEXICOGRAPHICAL WRITINGS OF D. WINTON THOMAS

THE LEXICOGRAPHICAL WRITINGS OF D. WINTON THOMAS

1. *The Recovery of the Ancient Hebrew Language: An Inaugural Lecture* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1939). [= pp. 119-56 below]
2. 'The Language of the Old Testament', in H.W. Robinson (ed.), *Record and Revelation: Essays on the Old Testament by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), pp. 374-402. [= pp. 157-85 below]
3. 'Some Observations on the Hebrew Word רָעָן', in B. Hartmann *et al.* (eds.), *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner* (VTSup, 16; Leiden: Brill, 1967), pp. 387-97. [= pp. 186-96 below]
4. 'A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew', *VT* 3 (1953), pp. 209-24. [= pp. 197-212 below]
5. 'Some Further Remarks on Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew', *VT* 18 (1968), pp. 120-24. [= pp. 213-17 below]
6. 'The Use of נָצַח as a Superlative in Hebrew', *JSS* 1 (1956), pp. 106-109. [= pp. 218-21 below]
7. 'צָלַמְתָּ in the Old Testament', *JSS* 7 (1962), pp. 191-200. [= pp. 222-31 below]
8. 'בָּלַעַל in the Old Testament', in J.N. Birdsall and R.W. Thomson (eds.), *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), pp. 11-19. [= pp. 232-40 below]
9. 'Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs', *JTS* 38 (1937), pp. 400-403. [= pp. 241-44 below]
10. 'A Note on דָּעַת in Proverbs xxii. 12', *JTS* NS 14 (1963), pp. 93-94. [= pp. 245-46 below]
11. 'A Note on דִּרְבֵּיִם in Isaiah xlix. 9b', *JTS* NS 19 (1968), pp. 203-204. [= pp. 247-48 below]
12. 'The Meaning of נָיִן in Psalm lxxx. 14', *ExpTim* 86 (1965), p. 385. [= p. 249 below]
13. 'A Note on Exodus xv. 2', *ExpTim* 48 (1937), p. 478. [= p. 250 below]
14. 'The Meaning of הִתְאַחַז in Proverbs x. 16', *JTS* NS 15 (1964), pp. 295-96. [= p. 251 below]
15. 'A Note on מִדַּל צוֹת in Zechariah iii 4', *JTS* 33 (1932), pp. 279-80. [= pp. 252-53 below]
16. 'A Note on הִלְצוֹתָם in Judges xiv 19', *JTS* 34 (1933), p. 165. [= p. 254 below]
17. 'A Note on לִיקְחָהּ in Proverbs xxx. 17', *JTS* 42 (1941), pp. 154-55. [= p. 255 below]

18. "'A Drop of a Bucket'? Some Observations on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah 40 15', in M. Black and G. Fohrer (eds.), *In Memoriam Paul Kahle* (BZAW, 103; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1968), pp. 214-21. [= pp. 256-63 below]
19. 'Job xl 29b: Text and Translation', *VT* 14 (1964), pp. 114-16. [= pp. 264-66 below]
20. 'The Interpretation of בָּסוֹד in Job 29 4', *JBL* 65 (1946), pp. 63-66. [= pp. 267-70 below]
21. 'Hebrew עָנִי "Captivity"', *JTS* NS 16 (1965), pp. 444-45. [= pp. 271-72 below]
22. 'The Word רַבֵּעַ in Numbers xxiii. 10', *ExpTim* 46 (1935), p. 285. [= p. 273 below]
23. 'Textual and Philological Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs', in M. Noth and D.W. Thomas (eds.), *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley* (VTSup, 3; Leiden: Brill, 1955), pp. 280-92. [= pp. 274-86 below]
24. 'Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs', *VT* 15 (1965), pp. 271-79. [= pp. 287-95 below]
25. 'Mount Tabor: The Meaning of the Name', *VT* 1 (1951), pp. 229-30. [= pp. 296-97 below]
26. 'The Meaning of the Name Mishal', *PEFQS* 68 (1936), pp. 39-40. [= pp. 298-99 below]
27. 'En-dor: A Sacred Spring?', *PEFQS* 65 (1933), pp. 205-206. [= pp. 300-301 below]
28. 'The Meaning of the Name Hammoth-dor', *PEFQS* 66 (1934), pp. 147-48. [= pp. 302-303 below]
29. 'Naphath-dor: A Hill Sanctuary?', *PEFQS* 67 (1935), pp. 89-90. [= pp. 304-305 below]
30. 'Proverbs xx 26', *JJS* 15 (1964), pp. 155-56. [= pp. 306-307 below]
31. 'Kelebh "Dog": Its Origin and Some Usages of It in the Old Testament', *VT* 10 (1960), pp. 410-27. [= pp. 308-25 below]
32. 'The Root אָהַב "Love" in Hebrew', *ZAW* 57 (NF 16, 1939), pp. 57-64. [= pp. 326-33 below]
33. 'Some Observations on the Hebrew Root חָדַל', in *Volume du Congrès: Strasbourg 1956* (VTSup, 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), pp. 8-16. [= pp. 334-42 below]
34. 'HDL-II in Hebrew', *CBQ* 24 (1962), p. 154. [= p. 343 below]
35. 'The Interpretation of Proverbs xxix. 5', *ExpTim* 59 (1948), p. 112. [= p. 344 below]
36. 'The Revised Psalter', *Theology* 66 (1963), pp. 504-507. [= pp. 345-48 below]
37. 'The Root מָכַר in Hebrew', *JTS* 37 (1936), pp. 388-89. [= pp. 349-50 below]
38. 'A Further Note on the Root מָכַר in Hebrew', *JTS* NS 3 (1952), p. 21. [= p. 351 below]
39. 'מָלָח in Jeremiah iv. 5: A Military Term', *JJS* 3 (1952), pp. 47-52. [= pp. 352-57 below]

40. 'A Note on the Hebrew Root נחם', *ExpTim* 44 (1933), pp. 191-92.
[= pp. 358-59 below]
41. 'Job's "Comforters"', *Durham University Journal* 28 (1933), pp. 276-77.
[= pp. 360-61 below]
42. 'A Note on the Meaning of נחם in Genesis xxvii. 42', *ExpTim* 51 (1940),
p. 252. [= p. 362 below]
43. 'A Study in Hebrew Synonyms: Verbs Signifying "to Breathe"', *Zeitschrift
für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete* 10 (1935), pp. 311-14. [= pp. 363-66
below]
44. 'A Note on the Hebrew Text of Judges 16, 20', *AfO* 10 (1935), pp. 162-63.
[= pp. 367-68 below]
45. 'A Note on לָבַי סִחַרְחַר in Psalm xxxviii 11', *JTS* 40 (1939), pp. 390-91.
[= pp. 369-70 below]
46. 'A Lost Hebrew Word in Isaiah ii. 6', *JTS* NS 13 (1962), pp. 323-24.
[= pp. 371-72 below]
47. 'The Text of Jesaia ii 6 and the Word שָׁפַק', *ZAW* 75 (NF 34, 1963), pp. 83-
90. [= pp. 373-75 below]
48. 'Translating Hebrew 'āsāh', *BT* 17 (1966), pp. 190-93. [= pp. 376-79
below]
49. 'Jeremiah v. 28', *ExpTim* 57 (1945), pp. 54-55. [= p. 380 below]
50. 'The Root צנע in Hebrew, and the Meaning of קדרנית in Malachi iii, 14',
JJS 1 (1949), pp. 182-88. [= pp. 381-87 below]
51. 'A Pun on the Name Ashdod in Zephaniah ii. 4', *ExpTim* 74 (1962), p. 63.
[= p. 388 below]
52. 'The Root שנה = سنى in Hebrew', *ZAW* 52 (NF 11, 1934), pp. 236-38.
[= pp. 389-91 below]
53. 'The Root שנה = سنى in Hebrew II', *ZAW* 55 (NF 14, 1937), pp. 174-76.
[= pp. 392-94 below]
54. 'The LXX's Rendering of שנות לב טוב in Ecclus. xxxiii 13', *VT* 10 (1960),
p. 456. [= p. 395 below]
55. 'The Root ידע in Hebrew', *JTS* 35 (1934), pp. 298-306. [= pp. 396-404
below]
56. 'The Root ידע in Hebrew, II', *JTS* 36 (1935), pp. 409-12. [= pp. 405-408
below]
57. 'A Note on לא ידע in Proverbs v 6', *JTS* 37 (1936), pp. 59-60. [= pp. 409-
10 below]
58. 'More Notes on the Root ידע in Hebrew', *JTS* 38 (1937), pp. 404-405.
[= pp. 411-12 below]
59. 'A Note on ולא ידעו in Jeremiah xiv 18', *JTS* 39 (1938), pp. 273-74.
[= pp. 413-14 below]
60. 'A Note on the Meaning of ידע in Hosea ix. 7 and Isaiah ix. 8', *JTS* 41
(1940), pp. 43-44. [= pp. 415-16 below]
61. 'Julius Fürst and the Hebrew Root ידע', *JTS* 42 (1941), pp. 64-65. [= p. 417
below]
62. 'Some Rabbinic Evidence for a Hebrew Root ידע = و ر ج', *JQR* NS 37
(1946), pp. 177-78. [= pp. 418-19 below]

63. 'A Note on אֶלֶּה־יָמֵי in Exod. ii. 25', *JTS* 49 (1948), pp. 143-44.
[= pp. 420-21 below]
64. 'A Note on בְּמִדְבָּר in Eccles. x. 20', *JTS* 50 (1949), p. 177. [= p. 422 below]
65. 'A Note on מוֹעֲדֵי־יָמִים in Jeremiah 24, 1', *JTS* NS 3 (1952), p. 55. [= p. 423 below]
66. 'A Note on בְּלִי־יָדָעָה in Proverbs 9¹³', *JTS* NS 4 (1953), pp. 23-24.
[= pp. 424-25 below]
67. 'Note on in לָדַעַת in Job 37⁷', *JTS* NS 5 (1954), pp. 56-57. [= pp. 426-27 below]
68. 'Some Remarks on the Hebrew Root יָדַע', *JJS* 6 (1955), pp. 50-52.
[= pp. 428-30 below]
69. 'Note on הָדַעַת in Daniel xii. 4', *JTS* NS 6 (1955), p. 226. [= p. 431 below]
70. 'Note on נוֹעַדִי in Amos iii. 3', *JTS* NS 7 (1956), pp. 69-70. [= pp. 432-33 below]
71. 'A Note on וְנוֹדַע לָכֶם in 1 Samuel vi. 3', *JTS* NS 11 (1960), p. 52. [= p. 434 below]
72. 'Psalm xxxv. 15f.', *JTS* NS 12 (1961), pp. 50-51. [= pp. 435-36 below]
73. 'Additional Notes on the Root יָדַע in Hebrew', *JTS* NS 15 (1964), pp. 54-57. [= pp. 437-40 below]
74. 'A Consideration of Isaiah liii in the Light of Recent Textual and Philological Study', *ETL* 44 (1968), pp. 79-86, in H. Cazelles (ed.), *De Mari à Qumran: L'Ancien Testament. Son milieu. Ses relectures juives. Hommages à Mgr J. Coppens* (Gembloux: J. Duculot, and Paris: Lethielleux, 1968), pp. 119-26. Also published in *ETL* 44 (1968), pp. 79-86. [= pp. 441-48 below]
75. 'A Note on נוֹדַע in 1 Samuel xxii. 6', *JTS* NS 21 (1970), pp. 401-402.
[= pp. 449-50 below]
76. 'Job xxxvii 22', *JJS* 1 (1948), pp. 116-17. [= p. 451 below]
77. 'אָר in Proverbs xxxi 4', *VT* 12 (1962), pp. 499-500. [= pp. 452-53 below]
78. "'Until the Day Break, and the Shadows Fly Away'", *ExpTim* 47 (1936), pp. 431-32. [= p. 454 below]
79. 'A Note on Ecclus. 51: 21a', *JTS* NS 20 (1969), pp. 225-26. [= pp. 455-56 below]
80. 'A Note on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah xli. 27', *JTS* NS 18 (1967), pp. 127-28. [= pp. 457-58 below]
81. 'Zechariah x.11a', *ExpTim* 66 (1955), pp. 272-73. [= p. 459 below]
82. 'נָצַב in Psalm xxxix, 6', in J.M. Grintz and J. Liver (eds.), *Studies in the Bible Presented to Professor M.H. Segal* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1964), pp. 10*-16*. [= pp. 460-66 below]
83. 'A Note on וְזָמְרָה־שָׁנָה יְהִי in Psalm xc 5', *VT* 18 (1968), pp. 267-68.
[= p. 467 below]
84. 'Isaiah xlv.9-20: A Translation and Commentary', in A. Caquot and M. Philonenko (eds.), *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1971), pp. 319-30. [= pp. 468-78 below]

THE RECOVERY
OF THE
ANCIENT HEBREW LANGUAGE

An inaugural lecture, as I understand it, should not aim in the first place at originality, but rather at presenting a more or less general account of some main problem connected with the lecturer's special field of study and the modern methods of investigating it. I propose, therefore, to speak on this occasion upon a problem which above all others is claiming the attention of Hebraists at the present time. This problem may be described as the recovery of the ancient Hebrew language. This subject is appropriate for this occasion, I venture to think, for another reason also. It is of importance not only for the Hebrew specialist, but also ultimately for all those who are concerned to see that the Old Testament is properly understood. For obviously, sound exegesis of the Old Testament must depend, first, upon the

establishment of the correct Hebrew text, and secondly, upon a right interpretation of it. And there can be no right interpretation of the Old Testament which is not based upon an exact knowledge of the Hebrew language. Among those present here there will be many who are not Hebraists, and it may appear that I have laid upon myself a difficult task in undertaking to speak upon a subject which falls within the sphere of the linguistic and textual study of the Old Testament. My hope is, however, that in spite of the technical nature of my subject, I may be able to convey to the inexpert something of the general problem; and I hope I may at the same time furnish the expert with an idea or two which may be found to be suggestive.

What then is the nature of our problem? Why must we speak in terms of the recovery of the ancient Hebrew language? Have we not the Old Testament, and is not that a sufficient basis for the study of Hebrew? To ask this question is at once to lay bare the problem. We have the Old Testament—but how meagre a monument it is of a people's literature! It is important, for the proper understanding of the problem before

us, that clear recognition should at the outset be given to the fact that the Hebrew literature which the Old Testament preserves is but a part, and a small part, of an extensive Hebrew literature, which has otherwise failed to survive. How extensive a literature the Hebrews possessed we can only guess. We cannot, therefore, with any certainty measure our loss. But certain considerations point to the disappearance of a considerable Hebrew literature. We think, for example, of the lost books to which the Old Testament itself refers—the Book of Jashar (Josh. x. 13, 2 Sam. i. 18), the Book of the Wars of the Lord (Num. xxi. 14), and so on; of the loss of literature which must inevitably have resulted from the process of editing through which the Old Testament has passed—how much northern literature, for example, did the Judaean editors reject? And again we think of the fact that many, if not most, of the apocryphal books were originally written in Hebrew. Considerations of this kind impress upon us the essential fact that the Old Testament, representing as it does a very small part of the literature of the Hebrews, can preserve only a

fraction of the Hebrew language. It cannot then of itself provide a sufficient basis for the study of ancient Hebrew. It should be remembered, in addition, that some parts of it have little or no value for the Hebraist—those parts, for example, which are merely genealogical or repetitive.

The inadequacy of the Old Testament as a basis for the study of ancient Hebrew is heightened if we consider some of those external influences which, we may suppose, affected the language, but of whose effect little or no trace now exists. Just as in our study of Old Testament history we are aware of gaps in our records, so in our study of the language are we aware of similar lacunae. If, for example, we may see in the Hebrew conquest of Canaan part of a larger Hābiru movement,¹ what elements may not that mixed horde of peoples have contributed to the later Hebrew language?² Other nomadic incursions into Palestine, whether in pre-historic or in historic times, will not have been without their effect too upon the language. Again, the language of the Old Testament betrays hardly any Philistine influence. But may we not

wonder, as we read Old Testament history, whether that influence was not greater than our records suggest? And are the few Egyptian words in the Old Testament a true index of the influence of that language upon Hebrew? At certain periods, for example in the reign of Solomon, that influence may have been very great. What 'Phoenicianisms' too may not have been introduced during the Jezebel régime? And further, we think of the events of 721 B.C. and 586 B.C.—to say nothing of other invasions and deportations—with their disruptive influences not only upon the history and religion of Palestine, but also upon its language. Something of what took place after 721 B.C. we know from the Old Testament—how Samaria was peopled with Aramaic-speaking settlers from Mesopotamia (2 Kings xvii. 24), with the result that from this time onwards the north probably became bilingual; while after 586 B.C. came encroachments on the land by Edomite and other desert peoples from the south.³

The problem of the recovery of the ancient Hebrew language springs then from the fact that the Old Testament is a small volume of

literature, which preserves only in part the full richness of the Hebrew language, and betrays but little of the many influences which must, in varying degrees, have left their mark upon it. It offers in consequence a very restricted field of enquiry for the study of ancient Hebrew. Certainly if we had to rely upon it alone we could scarcely hope to advance much further in our knowledge of the language. What means are then available whereby we may extend our knowledge of ancient Hebrew? First, and most important, we have the science of comparative Semitic philology. Here again we are conscious of a sense of loss. For some members of the Semitic group have vanished, some leaving a few traces, others none, behind them. Of the language of the Amorites, the Ammonites, the Amalekites, the Kenites and others we know little—in most cases, nothing at all. We can go little further than to suppose that they stood in a near relation to Hebrew. The Moabite Stone at least shows that the differences between Moabite and Hebrew were only dialectical.⁴ The sudden appearance a few years ago of the 'Hebraic' dialect of Ras Shamra—of which I shall have

more to say later—well illustrates how a Semitic tongue could fall into oblivion. Its recovery only emphasizes the loss of others. But against such losses may happily be set greater gains. Since the nineteenth century the science of comparative Semitic philology has been firmly established through the study of the greater Semitic languages—Accadian (i.e. Assyrian and Babylonian), Aramaic and Phoenician, Arabic and Ethiopic. As knowledge of these languages has increased, so Hebrew, which belongs to the same Semitic family as they do, has been gradually and remarkably illuminated.

The major problem in the recovery of ancient Hebrew is the development of Hebrew from proto-Semitic to the form in which we now find it in the Old Testament. By proto-Semitic is meant the assumed parent language which the Semites are supposed to have spoken in Arabia when they all lived together there before they migrated thence to people those parts of the Near East where later they are found. It is not possible, of course, to reconstruct proto-Semitic. Indeed there are difficulties in the very assumption of such a parent language with a common

stock of words and a common grammar. The study of comparative Semitic philology, however, demonstrates that such a hypothesis is not only useful but necessary. This does not mean that we postulate a complete identification of vocabulary and grammar for all the Semitic languages in their earlier stages. There is obviously much in the several languages that cannot be fitted into any proto-Semitic scheme. But it does mean that the Semitic languages were less clearly defined in their earlier than in their later stages. I may here quote Professor G. R. Driver — 'Early inscriptions', he writes, 'show Phoenician and Hebrew and Aramaic and even Arabic in a stage of development in which they stood in almost the same relation as Babylonian and Assyrian to each other and must indeed not so very far behind this stage have been a single language; it cannot therefore be considered surprising if idioms, present in regular use in this, are found sporadically also in that language, whether as isolated survivors from the common parent stock or as stray loans from the one to the other sister Semitic language.'⁵ It is a fundamental position of the modern study of Hebrew

that the Hebrews shared with their fellow Semites certain linguistic characteristics which now may be only or most clearly observable in the sister languages, and which, through the study of these languages, can be recovered for Hebrew. To-day we recognize that Hebrew was from the beginning a highly mixed language.⁶ By the time we meet it in the Old Testament it has assimilated a variety of linguistic phenomena drawn from many sources. As the modern study of ethnology has revealed the mixed character of the ancestry of the Hebrews, so comparative Semitic philology has revealed the mixed character of the Hebrew language. By the gradual extrication of the diverse elements which have gone to compose it, its vocabulary is being enriched and its grammar explained. In the sphere of syntax too the same mixed character is evident. The Hebrew verbal system is now seen to be composed of elements characteristic of the eastern and western groups of the Semitic languages, Accadian and Aramaean elements predominating. In this sphere we may note the interesting and important recovery of two forgotten Hebrew tenses—a present-future and a

preterite—in the light of which the difficulties surrounding the Hebrew construction with *waw* consecutive seem nearer solution than ever before.⁷

In the recovery of ancient Hebrew by means of the other Semitic languages Arabic plays an important part. At one time indeed, and it is not so very long ago, scholars depended almost entirely upon Arabic—with Aramaic—for their elucidation of Hebrew. The legitimacy of its use has, however, not always remained unquestioned. And still to-day there are some who accept it a little uneasily. No problem is involved, of course, in the use of Accadian for the elucidation of Hebrew, for Accadian literature can boast an antiquity far greater than can Hebrew literature. There can be no question either of the validity of the use of Phoenician and Aramaic for this purpose, for documents in these languages survive from an early period. But Arabic comes late on the scene as a literary language—some eight hundred years or so later than the latest literature in the Old Testament. Is it not dangerous, therefore, even absurd, it is sometimes objected, to utilize this youthful

language for the recovery of a language whose literature is centuries older? Dangerous it may be, but it is not absurd. The apparent absurdity disappears when once certain facts are fully comprehended. Attention may be drawn to three points especially. In the first place, we may reiterate the fundamental fact, familiar to every Semitic scholar, that Arabic, in spite of its youthful literature, is in many respects a far older language in a philological sense than Hebrew with its more ancient literature. It preserves, for example, many primitive grammatical forms which Hebrew has lost. It preserves, in fact, much that is far older even than Accadian. This statement must not be taken to imply that Arabic can lay any claim to exclusive priority above the other Semitic languages. For no Semitic language can such a claim be made. Yet there is truly a sense in which, as Dr S. A. Cook, my distinguished predecessor, writes, 'Arabic enables us to understand what is genuinely "Semitic" in the Semitic languages'.⁸

In the second place, there is the important fact that we are no longer dependent to-day for our knowledge of Arabic upon late sources. It

can in fact be traced far back into the pre-Christian era. We have first the highly important inscriptions from South Arabia. Through them the history of pre-Islamic Arabia can be traced back to about 1000 B.C., perhaps even earlier.⁹ If the inscriptions themselves do not extend as far back as this, they yet enable us to see what Arabic was like a thousand years and more before it became the language of the Qur'an. Only a few points in illustration of their significance for the study of Hebrew can be mentioned here. The fact that some common Hebrew words, which are scarcely known to classical Arabic, were already in use in Arabia at this early period cannot fail to impress us.¹⁰ Significant is it too that sometimes a difficulty in the Old Testament can be explained only by reference to the vocabulary of the inscriptions.¹¹ Very valuable also is the light the inscriptions throw on Hebrew proper names. Not only are many of the well-known names of the Old Testament common in them, but, further, the current explanations of some of them can now be corrected by reference to the old Arabian language.¹² Secondly, under this head we may

note that in north Semitic epigraphic records too we find means of tracing Arabic back to an early period. Professor Driver's statement, already quoted, will be recalled in this connection. What we may style 'Arabisms' are met with, for example, in the Aramaic inscriptions belonging to the eighth century B.C. from Zenjirli¹³—and earlier still in the fourteenth-century tablets from Ras Shamra.¹⁴

In the third place, inscriptions are not the only means we have of tracing Arabic back into the pre-Christian period. To-day the high value of the Septuagint in this respect is being gradually recognized. The Septuagint translators frequently translate the Hebrew text in such a way that their translations can only be explained on the assumption that they gave to a Hebrew word a meaning which to-day can only be recovered from Arabic. I touch on this point briefly here as I shall return to it again in a moment.

In richness of vocabulary classical Arabic leaves all the other Semitic languages behind. For the recovery of the ancient Hebrew vocabulary it provides an almost inexhaustible treasure-

house. Its copious vocabulary is, of course, in part the result of later development, and care must therefore be exercised in the exploration and use of it. We need not, however, hesitate to regard it as axiomatic that the vocabulary of classical Arabic preserves much that is primitive. We meet here with a linguistic phenomenon which is constantly making its appearance in the study of comparative Semitic philology. I refer to the re-emergence in late literature of words which themselves are very ancient, and which may or may not be, through pure accident, attested in earlier documents. Hebrew itself offers many an interesting illustration of this. If, for example, we had only Ben Sira, should we not be tempted to argue that the word *'šwḥ* 'reservoir' (l. 3), not occurring elsewhere in Hebrew, is a late word? And yet it is to be found on the Moabite Stone (lines 9, 23)!¹⁵ Since the ninth century B.C. this old Semitic word lay hid until it turned up again seven hundred years later in Ben Sira. Mishnaic Hebrew too, it can be shown, preserves many a survival from an antique vocabulary. For example, the well-known word *ḥazzān* 'super-

intendent, officer' is the same word as *ḥazānu* 'prefect, regent', which occurs in the Tell el-Amarna letters.¹⁶ Likewise in classical Arabic countless ancient words survive which, in spite of their antiquity, may happen to appear for the first time in the works of the classical Arabic writers. It is the recognition of this fact, combined with the fact that to-day we have means, as already shown, of tracking down some of the more ancient elements in the Arabic vocabulary, that justifies our use of the enormous vocabulary of classical Arabic for the recovery of the ancient Hebrew vocabulary.

The use of Syriac and Ethiopic for the elucidation of Hebrew also causes uneasiness in the minds of some, for their literatures too are late, being for the most part of Christian origin. This question need not detain us long, for what has been said about the use of Arabic applies in part also to the use of these two languages. It may be pointed out that both Syriac and Ethiopic can, like Arabic, be traced back through the Septuagint to the third century B.C. at least;¹⁷ and that in both languages survivals of ancient Semitic usage are to be found. Of

Ethiopic in particular two additional remarks may be made. First, there are clear indications that in its earliest period of development it had a much closer affinity with Hebrew than appears in the later form of the language.¹⁸ And secondly, common words which Ethiopic shares with Hebrew are not likely to have been borrowed by Ethiopic from Hebrew; rather were such words taken with them by the emigrants from their common home¹⁹—they are, in other words, proto-Semitic.

The legitimacy of the use of Arabic, Syriac and Ethiopic in our attempts to recover Hebrew is then beyond question. As was remarked above, we are not unmindful that this line of study has its dangers. A merely mechanical use of these languages may result in an explanation of Hebrew as arbitrary as any emendation of the Hebrew text. But the overwhelming evidence which comparative Semitic philology can produce completely vindicates this method of research. Hebrew, being a mixed language, shared with Arabic, Syriac and Ethiopic many of the characteristics and much of the vocabulary of these languages; and through the study

of these sister languages we are able to recover for Hebrew ancient features of Semitic grammar and vocabulary which its own limited literature does not preserve. Nor too must the field of modern Palestinian and Syrian Arabic be neglected; for we may expect to find therein relics of the classical rules and ancient roots which, for one reason or another, did not pass into the classical language.²⁰

How ancient Semitic words can be recovered through the Septuagint has already been pointed out. For the recovery of Hebrew it is by far the most important of the ancient Versions of the Old Testament. Whatever the merits or demerits of the Septuagint translators as Hebraists may have been—and that question will continue to be debated—they certainly retained a correct tradition as to the meanings of many Hebrew words, which are only to-day being recovered by means of the cognate languages. In the past it has been too readily assumed that where the Septuagint does not obviously represent the Hebrew text, the Greek translation reflects a different Hebrew text. To-day, however, many a Greek rendering, which at first

sight appears not to reflect the Hebrew text, is seen, through Semitic research, to reflect the Massoretic, and not another Hebrew text. We must not suppose, however, that the Greek translators were in any sense Semitic scholars. In translating the Hebrew text they were not conscious of the fact that the meanings which they assigned to Hebrew words were shared by Hebrew with Accadian, Arabic and so on. They only knew that the Hebrew words in their day bore these meanings. Many of these traditional meanings, with which they were perfectly familiar, have since their time been lost. They can be recovered to-day for Hebrew only through the cognate roots in the sister languages. So do the Greek translators force upon us once again the conception of a common stock of Semitic words. Their translations, even though they may preserve a true tradition as to the meanings of Hebrew words, are, of course, not necessarily always correct. Yet even their mis-translations have a value, for from them lost Semitic roots may frequently be recovered.²¹

For the recovery of ancient Hebrew other languages, besides the Semitic, must be em-

ployed. The number of languages which the Hebraist to-day must take into account is growing alarmingly large. His horizon must include Sumerian, Egyptian, Persian and Greek. And even these do not exhaust the list, for there are other languages which, as the knowledge of them progresses, are seen to be of increasing importance for the study of Hebrew, for example, Hittite. And on the fringe of our study lie yet other tongues. One of the most remarkable discoveries of recent times has been the establishment of the Horites—hitherto regarded as a legendary pre-Edomite race, and, through false etymology, as cave-dwelling folk—as a real Mesopotamian people, the Hurrians,²² who about 1900 B.C. moved westwards into Palestine and left their mark on Hebrew civilization, especially in the domain of law. From now on Hurrian must be reckoned among those languages which the Hebraist cannot ignore. The entry of the Horites upon the stage of history prompts the question whether some of those other peoples hitherto regarded as mythical—for example, the Rephaim or the Bene 'Anaqim—will at some future time turn out to be real

peoples with a language and civilization of their own.

We have already touched briefly upon the contribution which Semitic epigraphy is making towards the recovery of Hebrew. Something may now be said of the contribution made by documents written in ancient Hebrew. Such documents are, as is well known, few in number. All the greater welcome, therefore, is accorded to the discovery of any additional material. And here mention must be made of a recent discovery which, with another soon to be named, will make the present decade a memorable one in the annals of Biblical archaeology. I refer to the discovery of the Lachish letters in 1935,²³ the most valuable find yet made in the Biblical archaeology of Palestine. Our Palestinian records are on the whole a disappointing source for the recovery of the ancient Hebrew vocabulary. They add surprisingly little in this respect. This is unfortunately true also of the Lachish ostraca. Though they provide some ninety lines of legible Hebrew, they scarcely add any new words. It is possible that when greater agreement has been reached regarding some of the

readings other new words may be found to occur therein. But they will not be many. The importance of these ostraca lies elsewhere than in the sphere of lexicography. It lies in the certainty they afford that our Hebrew Bible is written in the genuine ancient Hebrew language. We know from them the kind of Hebrew the men of Judah were using in the age of Jeremiah, and a comparison between the language of the ostraca and the language of the Old Testament reveals their essential identity. It is for this, and for their further contribution to our meagre knowledge of Hebrew palaeography, that these letters from Lachish are of such high significance. The discovery of further ostraca of this kind is much to be hoped for. Continuous Hebrew texts such as these letters provide—and if we except the Siloam inscription, provide for the first time—have a value for the study of the Hebrew language which short and isolated fragments have not.

It is to Ras Shamra on the Syrian coast that we have to look for the second great archaeological discovery of recent times. The tablets unearthed there in 1929 and succeeding years

are the most important epigraphic monuments ever found in Syria.²⁴ It will be possible here only to indicate in brief terms something of their significance for the study of Hebrew. There is as yet no agreement as to precisely what the language is in which they are written. For our present purpose we are content to style it, as we have done earlier, vaguely 'Hebraic'. These tablets, older than almost anything in the Old Testament, push the history of Hebrew back to the middle of the second millennium B.C. In view of what has been said earlier regarding the mixed character of Hebrew at an early stage, it is of great interest to note that this 'Hebraic' dialect of the Ras Shamra texts is also highly mixed, being composed of various Semitic and other elements. The value of these tablets for the study of early 'Arabisms' has been mentioned. It is indeed noteworthy how often the vocabulary of Ras Shamra is explicable from south rather than north Semitic.²⁵ It cannot be said that these tablets, like the Lachish ostraca, disappoint in the matter of the light they throw on the Hebrew vocabulary. On the contrary, they will, it is safe to forecast, effect something like

a revolution in Hebrew and Semitic lexicography. One interesting fact they reveal is that words which in the Old Testament are ἀπαξ λεγόμενα must have been in far more frequent use than their isolated occurrence in the Old Testament would suggest. An interesting example may be given. In Is. xxvii. 1 Leviathan is described as a 'swift' and 'crooked serpent'. The two epithets in Hebrew are respectively *bārīah* and *'aqallātôn*, the latter occurring nowhere else in the Old Testament. And yet here it is on the Ras Shamra tablets in this same sense, and what is more, it is used there, in conjunction moreover with the word *bārīah*, of a creature called *ltn*, the primitive form perhaps of the word Leviathan.²⁶ The twenty-seventh chapter of Isaiah is generally regarded as part of a late section of the book of Isaiah. We meet once again, therefore, with an example of that phenomenon, referred to above, whereby a word is lost sight of for centuries only to turn up again at a later date. It is not only in the realm of lexicography that these tablets are of such great importance. The problem of the Hebrew tenses, for example, will have to be studied in the light

of the Ras Shamra use of the tenses. There is much about the latter that is as yet obscure. But we note with the greatest interest the use at Ras Shamra of the *yql* form as the narrative tense, for it links up with the proto-Semitic *yáqtul* which underlies the preterite tense which we now recognize in the Hebrew *way-yiqtol*.²⁷

We may turn now for a few moments to another aspect of our problem. It is the question of the pronunciation of ancient Hebrew and its relevance for the recovery of ancient Hebrew grammar. Until comparatively recently Hebrew grammarians have been content to recover the rules of Hebrew grammar on the basis of the vocalization which the Massoretes of Tiberias, with a view to the establishment of a correct pronunciation of Hebrew and correct recital of the Hebrew Bible in the synagogue, fixed once and for all about the eighth to the ninth centuries A.D. The application of their system of vocalization throughout the whole of the Hebrew Bible, to the earliest as well as to the latest documents, has had the effect of making it extremely difficult to trace the historical development of the language. If we would do

this, we must endeavour to go behind the late, uniform system of the Massoretic vocalization and recover the pronunciation of Hebrew in earlier days. The recovery of this earlier pronunciation and the study of Hebrew grammar are intimately connected the one with the other. For the recovery of the earlier pronunciation brings with it the recovery too of ancient forms which at one time were a real part of the language, but which have been levelled out of existence through the schematic uniformity of the Tiberian system of vocalization. Can we know then how ancient Hebrew was pronounced? I must pass by with a bare mention the evidence for the pronunciation of Hebrew in the earlier period which is furnished by the Canaanite glosses in the Tell el-Amarna letters, by the Ras Shamra material, and by Egyptian and Accadian transliterations of Canaanite names. For the pre-Massoretic pronunciation of the Hebrew text itself we have to rely principally upon the transliterations which have been preserved, notably in the Septuagint, the Second Column of Origen's Hexapla, and in the writings of St Jerome.²⁸ The methodical use

of these transliterations is, it must be confessed, far from easy.²⁹ The Greek and Latin alphabets, for example, have no exact equivalents of the Hebrew gutturals and sibilants;³⁰ and again proper names, which bulk large in this material, are notoriously liable to corruption. Yet, though their use calls for the exercise of great care, they do make it possible to go behind the Massoretic tradition and to recover evidence which points distinctly to a diversity of pronunciation at different periods in the days anterior to the Massoretes. They show us, to take a few simple examples, that the pronunciation of segholates during the period they cover was not uniform;³¹ that the article was always pronounced with an 'a' vowel, even before a *hēth* with *qāmeṣ*;³² that the doubling of the following consonant after the article is no older than the Second Column of the Hexapla;³³ and that St Jerome knew of no differentiation between the sounds *šin* and *šin*.³⁴

The transliterations then make it abundantly clear that the Hebrew text could be read differently from the Tiberian text. In revealing an earlier stage of Hebrew pronunciation they

reveal at the same time an earlier stage in the development of the Hebrew language. A like result emerges from the study of Hebrew Biblical manuscripts which are vocalized otherwise than according to the Tiberian system, especially those vocalized according to the Babylonian system of punctuation.³⁵ They too enable us to catch a glimpse of the vocalization of the Hebrew text at an earlier stage of development than that which is exhibited in the Tiberian text, and to recover ancient features of Hebrew grammar which are not, or which are only in part, recoverable from the Tiberian text. The evidence of the pre-Massoretic material compels us indeed to make a clear distinction between the grammar of ancient Hebrew and Tiberian grammar. The two are far from being always identical.

In this lecture an attempt has been made to show how the problem of the recovery of ancient Hebrew is forced upon us through the limited field of enquiry which the Old Testament offers, and how this recovery is being effected. We have seen something of the contribution towards this recovery that is being made by comparative

Semitic philology and the study of other languages, by the study of the Versions, especially of the Septuagint, by Semitic epigraphy, and by investigation into early Hebrew pronunciation. There are, of course, many other aspects of our problem on which we would, if time were available, willingly linger. There is, for example, the question of the recovery of Hebrew dialectal variations. The relative seclusion of some parts of Palestine and the frequent movements of peoples on Palestinian soil and the consequent intermixtures of populations permit us to take the growth of Hebrew dialects for granted. Yet it is no easy matter to distinguish them. Indeed, in the opinion of some, little certainty can be achieved in this matter. In certain parts of the Old Testament, however, notably in the Elohist document and in the books of Judges, Kings and Hosea, clear traces of a northern dialect, strongly tinged with Aramaic, can be discerned.³⁶ Some interesting questions suggest themselves here. Can the characteristic features of the northern and southern dialects of Palestine be more exactly determined than at present? What contribution has Semitic epigraphy to

make here? And may we look for help to the Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch, representing as it does a northern recension of the Torah, as the Massoretic text represents it in a Judæan recension?³⁷

Passing reference may also be made to one other aspect of our problem. At the beginning of this lecture I remarked upon the importance for the sound exegesis of the Old Testament of the establishment of the correct Hebrew text. In view of the special value which attaches to the Septuagint in this connection, it is tempting to enlarge upon the significance of the Chester Beatty papyri, upon the early textual forms of the Greek Bible they afford,³⁸ and upon the discovery among them of a further copy of the original Septuagint Version of Daniel.³⁹ Or we might turn our minds to a consideration of the attempt by F. X. Wutz to recover the original Hebrew text on the supposition that the Septuagint translators had before them not a text in Hebrew characters, but a Greek transcription text.⁴⁰ But upon these, and upon other problems, no less fascinating, we cannot now dwell. For we have still to refer to three considerations

beginning of a revolution in Hebrew grammatical study.⁴¹ Already we are perceiving that Hebrew grammatical phenomena, which before seemed inexplicable, appear in a new light, and are recognizable as relics of an older stage of the language. We see how forms, which have been thought to be exceptional, themselves come under rules; and we observe again how some current explanations of grammatical problems are mere inventions on the part of Hebrew grammarians. There can be little doubt where the main problem of Hebrew grammatical research lies in the future. A hope may be expressed that there will not be lacking a succession of scholars, competent and properly equipped, to carry out the tasks that lie ahead in this difficult field of Hebrew study.

And finally, what effect, it may be asked, is the recovery of Hebrew having upon our attitude towards the value of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament? Its effect is very clear. We are moving in the direction of a more conservative frame of mind. The conditions under which the Old Testament has come down to us make the legitimacy of conjectural emendation un-

deniable. Such emendations, however, should not be treated with more respect than they deserve. They are after all only what their name implies—they are conjectures—and they should not be treated as if they were proven facts. We recall Hugo Gressmann's striking words—'Zehn Konjekturen, von denen keine überzeugt, sind wie zehn Nullen, die keine Eins geben'.⁴² A conjecture may be right—in fact, some brilliant guesses, which have in the past been made, have been vindicated by later scholarship. But, on the other hand, it may be hopelessly wide of the mark. Old Testament scholarship has nothing to gain from conjectural emendation when it is undisciplined and uncontrolled. There is, and must be, a place for it, however, if it is regulated in accordance with recognized canons. The formulation of canons of emendation is a task beset with very great difficulties. Yet the time has come when that task should be attempted.⁴³ The legitimacy of disciplined emendation must then be allowed. But it cannot be too frequently insisted that the Hebrew text must, wherever possible, be explained, and not explained away. In innumerable instances where it has in the

past been thought to be wrong, more recent study has shown it to be right. We are not blind to the fact that corrupt passages exist; it would be strange indeed if they did not. And the difficulties they present must be boldly faced. Some of them may be for ever beyond our power to restore. Yet it is the clear verdict of Hebrew research to-day that the reputation of the Massoretic text stands deservedly high, and that for the serious study of the Old Testament it must, in spite of its imperfections, constitute the proper starting-point. So does the linguist point the way for the exegete.

NOTES

1. See S. H. HOOKE in *Record and Revelation*, ed. H. Wheeler Robinson, 1938, p. 359.
2. Cp. H. BAUER and P. LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache*, 1922, pp. 19 ff.; further H. BAUER, *Zur Frage der Sprachmischung im Hebräischen*, 1924, pp. 16 ff.
3. Cp. W. O. E. OESTERLEY and T. H. ROBINSON, *A History of Israel*, vol. ii, 1932, pp. 55 f.
4. See G. A. COOKE, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, 1903, p. 5.
5. *Miscellanea Orientalia, dedicata Antonio Deimel annos lxx complenti* (*Analecta Orientalia* 12, Rome, 1935), p. 70.
6. See further the present writer's article 'The Language of the Old Testament' in *Record and Revelation*, pp. 374 ff.
7. See G. R. DRIVER, *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System*, 1936, especially chs. ix and xiv.
8. *The 'Truth' of the Bible*, 1938, p. 156.
9. See D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, *The Relations between Arabs and Israelites prior to the Rise of Islam* (Schweich Lectures, 1921), p. 7.

NOTES

1. See S. H. HOOKE in *Record and Revelation*, ed. H. Wheeler Robinson, 1938, p. 359.
2. Cp. H. BAUER and P. LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache*, 1922, pp. 19 ff.; further H. BAUER, *Zur Frage der Sprachmischung im Hebräischen*, 1924, pp. 16 ff.
3. Cp. W. O. E. OESTERLEY and T. H. ROBINSON, *A History of Israel*, vol. ii, 1932, pp. 55 f.
4. See G. A. COOKE, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, 1903, p. 5.
5. *Miscellanea Orientalia, dedicata Antonio Deimel annos lxx complenti (Analecta Orientalia 12, Rome, 1935)*, p. 70.
6. See further the present writer's article 'The Language of the Old Testament' in *Record and Revelation*, pp. 374 ff.
7. See G. R. DRIVER, *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System*, 1936, especially chs. ix and xiv.
8. *The 'Truth' of the Bible*, 1938, p. 156.
9. See D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, *The Relations between Arabs and Israelites prior to the Rise of Islam* (Schweich Lectures, 1921), p. 7.

10. *Ibid.* p. 8.
11. *Ibid.* p. 25, where **āzab* in Neh. iii. 8 is explained as meaning 'restore'.
12. *Ibid.* pp. 13 ff.
13. See G. A. COOKE, *op. cit.* p. 185.
14. See n. 25 below.
15. Cp. S. R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, 1913, p. xc; and G. A. COOKE, *op. cit.* p. 10.
16. See J. A. KNUDTZON, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, 1907, p. 856; F. BÖHL, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe*, 1909, p. 9; and *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. ii, p. 321.
17. See the present writer in *Record and Revelation*, p. 397, and references there.
18. A. DILLMANN, *Ethiopic Grammar*, 1907, p. 10.
19. D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, *op. cit.* p. 8.
20. Cp. I. EITAN, *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography*, 1924, p. 18.
21. With this paragraph cp. G. R. DRIVER in *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* lv, pt. ii (1936), pp. 101 ff.
22. See further E. A. SPEISER, *Mesopotamian Origins*, 1931, ch. 5, and the same writer's *Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B.C.*, 1933.

23. See further the present writer's article in *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, xl (1939), pp. 1 ff.
24. A full Ras Shamra bibliography may be found in S. H. HOOKE, *The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual* (Schweich Lectures, 1935), pp. 69 ff.
25. For the affinities of the Ras Shamra dialect with Arabic and Ethiopic, cp. J. A. MONTGOMERY, *Zeitschr. für d. alttestam. Wiss.* Bd. xii (1935), p. 208; and T. H. GASTER, *Religions*, No. 18 (Jan. 1937), p. 32.
26. See J. W. JACK, *The Ras Shamra Tablets*, 1935, pp. 45 f.
27. See G. R. DRIVER, *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System*, pp. 85 ff.; for the use of the tenses at Ras Shamra see J. A. MONTGOMERY and Z. S. HARRIS, *The Ras Shamra Mythological Texts*, 1935, p. 25, and Z. S. HARRIS, *Ras Shamra; Canaanite Civilisation and Language* (Smithsonian Report for 1937), pp. 496 f.
28. See especially E. A. SPEISER, 'The Pronunciation of Hebrew according to the Transliterations in the Hexapla', in *Jew. Quart. Rev.* xvi (1926), pp. 343 ff., xxiii (1932-3), pp. 233 ff., xxiv (1933-4), pp. 9 ff.; and A. SPERBER, 'Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations', in *Heb. Union Coll. Annual*, xii-xiii (1937-8), pp. 103 ff.

29. Cp. K. LEVY, *Zur masoretische Grammatik*, 1936, pp. 9 f.
30. Cp. A. SPERBER, *op. cit.* pp. 113 ff.
31. *Ibid.* pp. 181 f. Cp. C. F. BURNEY, *The Book of Judges*, 1920, pp. 167 f.
32. Cp. A. SPERBER, *op. cit.* pp. 137, 193.
33. *Ibid. loc. cit.*
34. *Ibid.* p. 115.
35. Special mention may be made of the following writings of P. KAHLE: *Der masoretische Text des A.T. nach der Überlieferung der babyl. Juden*, 1902; *Masoreten des Ostens*, 1913; and 'Die hebr. Bibelhandschriften aus Babylonien', in *Zeitschr. f. d. alttest. Wiss.* Bd. v (1928), pp. 113 ff.
36. Cp. C. F. BURNEY, *op. cit.* pp. 172 ff. and *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, 1903, by the same writer, pp. 208 f.; H. S. NYBERG, *Studien zum Hoseabuche*, 1935, pp. 12, 22, 35, etc.; and S. R. DRIVER, *Introd. to the Literature of the O.T.*, 9th ed., 1920, pp. 188, 448 ff.
37. Cp. A. SPERBER, *op. cit.* pp. 151 ff.
38. See F. G. KENYON, *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible* (Schweich Lectures, 1932), pp. 97 f., 105 ff.
39. *Ibid.* pp. 112 f.

40. Cp. the present writer in *Record and Revelation*, p. 396, n. 2.
41. Cp. further P. LEANDER, 'Einige hebr. Lautgesetze chronologisch geordnet', in *Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, Bd. lxxiv (1920), pp. 61 ff. See also J. Hempel's short sketch, 'Zur alttestam. Grammatik', in *Zeitschr. f. d. alttestam. Wiss.* Bd. iv (1927), pp. 234 ff.
42. *Zeitschr. f. d. alttestam. Wiss.* Bd. i (1924), p. 19.
43. Cp. P. VOLZ, *ibid.* Bd. xiii (1936), pp. 100 ff.

VII
THE LANGUAGE OF THE OLD
TESTAMENT

HEBREW and Aramaic, the original languages in which the Old Testament was written, belong to that family of languages which, since the end of the eighteenth century, has been conveniently, if not entirely correctly, called Semitic. Owing to the closeness of the family relationship which exists between them, no grouping of them is altogether satisfactory, one group frequently sharing the characteristics of another; it seems best, however, that they should be grouped as follows: Hebrew and Aramaic (together with Phoenician and Moabite) forming a north-western group, Accadian (Assyrian and Babylonian) forming an eastern group, and Arabic and Ethiopic a southern group.¹ These languages are descended from an assumed parent language which the Semites are supposed to have spoken when they lived together in Arabia before they poured out thence and peopled the countries where later they are found. Any reconstruction of this proto-Semitic must, of course, be necessarily hypothetical. It will already have broken up into dialects when the proto-Semites lived together. It is then a fiction. But it serves as a useful working hypothesis, and as a reminder that the Hebrews will from the beginning have shared with their fellow Semites certain characteristics of language which now may be only or most clearly observable in the sister languages. Perhaps the most outstanding achievement of the modern study of Hebrew has

¹ The grouping of Accadian with Hebrew as an older group as opposed to a younger group consisting of the other Semitic languages, as attempted by Bauer and Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache* (1922), p. 6 f., is open to criticism; see A. A. Bevan in *Old Testament Essays* (1927), p. 94 f.

The Language of the Old Testament 375

been the establishment of the fact that Hebrew, in its descent from the parent language to the stage at which we meet it in the Old Testament, has assimilated a variety of linguistic phenomena drawn from many sources—that it is, in fact, a highly mixed language. A consideration of this mixed character of Hebrew and of those diverse elements which have gone to compose it will first engage us.

A people's language usually reflects the ancestry of the people that speaks it. The more mixed the ancestry, the more mixed will be the language. That the ancestry of the Hebrews was a very mixed one is a sure result of modern ethnographical study. When the Hebrews, borne on the Aramaean wave that brought also other peoples—Edomites, Ammonites, Moabites—entered Canaan in the second half of the second millennium B.C., they found a country where the ethnographical conditions were extremely complex. Here diverse racial elements—Amorite, Canaanite, Hittite, Egyptian, Phoenician—non-Semitic as well as Semitic, had during many centuries crossed each other. They all, save probably the Egyptian, contributed in greater or lesser degree to the blood of later Israel. Hebrew tradition itself has preserved a lively recollection of her mixed origin. The Priestly Writer (Gen. xi. 31) tells of the tradition of Abraham's departure from Ur to Canaan, which points to a Babylonian element in Israel's ancestry. The description of Jacob as a 'nomad Aramaean' ('*ārammī* 'ōbēd, Deut. xxvi. 5) illustrates Israel's acute consciousness of her Aramaean forbears. The Book of Judges emphasizes the fact that Israelites and Canaanites intermarried (was not Abimelech half-Canaanite?). And when Ezekiel (xvi. 3) in the sixth century flung his taunt at Israel—'Thy birth and thy nativity is of the land of the Canaanite; the Amorite was thy father, and thy mother was an Hittite' (cp. ver. 45), he stated what is to-day regarded as an ethnographical fact. Ethnographical study and Hebrew tradition, then, combine to expose the very mixed origin of the Hebrews which, as

376 *The Language of the Old Testament*

comparative philology clearly shows, reflects itself in the mixed character of their language.

Of the language in which, save for a few chapters, it is written, the Old Testament itself has scarcely anything to say. It is perhaps purely accidental that the term *'ibrîṭ*, 'Hebrew' (with ellipse of the word *lāšôn*, 'tongue, language', cp. *'ārāmîṭ*, 'Aramaean', *'ašdōdîṭ*, 'Ashdodite') is not to be found in the Old Testament. The full phrase *lāšôn 'ibrîṭ* occurs for the first time in the Mishna. The two Old Testament terms are *šepat k'na'an*, 'lip (tongue) of Canaan' (Isa. xix. 18), and *y'hūdîṭ* (2 Kings xviii. 26, 28; Neh. xiii. 24), the latter in accordance with the usage of the term 'Jew, Jewish' by post-exilic writers to include the whole population of Palestine. This information is meagre enough, but the description in Isaiah (if the author is not merely opposing the language of one country to another, in this case Egypt) is valuable. Hebrew is in some way the language of Canaan.

When, in the face of the rising power of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty (c. 1600–1350 B.C.) the power of Babylon in the West waned, one remarkable relic of her influence endured there—the Babylonian language and the cuneiform script in which it was written. The Tell el-Amarna letters show that this language was at the period of the Israelite invasion of Canaan the international language; the tablets from Ta'anach make clear that it was used also by the Palestinian princelings in their correspondence with each other. The retention of this language, in spite of the difficulties it presented to those who used it, is strong testimony to the predominance of Babylonian influence in the preceding period. The Babylonian in which these letters are written is far from pure. To the illustration of its mixed character we shall return at a more convenient place; our present purpose is served if we emphasize at this point that this pre-Israelite language of Palestine was of a composite character, exhibiting elements drawn from Eastern and Western Semitic.

The Language of the Old Testament 377

Side by side with this *lingua franca* was the native language of Canaan, which had already been influenced by Amorite and Phoenician. It is preserved in the Canaanite glosses on the Tell el-Amarna letters—those Canaanite words, that is, which the native scribes, imperfectly skilled in the use of Babylonian, wrote in Babylonian cuneiform syllables to explain certain Babylonian words. These glosses represent a language which may be regarded as the prototype of Hebrew, as a few examples will show—*ḥa-ar-ri* is the Hebrew *hārīm*, 'mountains' (the letter *ṛēš*, it seems, could anciently be doubled); *zu-ki-ni* is the same word as *sōkēn*, 'steward' (Isa. xxii. 15); *a-ba-da-at* represents an older stage than the Hebrew *'āb'dāh*, 'she perished'; and *ḥu-ul-lu* (Hebrew *'āl* 'yoke') and *ki-lu-bi* (Hebrew *k'lūb*, 'basket') illustrate the use of the ancient case-endings which, save for a few traces, have died out in classical Hebrew. The vocalization of the glosses is, of course, of very great value, for it represents a stage centuries earlier than that of the Massoretic text, and furnishes the nearest indication we have of the ancient pronunciation of Hebrew.

Babylonian and Canaanite were, then, the prevailing languages in Palestine immediately prior to the entry of the Hebrews. They themselves came speaking an Aramaeo-Arabic dialect. It was by fusion of this speech of the invading Hebrews with the native Canaanite, already influenced, as we have seen, by other Semitic languages, that the Hebrew of the Old Testament was born, the contemporary international Babylonian—again a composite language—at the same time exercising a potent influence in its creation. The Hebrew language, therefore, was not brought into Palestine by the Israelites—the glosses, as well as pre-Israelite names in Canaan like Melchizedek, Kiriath-sepher, and so on, together with the Canaanite words and proper names preserved in Egyptian sources, show that it was in a sense already there. The Ras Shamra tablets, too, reveal the existence in Palestine in the pre-Israelite period of a strongly 'Hebraic' dialect.

378 *The Language of the Old Testament*

In this sense is the description of Hebrew in Isa. xix. 18 justified—it is at bottom the language of Canaan, a later form of the ancient language of Amurru. The syncretism that took place in the sphere of religion—the fusion of Yahweh with the Baal—reflects itself also in the language.¹

The mixed character of Hebrew reveals itself very clearly in its vocabulary. Its four negative particles, for example, can be traced to different sources: *lō'* (Accadian, Aramaic, Arabic), *'al* (Accadian and Old Aramaic), *bal* (Phoenician), and *'i* (Accadian and Ethiopic). The study of synonyms yields the same result, e.g. *heres*, 'sun', is known only to Hebrew, whereas *šemeš* is shared by Accadian, Aramaic, and Arabic; *nāṭan*, 'give', is Accadian as well as Hebrew, while *yāhaḥ* is common to Aramaic, Arabic, and Ethiopic. There is no trace in Hebrew of a Hiph'il from *šātāh*, 'drink' (Accadian and Aramaic); in its place the Hiph'il of *šāqāh* (Arabic and Ethiopic) is used. The duplicate forms in the pronouns are likewise referable to different sources, e.g. *'ānōkī*, 'I' (Phoenician and Accadian), and *'ānī* (Aramaic, Arabic, and Ethiopic), as are those of the verb, e.g. *yizkrū*, 'they will remember' (Accadian and Ethiopic) and *yizkrūn* (Aramaic and Arabic).

Of the highest importance is the discovery that the Hebrew verbal system also is of composite origin, being derived from a

¹ The attempt of A. S. Yahuda in *Die Sprache des Pentateuchs in ihren Beziehungen zum Ägyptischen* (1929)—English edition *The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian* (1933)—to prove that Hebrew was developed from a primitive Canaanite dialect into a literary language in a milieu in which Egyptians and Israelites lived together, i.e. during the period when Israel was in Egypt, must be regarded as unsuccessful. His examples do not always support his theory, e.g. *'ēṭān* (p. 92 f., German ed.) does not require to be explained from Egyptian; its affinity with the Arabic *watana*, 'be perpetual, never failing' (especially of water), is clear. That some grammatical relationship between Hebrew and Egyptian is traceable is undeniable, but it belongs to the prehistoric period. The Egyptian elements in the Pentateuch and elsewhere in the Old Testament are patient of other explanations than that Israel acquired them in the land of Goshen. See J. E. Macfadyen, *Expository Times*, xli (1929), p. 57.

The Language of the Old Testament 379

twofold source, an eastern and a western one.¹ It is especially interesting to find that to this twofold source go back the constructions with *waw*—those with strong *waw* to the Accadian, those with weak *waw* to the Aramaean, element in Hebrew. Students of current theories of the 'mysterious but potent *waw*' will be aware of their inadequacy; it is a happy result of the modern study of the Hebrew verbal system that there is at last available an explanation of this construction which carries conviction. It has long been known that this construction with the imperfect, though fully developed only in Hebrew, is to be found outside Israel—notably on the Moabite Stone and in early Aramaic and south Arabian inscriptions. It is clearly, therefore, not a specific Hebraism, but an archaism, and its use in Hebrew can best be explained from Accadian. It should be remarked that Accadian is employed for the purpose of unravelling the difficulties of the Hebrew usage not because it is necessarily in a philological sense the oldest Semitic language (for Arabic, as is well known, preserves much that is far older), but because it retains or develops much from the proto-Semitic language in its fullest form, of which the Western languages preserve only dying traces.

It now appears that it is not the perfect tense *qāṭāl*, 'has killed' (Aramaic *qāṭāl*, Ethiopic *qatāla*, Arabic *qātala*), which is used in Hebrew with consecutive *waw* with reference to future time, but a quite distinct present-future tense *qāṭal*, 'is in a killing state', 'is, has been, will be killed', 'has killed, will kill', as seen in the Accadian permansive state; nor is it the imperfect *yiqṭól*, 'he was killing, he will kill' (Aramaic *yiqṭúl* with the same significance), which is used with *waw* with reference to past

¹ The following paragraphs, which give a brief account of some aspects of the Hebrew verbal system, are based upon G. R. Driver's *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System* (1936)—an invaluable contribution to Semitic philology. The present writer gladly acknowledges his debt to the author for much of the material used in this essay in illustration of the mixed character of Hebrew.

380 *The Language of the Old Testament*

time, but a quite distinct preterite tense *yīqtāl*, going back to the proto-Semitic *yāqtul* as seen in the Accadian *īqtul*.

With regard to the accentuation of the forms with consecutive *waw*, it is incorrect to say that in the perfect the effect of the *waw* is to throw the accent forward, and in the imperfect to retract it. Once again Accadian, which preserves the accent of primitive Semitic speech, comes to our aid. The accent in the preterite *īqtul* (= Hebrew consecutive *yīqtāl*, accented thus for the sake of the argument against the rules of the Massoretes which would require *yīqtāl*) fell on the first syllable; in *way-yīqtāl* its position is the same. The primitive accent of the Accadian *īqtul* can be seen more clearly in forms from weak verbs, for example, *way-yāqom*, 'and he arose', *way-yībn*, 'and he built', *way-yēšeb*, 'and he dwelt', and so on. In the permansive the accent likewise fell on the first syllable *qātil*; in the Hebrew consecutive *w^cqāṭal* (again accented against Massoretic rules for the sake of the argument) its position is unchanged. Hebrew forms like *qāṭaltā* and *qāṭaltā* are both younger than *qāṭaltā*. Both the older form *w^cqāṭaltā* and the younger *w^cqāṭaltā* were no doubt in use side by side, but the former, being contrary to the normal Hebrew accentuation, fell into desuetude, just as the preterite came to be accented as if it were the imperfect—*yāqtul*, in other words, was assimilated to *yāqtul*. The true accentuation of the Hebrew verb with *waw* consecutive (or to adopt a term which is altogether more appropriate 'waw conservative') is to be regarded, like the use of the tenses themselves, as a survival from the common proto-Semitic speech.

The origin of the *waw* itself is to be sought in Accadian. Here the conjunction *u* was used to connect nominal expressions generally including, since they were of nominal origin, the permansive forms of the verb, corresponding in function with the Hebrew perfect; while an enclitic *-ma* was used to connect a series of verbs. These two elements, *u* and *-ma*, are the prototypes of the two forms of consecutive *waw* in Hebrew, where

The Language of the Old Testament 381

-*ma* has become a proclitic.¹ Thus *u* with the permansive *qđıl* is identical with the Hebrew *waw* with the perfect (*w'qđal* or *uqđal*—the latter form is seen in *umāšal*, &c.), while -*ma* with the preterite *iqđul* is identical with *way-yiqđöl*. The doubling of the *yöd* in Hebrew is best explained as an attempt to maintain the original short *a* in an open syllable.

The proto-Semitic usage of *yáqđul* in narrative which, as we have seen, underlies the Hebrew *way-yiqđöl*, survives fully only in Accadian, which developed no perfect tense, but it can be traced in the west, not only in Hebrew, but also in Aramaic, Arabic, and Ethiopic; the narrative tense at Ras Shamra, too, was of the form *yqđl*. From Hebrew it disappeared gradually. Owing to the similarity of form the distinction between the eastern preterite *yáqđul* and the western imperfect *yaqđül* (distinguished in the strong verb only by the accent) was very early forgotten, and *yáqđul* became assimilated to the imperfect *yaqđül*—the preterite *way-yiqđöl* (accented according to the rules of the Massoretes, to whom the true pronunciation was lost) owed its accent to the imperfect *yiqđöl*, with which it was wrongly identified. The archaic constructions *way-yiqđöl* and *w'qđal* were dead by the Exile or soon after; subsequently, under increasing Aramaic influence, the constructions with weak *waw* gradually encroached upon the sphere formerly held by them. This process may be seen at its extreme in Qoheleth, where strong *waw* with the imperfect occurs only three times (i. 17, iv. 1, 7).

The recovery of the ancient Hebrew preterite tense provides a solution to another difficulty. In Hebrew poetry there occur some apparent imperfects without *waw* in reference to past time; they occur, too, after some particles. There can be little doubt that in these cases we have to do not with genuine

¹ The interchange of *m* and *w* is common; compare, for example, the Babylonian *amēlu* (*awēlu*), 'man', with the Hebrew *'ēwāl* (seen in *'Éwāl Merōdak*, 'man (servant) of Merodak'). Further examples may be found in Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (1908), i, p. 138.

382 *The Language of the Old Testament*

imperfect tenses but with survivals of the old preterite tense. A good example of the preterite standing alone is furnished by Exod. xv. 5—'The depths covered them (*y'kas'yūmū*—preterite) they sank down' (*yār'dū*—perfect), where the parallelism clearly indicates the preterite force of the first verb. A comparison of Job iii. 3 (*iwwāled*, 'I was born'—preterite) with Jer. xx. 14 (*yulladtī*, 'I was born'—perfect) is illuminating. With regard to those apparent imperfects which follow certain particles, it is enough to say that a Hebrew could as easily write 'āz *dibber* as 'āz *y'dabbēr*, 'then he spoke', where the latter is the preterite tense.

It may well be asked what the relation, if any, may be between this primitive preterite *yāqtul* and the jussive *yāqtul* (Accadian precativ (*lū*) *iqṭul*, Hebrew *yiqṭōl*, accented thus for the sake of the argument). They can hardly be identical forms, for it is highly improbable that the one form *yāqtul* could have had at the same time a preterite sense as well as a jussive (or precativ) and present-future significance. The only satisfactory explanation appears to be that the Accadian precativ and the Hebrew jussive are to be dissociated altogether from the preterite, and are to be derived directly from the imperative *quṭul* (which, it may be remarked, is posterior in time of development to the permansive *qaṭi/ul*, the original form of the Semitic verb, the form *qaṭal* being developed later). The imperative *quṭul* gave rise to the jussive *ya-quṭul* and a cohortative *a-quṭul* (which became *yāqtul* and *dāqtul* respectively). In other words, the first and third persons of the jussive are extensions of the imperative second person.

Reference was made earlier to the composite character of the language of the Tell el-Amarna letters. Here, too, we find traces of two verbal systems, e.g. *naṣrāku*, 'I protect(ed)', with the eastern ending, occurs side by side with *naṣrātī*, with the western ending (Hebrew *nāṣartī*); while in the preterite tense there is found besides *ikšud* (eastern form) the western forms *yikšudu* and *yakšudu* (the *ya-* of the latter probably being due to Amorite

The Language of the Old Testament 383

influence). Much more interesting and important, however, is the fact that in these letters *qatī'al* covers the whole range of meanings which the corresponding forms in Accadian and Hebrew bear, while *iqṭul* and *ya/iqṭul* correspond in meaning with the Accadian preterite *iqṭul* and the Hebrew imperfect *yiqṭōl*. The fact that in the language of these letters—the language, it should be remembered, of international relations in pre-Israelite Canaan—it is possible to trace a double verbal system drawn from east and west (to say nothing of the fact that sporadic traces of the eastern system are observable also in Aramaic and Arabic) considerably strengthens the case for the derivation of the Hebrew verbal system likewise from eastern and western sources.

Hebrew, during the thousand years or so of existence which it enjoyed in Palestine after the Conquest, must have undergone many changes. These changes are not easy to observe, at least in the pre-exilic period, for the Old Testament exhibits a uniformity of language which is deceiving. There is, first, what may be called a consonantal and vocalic uniformity. A consonantal system of writing, in which the vowels are not represented, is a poor instrument for the recording of language, especially of pronunciation. Hebrew and Moabite, for example, which, as is well known, are related dialects, employed a common consonantal system, yet to the ear they may have sounded very different. A consonantal system serves as a vehicle of thought, but it lacks 'voice'. The 'voice' we hear in the Old Testament in the vocalization of the Massoretes is not the ancient 'voice'; it gives us no idea as to how the texts were pronounced at the time of their composition—only how they were pronounced many centuries later in the synagogue. The Massoretic vocalization of the texts was largely, though not entirely, schematic. Deborah does not talk so very differently from Qoheleth, though well over a thousand years separate them. The Massoretes were themselves in a sense strangers to the text they strove to preserve;

384 *The Language of the Old Testament*

in consequence they sometimes destroyed—their uniform system, for example, has succeeded in levelling away most traces of dialectical variation. Again, we have to reckon with an editorial uniformity. The Old Testament material has been handed down largely through Judæan (Jerusalem) tradition, the greater part of it in post-exilic times. The influence of the language of Jerusalem may rightly be considered to be a factor in the final preparation of the sacred books. Hosea, for example, the work of a northerner, found its final editing in Jerusalem; and books like Deutero-Isaiah, composed in Babylon, and Job, with its strong 'Aramaico-Arabic' colouring, have shared the same experience and emerged with the mark of Jerusalem upon them.

Almost the only departures from this general uniformity which are observable in the Old Testament in the early period, apart from some comparatively minor grammatical points (such as the rarer use of the verbal suffixes and the more frequent introduction of the object by 'et, or the gradual disappearance of the distinction between *lāmed hē* and *lāmed 'ālep* verbs), are traces here and there of dialectical variations which the Massoretes have not succeeded in effacing. Some of these variations could be very ancient, while others would be of more recent date. The Ephraimites, it is well known, could not pronounce a *šin* (Judges xii. 6)—as in Arabic and Amorite *s* takes its place; while such forms as *ṣāḥaq* and *śāḥaq*, *'āšam* and *yāšam* and *šāmēm* point to a use of these variants in different localities. Infinitives like *hālōk* (for the more usual *leket*) and *'āšōh* (for *'āšōt*) are no doubt dialectical, while the K^ethibh *š'n* and *r'š* (Q^erē *šō'n* and *rō's*) point to a widespread pronunciation *šan* and *rāš* (cp. Arabic *ḍa'n*, *ra's*, and the Hebrew plural *rāšīm*, formed on the Aramaic or Arabic model). The Massoretic vocalization *y'rūšālam*, as compared with the K^ethibh *y'rūšālēm*, is suggestive (cp. the forms in the Tell el-Amarna letters *mēma*, *šamēma*, *lēl* with the Hebrew forms *mayim*, *šamayim*, *layil*). That traces of

The Language of the Old Testament 385

a northern dialect, related to Aramaic, are to be found in Judges, Kings, and Hosea is well established.¹

In the post-exilic period the outstanding change in the language is the approximation of Hebrew to Aramaic. More frequently now we meet with the ending *-ā* for *-āh*, with substantives having the terminations *-ān* and *-ūt*, with the use of the *scriptio plena* and the introduction of the direct object by *lāmed*; while the consecutive *waw*, as remarked above, is fast disappearing. Aramaic is to be found in all three parts of the Old Testament—in the Law, in Gen. xxxi. 47—two words put into the mouth of Laban, an Aramaean; in the Prophets, in Jer. x. 11, a verse of dubious origin and import; and in the Writings, in Ezra iv. 8—vi. 18, vii. 12–26, and Dan. ii. 4—viii. 28.

This language was widely diffused at an early date. The Old Testament knows of various Aramaean states (Damascus, Beth-Rehob, Zobah, &c.) which flourished as early as 1000 B.C. Aramaic endorsements are to be found on cuneiform tablets dating from the eighth century to the fifth B.C., while the inscriptions range from the eighth century B.C. to the third A.D. By the eighth century Aramaic had become the language of diplomacy. At this time the political leaders in Jerusalem were thoroughly familiar with it (2 Kings xviii. 26—where it is interesting to observe that the Rabshakeh could speak Hebrew). It became the official language throughout the western half of the Persian empire. Public documents (such as those found in Ezra) were written in it, and literary works, too, circulated in this language, as witness the Aramaic text of Ahiqar found at Elephantine. These Egyptian papyri illustrate further the use of Aramaic for propagandist purposes, for among them is preserved a fragment of an Aramaic version of Darius' inscription at Behistun.

¹ See C. F. Burney, *Book of Judges* (1920), p. 172 f., and *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (1903), by the same writer, p. 208 f.; and H. S. Nyberg, *Studien zum Hoseabuche* (1935), pp. 12, 22, 35, 43, 79, &c.

386 *The Language of the Old Testament*

It is, then, but natural to look for Aramaic influence on Hebrew in the period following 586 B.C., seeing that Palestine some fifty years later was incorporated in the Persian empire. That very strong influence was wielded by Aramaic in the later period is commonly recognized. It has, however, in the past been too readily assumed that Aramaic influence on Hebrew can have become operative only from the Babylonian or Persian period onwards. Very often the mere occurrence in an Old Testament book of Aramaic words or constructions has been sufficient for the book to have a late date assigned to it. The growing recognition that Hebrew was a mixed language, with an Aramaic element in it from the first, combined with a fuller appreciation of the wide diffusion of Aramaic at an early date has, however, shifted the emphasis from a consideration of later to earlier Aramaic influence in the Old Testament. And it need not be denied. Poetical words like 'ēnāš, 'man', 'ōrah, 'way', ḥāzāh, 'see', 'āṭāh, 'come', and such-like are best regarded not as late introductions into Hebrew from Aramaic, but as survivals of the early Aramaic speech of the Hebrews, which have been retained as archaisms by the poets of Israel. Reference has already been made to the presence of clear traces of a northern dialect, with a strong infusion of Aramaic, in some Old Testament books. In one of them, Hosea, further 'Aramaisms' have recently been recovered. The explanation of *yārēb* (v. 13), for example, as an Aramaizing form of *rābāb* or *rābāh*, so that *melek yārēb* is the Assyrian *šarru rabū*, 'great king' (the usual title of the Assyrian monarchs), in Aramaic guise, gets rid of a well-known difficulty.¹ The presence of an Aramaism like *y'ṭannū* (in Hebrew *y'ṭannū* would be the form) in so early a piece of literature as Judges v (ver. 11) cannot to-day be declared to be inconceivable, as it was some forty years ago.² The early

¹ See G. R. Driver, *Journ. of Theol. Studies* (hereafter *JTS*), xxxvi (1935), p. 295 f., where further Aramaisms are discussed.

² So G. F. Moore, *Judges* (ICC, 1895), p. 148.

The Language of the Old Testament 387

Aramaic speech of the Hebrews and the influence of neighbouring peoples, especially in the north, make early 'Aramaisms' in Hebrew not only possible but natural. The greatest caution, therefore, must be exercised in utilizing Aramaic elements in the Old Testament for the dating of the books or parts of books in which they occur.

A powerful impetus to the spread of Aramaic in Palestine was provided by the Assyrian deportations and the peopling of the depopulated districts by foreigners to whom Aramaic was a familiar language. Into Samaria, for example, after its fall in 721 B.C., was introduced a motley crowd of Aramaic-speaking folk (2 Kings xvii. 24). From this time onwards bilingualism in the north was probably common. In the south, in the same century, the people were unacquainted with it (2 Kings xviii. 26), but gradually it began to penetrate from the north into Judah. It may be an exaggeration, perhaps, to assert that by the time of the Exile most southerners were bilingual. Yet it may well be that a knowledge of Aramaic was more widespread in Judah in the days prior to the Exile than has sometimes been supposed.

Aramaic was not, therefore, introduced into Palestine by the returning exiles, among whom, it is sometimes thought, Hebrew was forgotten and supplanted by Aramaic. The writings of Deutero-Isaiah show that Hebrew was still their language late in the Exile. As their nomad ancestors had found Hebrew already in Palestine, so these returning exiles found Aramaic already entrenched there. Yet, after the Return, Hebrew continued to be the normal vehicle of expression, if we may judge from the literature which has survived. As the Persian period advances, however, a transitional stage is reached, as is evidenced by the Aramaic sections of Ezra. In this transitional period both languages would be equally well known, and it was perhaps an author's taste or some accidental circumstance which determined his choice of the one language or the other. Some later Hebrew

388 *The Language of the Old Testament*

books betray strong Aramaic influence, for example, Esther, Qoheleth (did the author think in Aramaic?), and some Psalms, e.g. ciii, cxii, cxxxix, and cxliv. The real extent of Aramaic influence can be seen in Daniel, a book intended for popular reading. In the Maccabaeon period Hebrew as a spoken language was all but dead, and Aramaic was well on its way to becoming the vernacular of Palestine. The penetration of Aramaic was, as we have seen, gradual, and no doubt in some places it displaced Hebrew even earlier—in Jerusalem in Nehemiah's time Hebrew was with difficulty being kept alive (Neh. xiii. 24).¹ Yet in some remoter corners of the land doubtless it continued to be spoken. As the language of religion and learning it lived on and even developed—some three decades only before the Book of Daniel was composed good Hebrew could still be written by the cultured Ben Sira, and the Mishna exhibits grammatical phenomena which, though unknown to classical Hebrew, may be regarded as genuine developments from the ancient language.

Aramaic, then, triumphed, but it could not escape the influence of the language which it had ousted. It has long been known that in Biblical Aramaic there are 'Hebraisms', but greater attention is now being given to the fact that they are not all of a kind. First, there may be distinguished 'Canaanisms', i.e. survivals from the Canaanite stratum (exhibiting the characteristic Canaanite vowel *ā*) which penetrated into common Aramaic, for example, *ribbō*, 'myriad' (Dan. vii. 10), *ḥāšōkā*, 'darkness' (Dan. ii. 22), and substantives with the termination *-ōn*, as in *dikrōn*, 'record' (Ezra vi. 2), which occurs side by side with *dokrān* (Ezra iv. 15). Then there are pure 'Hebraisms', which Aramaic in Palestine took over from Hebrew; these

¹ The precise significance of *'āšdōdī* in this passage is uncertain. It may be an Aramaic or some other local Semitic dialect. It is possible, however, that the term may indicate that even so late as this there was preserved at Ashdod a dialect which was still in some way distinctly 'Philistine'.

The Language of the Old Testament 389

are mainly religious terms like 'elyōn, 'Most High' (Dan. vii. 18, &c.), ḥānukkāh, 'dedication' (Ezra vi. 16, &c.), ḥattāyā, 'sin-offering' (Ezra vi. 17). Further, false 'Hebraisms' may be detected. These were introduced into Aramaic, either through ignorance or carelessness, by those who were accustomed to the reading of Hebrew, for example, the vowel qāmeṣ for šērē in rāšēhōm (Ezra v. 10). To this category belong, too, forms ending in -īm in place of the usual -in (Ezra iv. 13; Dan. iv. 14, vii. 10).¹

Much has been written in defence of the traditional dating of the Book of Daniel and much against it. As between a date in the Babylonian period and a later date the battle may be said to be over as far as linguistic considerations are concerned, for the most important result of recent study of the Aramaic sections of Daniel (and Ezra) has been the successful delimiting of the period within which this type of Aramaic could have arisen. A comparison of Biblical Aramaic with other known Aramaic dialects has established the position of Biblical Aramaic somewhere between the Aramaic of the papyri (fifth century B.C.) and that of the Nabataean and Palmyrene inscriptions and the Targums.²

The evidence of the consonantal mutations which can be traced in the history of the language is important. An example may be given. Usually when the Hebrew šāḏē corresponds with the Arabic ḏād (as in 'ereṣ, 'land', Arabic 'arḏ) Aramaic has 'ayin (so 'ar'd). The Aramaic of Ezra and Daniel, together with that of the Nabataean and Palmyrene inscriptions, exhibits this normal usage, while the older Aramaic, instead of 'ayin, has qōp. In Ezra v. 17, for example, we find r'ūṭ, 'will, pleasure' (cp. Hebrew rāṣāh); in the Hadad inscription from Zenjirli (eighth century) the form 'rḡw (from rḡy, 'be pleased') is found, while

¹ See H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (1927), p. 10 f.

² The whole subject should be studied in H. H. Rowley, *The Aramaic of the Old Testament* (1929), to which the present writer is greatly indebted.

390 *The Language of the Old Testament*

the Bar-Rekub inscription (from the same century) has 'arqā, 'land', for 'ar'ā. Jer. x. 11 is highly interesting in that in the same verse we meet both the older form 'arqā and the younger 'ar'ā; these two forms interchange also in the papyri, but the older form predominates. The transition from qōp to 'ayin is observable, then, in the papyri; it is quite complete before the appearance of the texts of Ezra and Daniel, which know nothing of the older form with qōp.

An examination of other consonantal equations leads to the same result—Biblical Aramaic almost without exception differs from the older Aramaic and normally agrees with the Aramaic of the later sources. Its accidence, too, points in the same direction; for example, the suffix of the third person masculine to the masculine plural noun appears in the older Aramaic as -yh or -wh; in Biblical Aramaic it is -ôhî, as it is in the papyri, Nabataean, Palmyrene, and usually in the Targums. Syntactical agreement as between Biblical Aramaic and Nabataean can be seen in the prefixing of *lamed* by both to the name of the king (or reign) in dates (e.g. Ezra iv. 24, v. 13), whereas in Babylonian Aramaic either no preposition is employed (and this usage agrees with that of the papyri), or the preposition *bêt* is used. Agreement with the Targums is seen in the fact that Biblical Aramaic construes verbs expressing ideas of possibility, permission, wish, command, &c., with *lamed* and the infinitive (e.g. Ezra vii. 24; Dan. ii. 10, 12); the usage of Nabataean and Palmyrene fluctuates on this point.

It is impossible to furnish an absolute date for Biblical Aramaic. Perhaps the most that can be said is that it is not necessarily very much earlier than the Aramaic of the Nabataean and Palmyrene inscriptions. As for the comparative dates of the Aramaic of Ezra and Daniel, the evidence hardly allows a precise differentiation in time. On the whole it may be said that the Aramaic of Daniel exhibits later usage to a more marked degree than does that of Ezra. If Biblical Aramaic is not earlier than the fourth

The Language of the Old Testament 391

century B.C., and it probably is not, then the Aramaic of Ezra may be assigned to this, or the following, century. As far as Daniel is concerned, it may be held, to state it in negative terms, that the evidence of the Aramaic sections of it does not stand in the way of a Maccabaeon date for the composition of the book—the presence of Greek words in it even makes such a dating probable. Though the linguistic study of Biblical Aramaic has not indeed shown Daniel to be certainly Maccabaeon, it has proved conclusively that the Aramaic of the book does not belong to the period of Nebuchadnezzar.¹

Recent years have seen an extraordinary advance in the recovery of the vocabulary of the Hebrew language. It can be safely assumed that so small a literature as the Old Testament—and a carefully selected and edited one at that—can preserve only in part the richness of the living language. Countless writings, both secular and religious, have perished; the names of some of these lost books are known from the Old Testament itself (see, for example, Num. xxi. 14; 2 Sam. i. 18; 1 Kings xiv. 19, 29; 2 Chron. xii. 15). Again, epigraphic study attests the use of words which are unknown to classical Hebrew—for example, on the Siloam inscription two such words are found, viz. *niqbāh* (or *noqbāh*), 'tunnel' (line 1), and *ziddāh*, 'fissure' (line 3—if this be the correct vocalization and translation); and from the Gezer calendar-inscription (line 3) may be recovered the word *'eṣed* (or *'āṣād*), 'cutting or hoeing up' (cp. *ma'āṣād*, 'axe', in Jer. x. 3; Isa. xlv. 12). Further, we may not assume that ἀπαξ λεγόμενα in the Old Testament were only infrequently used in the spoken language. The rare occurrence of these words in Hebrew may well be purely accidental. At any rate some of them are now appearing in a 'Hebrew' dialect on the tablets from Ras Shamra.

¹ Nor, probably, to his terrain, since the Aramaic is held by some to be of the western type, though others are not agreed that eastern and western Aramaic can be differentiated as early as this. See R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (1929), pp. lxxix–lxxx.

392 *The Language of the Old Testament*

The word *šēšim*, for example, occurs in the Old Testament only in Isa. iii. 18, where it is translated 'cauls' (R.V. margin 'networks'). The true meaning is, however, 'sun-ornaments', made of glass or metal, for at Ras Shamra *špš* (the form there for *šemeš*) bore this meaning; with this may be compared the Arabic *šamsu*, 'sun', which also means a kind of woman's ornament of the pendant or necklace type (in the same verse we meet with *šahārônîm*, 'moon-ornaments').¹ In Isa. xxvii. 1 again Leviathan is described as a 'swift (*bārîḥ*) and crooked (*ʿāqallātôn*) serpent', the word *ʿāqallātôn* occurring only here in the Old Testament. It is extremely interesting to find that on the Ras Shamra tablets these two same epithets are used of a creature called *ltn*, perhaps the most ancient form of the word *liwʿyātān* known.² Then there are those elements in the Mishna already referred to, which, though unknown to the Old Testament, are genuinely Hebraic. That Hebrew did in fact possess a far richer vocabulary than has hitherto been thought has been amply proved by comparative Semitic philology, which has already achieved enough to render the current lexica inadequate. More and more words which may be regarded as descended from a common Semitic stock, and which may be assumed therefore to have been at one time current in Hebrew, are being recovered. The study of the vocabulary of the Old Testament, as has been already indicated, sends the investigator back once more to a consideration of all those heterogeneous elements of which Hebrew is composed.

Some illustration may now be given of this recovery of lost Hebrew words. First, attention may be drawn to some common Hebrew words in which two distinct roots, owing to their identity of spelling, have become merged. The root *ḏbr*, for example, commonly means 'speak', but in several passages where 'speak' makes poor sense another root *ḏbr* is to be detected,

¹ J. W. Jack, *The Ras Shamra Tablets* (Old Testament Studies, No. 1), 1935, p. 45.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 45-6.

The Language of the Old Testament 393

which is cognate with the Accadian *dabāru*, 'overthrow' (*dub-buru* or *duppuru*, 'drive away'; Arabic 'adbara, 'follow after', i.e. pursue the back of any one). This meaning 'drive out, overthrow' may be seen in such examples as *wat-ʿdabbēr* in 2 Chron. xxii. 10 (the parallel passage 2 Kings xi. 1, which has a different word—*wat-ʿabbēd*, 'and she destroyed'—supports this meaning),¹ and *bʿdabbʾrō* (Song of Songs v. 6), 'when he turned his back (on me)'.² Again, *rūm* means 'be high', but another root, cognate with the Arabic *rāma*, 'desire, wish', is to be seen in a few passages; for example, in Prov. xxix. 4 'if *ʿrūmōt* is not 'he that exacteth gifts' (as in the R.V., which thought of *ʿrūmāh*, 'contribution, offering') but 'a man of desires', i.e. a covetous person;³ while the proper name Miriam, 'the desired one', is to be derived from the same root.⁴ With the root *šānāh*, 'change', has been merged another, cognate with the Arabic *saniya*, 'become high, exalted in rank'. Hereby is explained *šōnīm* in Prov. xxiv. 21, which means not 'them that are given to change', as the English versions have it, but 'those of high rank'.⁵ In Prov. v. 9 *ʿnōtʾkā* is parallel with *hōdʾkā*, 'honour'; obviously it is connected with the same root and means 'dignity'.⁶ The discovery of this root in Hebrew provides a solution to a difficult phrase in the Ras Shamra tablets, where the word *šny* in the imperative is followed by *pīkem*, 'your mouth'; clearly the correct translation is 'lift up your mouth (voice)'.⁷

Hardly any word is of more common occurrence in Hebrew than *yādaʾ*, 'know'. Once again two distinct roots must be recognized, the common verb 'know' and the rarer *yādaʾ* cognate

¹ G. R. Driver, *JTS*, xxvii (1926), p. 159 f. Cp. further xxxii (1931), p. 250 f.; and *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (hereafter *ZAW*) Bd. lii (1934), p. 55 f.

² See G. R. Driver, *JTS*, xxxi (1930), p. 284.

³ D. W. Thomas, *ibid.*, xxxviii (1937), p. 403.

⁴ H. Bauer, *ZAW*, Bd. liii (1935), p. 59.

⁵ D. W. Thomas, *ibid.*, Bd. lii (1934), p. 236 f.

⁶ D. W. Thomas, *ibid.*, Bd. lv (1937), p. 174 f.

⁷ J. A. Montgomery, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, lv, No. 1, p. 90.

394 *The Language of the Old Testament*

with the Arabic *wadu'a*, 'was still, quiet, humiliated'. A good example of the latter is seen in Judges xvi. 9, where, after Samson's exploit in breaking the withes that bound him, it is said *w'lō' nōda' kōhō*, 'and his strength was not known' (as translated in the English versions). But, of course, by his exploit his strength *was* known; what the text actually says is—'his strength was not brought low' (as the Peshitto version recognizes).¹ The phrase 'acquainted with grief' (Isa. liii. 3) is hal-
lowed by tradition, but the Hebrew phrase *y'dā' hōlī* is probably more correctly translated 'humbled, disciplined by grief'²—a translation, incidentally, which finds confirmation in Jewish tradition. Underlying the word *da'tō*, too, in verse 11, which is extremely difficult on the assumption that it is connected with *yāda'*, 'know', is this same root—'he shall be sated with his humiliation', a translation which accords well with the general characterization in the Servant Songs of the Servant's degradation and submission to his martyr's fate.³

Once it is recognized that Hebrew possessed a root *šamar*, 'rage' (Accadian *šamāru*), as well as the more common one with the meaning 'keep', the word *šmārāh* in Amos i. 11 is at once explained—'and his wrath raged for ever' (reading *šam'rāh*). With these two roots may be compared *nāṭar*, 'keep', and *nāṭar* (Accadian *nadāru*), 'be angry', the latter occurring in Jer. iii. 12 and elsewhere, while *šamar* and *nāṭar* occur together in the sense of 'be angry' in Jer. iii. 5.⁴ How parallelism can be restored when a word is properly recognized is illustrated in Isa. xli. 14, where the word *m'tē* has nothing to do with *mat*, 'man' (Accadian *mutu*, Ethiopic *met*), but is the Accadian *mutu*, 'louse'—'ye lice of Israel' stands in parallelism with 'thou worm Jacob'.⁵

Secondly, the recovery of forgotten Hebrew roots has shed

¹ D. W. Thomas, *JTS*, xxxv (1934), p. 302.

² G. R. Driver, *ibid.*, xxxviii (1937), p. 49.

³ D. W. Thomas, *ibid.*, xxxviii (1937), p. 404 f.

⁴ G. R. Driver, *ibid.*, xxxii (1931), p. 361 f.

⁵ G. R. Driver, *ibid.*, xxxvi (1935), p. 399.

The Language of the Old Testament 395

fresh light on some well-known difficulties. The phrase *b'rît 'ām* (Isa. xlii. 6), for example, has presented great difficulty to those exegetes who have assumed that *b'rît* here is the common word meaning 'covenant' (from *bārāh*, Assyrian *barû*, 'bind', *birîtu*, 'treaty, covenant'). A comparison with the Accadian *barāru*, 'shine', however, shows its true meaning—'splendour of the people' is parallel with 'a light of the nations'.¹ In Ps. xxii. 17, again, it is probable that the difficult *kā'ārî* (English versions 'they pierced') is to be taken as a verb in the third person plural and referred to the Accadian *kāru*, 'lop off, shear', the spelling being an Aramaized form of *kārû* (cp. *rā'āmāh* in Zech. xiv. 10 for *rāmāh*).² Underlying the enigmatic '*ēr w'ōneh*' (Mal. ii. 12)—variously translated in the English and ancient versions—are two Arabic words—'*āra*' (Hebrew '*ūr*'), 'be a vagabond' (cp. '*ayir*', 'wild ass'), and *ghaniya* (Hebrew '*ānāh*'), 'stayed in a place' (cp. *w'ānāh* in Isa. xiii. 22 in the same sense); the meaning 'gad-about and stay-at-home' is then one of those all-inclusive terms which Hebrew sometimes employs (e.g. '*ōhēr wāšāb*', 'passer-by and returner', to include every wayfarer)—in this case it will comprehend all the members of a family or class—the Esaus and the Jacobs.³ In Ps. cxxxvii. 5 some have felt that an object to *tiškāh*, 'forget', is necessary, and have variously emended the text in order to produce one. The Arabic *kasiha*, however, meaning 'was crippled, paralysed' (if we may assume that the Hebrew *šākāh* has arisen by metathesis from *kāšāh*), suggests what may be the true meaning and makes emendation unnecessary.⁴ 'The Lord is my strength and song' (Exod. xv. 2) are words with a familiar ring, but they probably do not represent the original meaning of the Hebrew. It is likely that *zimrāt* here has nothing to do with the common word *zāmar* meaning 'sing', but

¹ H. Torczyner—cited in *ZAW*, Bd. liv (1936), p. 134.

² G. R. Driver, *HTHR*, xxix, No. 3 (July, 1936), p. 175.

³ G. R. Driver, *Occident and Orient* (ed. B. Schindler and A. Marmorstein), 1936, p. 80 f.

⁴ S. Eitan, *Journal of Biblical Literature* (hereafter *JBL*), xlvii (1928), p. 193 f.

396 *The Language of the Old Testament*

is to be derived from a totally different word cognate with the Arabic *damara*, 'protect'. Nor is 'ozzi connected with 'āzaz, 'be strong', but with the Arabic *ghāzi(n)*, 'warrior' (*ghazā*, 'go forth to war'); the Hebrew root will then be 'āzāh. The translation should, therefore, run—'Protector and warrior is Yah'.¹

Thirdly, many new additions to the Hebrew vocabulary are being made as a result of the intensive study of the ancient versions, especially of the Septuagint,² which frequently presupposes Hebrew words which are only explicable by reference to one or other of the Semitic languages, more particularly to Arabic. 'Arabisms' in the Septuagint have, of course, been suspected before now, and indeed some have already been recovered. Recently, however, the extent to which the Septuagint translators could 'Arabize' has gradually become more apparent. A few examples may be given. Reference has already been made to *w*'ānāh in Isa. xiii. 22; the Septuagint translation of it by *κατοικήσουσι* shows that the Greek translators were familiar with a Hebrew word 'ānāh in the sense of the Arabic *ghaniya*, 'stay in a place'.³ In Ps. xxv. 14 the rendering of *sōd* by *κραταίωμα* points to the Arabic *sūdu*, 'chieftaincy';⁴ while in Lam. iv. 15 *nāṣū*, translated by *ἀνήφθησαν*, goes back to the Arabic *naṣā*, 'was joined'.⁵

How are these 'Arabizing' renderings to be explained? It is not to be supposed that the Septuagint translators had any know-

¹ D. W. Thomas, *Expository Times*, xlviii (1937), p. 478. Cp. T. H. Gaster, *ibid.*, xlviii (1936), p. 45.

² The method of F. X. Wutz, which aims at the recovery of lost roots on the assumption that the Septuagint translators had before them not a Hebrew consonantal text, but a transcription text written in Greek letters, has not met with general approval from scholars, although as a method of research it can hardly be pronounced to be altogether untenable. His chief works are *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus* (1925 f.); *Die Psalmen textkritisch untersucht* (1925); and *Systematische Wege von der Septuaginta zum hebräischen Urtext*, Teil I (1937).

³ G. R. Driver, *JBL*, lv, pt. ii (1936), p. 104 f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

⁵ G. R. Driver, *ZAW*, Bd. lii (1934), p. 308.

The Language of the Old Testament 397

ledge of Arabic, any more than had Ben Sira's grandson, who frequently 'Arabizes' when translating his grandfather's work. On the contrary, it can only be assumed that these words originally belonged to the common stock of the Semitic languages, and that they formed at one time part of the Hebrew vocabulary, but that their meaning was generally lost, to be retained only by the Egyptian Jews, and traceable to-day only through the medium of Arabic. In the same way must be explained those renderings in the Septuagint which presuppose other Semitic languages. In Isa. xlviii. 10, for example, *ḥraptikā* is translated *πέπρακα*, which indicates that Hebrew possessed a word *ḥarap*, 'buy', cognate with the Accadian *sarāpu* (cp. Arabic *ṣarafa*);¹ the same conclusion must be drawn with regard to *m'ṭāh* (Dan. vii. 22) in the sense of the Ethiopic *matawa*, 'gave',² and *rō'i* (Isa. xlv. 28) in the sense of the Syriac *r'ā'*,³ 'thought'—the former is translated *ἐδόθη* and the latter *φροεῖν*. The significance of these Septuagint renderings for the relation between the Hebrew and Greek texts will be referred to later.

Perhaps no ancient Semitic language has absorbed foreign elements to the same extent as has Aramaic. For Biblical Aramaic we have to take account of Accadian, Persian, and Greek. The difficult *'app'ṭōm* (Ezra iv. 13), hitherto explained from Persian or Greek, is best connected with the Accadian *appitti* or *abbitti-ma*, 'suddenly' (so is explained the *dāgeš* in the *pē*, since it represents a doubled *p* in Accadian).⁴ The word *pitgāmā* (Ezra iv. 17, &c.) has been commonly taken as Persian with the meaning 'command, word', though attempts to connect it with the Greek *φθέγμα* or *ἀπόφθεγμα* have in the past been made. Recently the suggestion that the Aramaic word represents *ἐπίταγμα*, 'royal decree' (already made by Vatke in 1886),⁵

¹ G. R. Driver, *JTS*, xxxvi (1935), p. 83.

² G. R. Driver, *JBL*, lv, pt. ii (1936), p. 102.

³ G. R. Driver, *JTS*, xxxvi (1935), p. 82.

⁴ G. R. Driver, *ibid.*, xxxii (1931), p. 364.

⁵ See his *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 63.

398 *The Language of the Old Testament*

has been put forward¹ and may well be the true explanation. Apart from *pitgāmā'* only three other words in Biblical Aramaic can with certainty be regarded as directly borrowed from Greek; these are the names of musical instruments in Daniel—*qatrōs* (so Q^ere: the K^ethibh has *qytr̄s*) (κίθαρῆς), *p'santērīn* (ψαλτήριον), and *sūmpōnyāh* (συμφωνία).²

In addition to Persian and Greek the Old Testament student must take account of yet other non-Semitic languages, more especially of Egyptian, Sumerian, and, so far as the present state of knowledge allows, of Hittite.³ Though the Egyptian god Ra is not certainly to be seen in *kī rā'āh neged p'nēkem*⁴ (Exod. x. 10), there can be little doubt that *'ārōt* (Isa. xix. 7), which occurs in an oracle against Egypt in which several Egyptian words have already been detected (e.g. *y'ōr*, 'the Nile', *sūp*, 'reeds', *šātōteyā*, 'her weavers'), is correctly identified with the Egyptian 'r, 'rush'⁵ (the Septuagint renders by ἄχτι, itself an Egyptian word, occurring in Hebrew in the form *'āhū*, Gen. xli. 2, &c.). That Hebrew could rightly transliterate the Egyptian *ms*, 'son', is clearly shown in *ra'amsēs* (Exod. i. 11, &c., with *sāmekh*); it is all the more curious, therefore, that the name Moses, hitherto connected with *ms*, is spelt with a *šin*. The *šin*, however, is explained if his name is connected not with *ms*, but with the title *Shu*, 'brilliance, dazzling light', which is of frequent occurrence in Egyptian; his name or one of his titles was perhaps *mi* or *ma Shu*, 'like Shu' or 'like the Shining Sun' (cf. Exod. xxxiv. 29, 30, 35).⁶ That some Hebrew words can be traced back to a Sumerian origin cannot be denied, e.g. *hēkal*, 'palace,

¹ By A. E. Cowley, *JTS*, xxx (1929), p. 54 f., apparently quite independently of Vatke's proposal.

² For the problem of Greek words in Daniel see H. H. Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 147 f.

³ A useful account of the Hittite languages may be found in L. Delaporte, *Les Hittites* (1936), p. 302 f., where see also the bibliography, p. 356 f.

⁴ J. Bloch, *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, xvi (1932), p. 57.

⁵ T. W. Thacker, *JTS*, xxxiv (1933), p. 163 f.

⁶ J. R. Towers, *ibid.*, xxxvi (1935), p. 407 f.

The Language of the Old Testament 399

temple' (Sumerian *E*, 'house' and *GAL*, 'great'), and *mallāh*, 'sailor' (Sumerian *MA*, 'ship', and *LAKH*, 'to go'), but whether there is any ultimate linguistic connexion between Sumerian and some of the primitive bilaterals which undoubtedly underlie Semitic trilateral roots can hardly be determined with certainty at present. A comparison, for example, between the Sumerian *BAR.PAR* (standing in syllabaries for *barāru*, 'shine', *namāru*, 'be bright') and the Hebrew *bārar*, 'make bright', is, however, suggestive. An interesting example in Hebrew of linguistic syncretism, involving a Sumerian element, is to be seen in *šib'atayim*, 'sevenfold', which is derived from the Canaanite *šibe/itān*, which is a conflate from the Accadian *sibi*, 'seven', and the Sumerian *TA.AM*, which has a distributive force.¹

This essay may close with a few brief remarks on some points which seem to stand out clearly as a result of modern comparative study of the language of the Old Testament and the emergence of Hebrew as a mixed language. First, it is apparent that the language of the Old Testament can no longer be studied in isolation. Just as the history and religion of Israel can be properly studied only against a background of ancient oriental antiquity, so her language, too, will be understood only when it takes its place among the languages of the ancient Near East. Time was when the Old Testament scholar found only Arabic available for the illustration of Hebrew. Then came the decipherment of the Assyrian and Babylonian cuneiform, and new horizons at once came into view. The serious student of the language of the Old Testament, however, cannot to-day rely only upon Arabic and Accadian in his attempts to explain Hebrew—he must draw on all those languages, Semitic and non-Semitic, of that ancient world of which Palestine formed a part. Only so can those heterogeneous elements of which we have seen Hebrew to be composed be disentangled and Hebrew more fully understood. Moreover, the philologist's task does not

¹ G. R. Driver, *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System*, p. 99, n. 12.

400 *The Language of the Old Testament*

begin and end with the study of these ancient languages. Philological study, if it is to be really fruitful, must ally itself with a more intensive study of the history, culture, and psychology of the peoples whose languages are under review.

It would hardly seem necessary to refer to the significance for the exegesis of the Old Testament of the steady advance that is being made in Semitic philology were it not that it is too often forgotten that the Old Testament is a volume of Semitic literature, written in a Semitic language by men accustomed to employ Semitic modes of thought and expression. True exegesis of the Old Testament has no sure foundation if it be not based upon a sound philological knowledge of the language of it. Exegesis and philology must proceed *pari passu*. The Hebrew text will yield up its true meaning only to the trained philologist. The exegete, if he is rightly to comprehend and interpret these Semitic modes of thought and expression, must needs be, like the pure philologist, an orientalist. Upon sound principles of textual criticism and philology the whole structure of theological study of the Old Testament must rest.

Comparative philology has played its part in bringing about of late a welcome reaction against the excessive emendation of the Massoretic text which has been noticeable in so much work in the past. Corrupt texts of course there are—the transmission of the Hebrew text makes their existence inevitable; and we may well wonder to what extent Hebrew grammar has been artificially complicated by them. Yet once it is recognized that Hebrew is a mixed language, seemingly corrupt or impossible forms will frequently find their explanation in some other Semitic language. What, for example, could appear more impossible than a form like *tābō'tāh*, 'she comes' (Deut. xxxiii. 16; cp. Job xxii. 21), presumably a *forma mixta*, composed of the perfect and imperfect tenses? Yet the Tell el-Amarna letters not infrequently exhibit such hybrid forms, for example, *tašapparta*, 'thou sendest', and especially frequently in forms like *ibašat*, 'she is',

The Language of the Old Testament 401

and *ibašati*, 'I am', where in all three examples the affirmative is that of the permansive, while the preformative is that of the preterite. The Hebrew form may therefore be regarded as a further example of an archaism retained in poetry. The mixed character of Hebrew is making it increasingly difficult to designate Hebrew forms and constructions as impossible. If Hebrew is a mixed language, what is possible Accadian, Aramaic, Arabic, and so on cannot be ruled out as also possible Hebrew. Hebrew grammars are far too full of unexplained forms—a label too frequently appears as a substitute for an explanation. It must be regarded as the first business of the Old Testament linguist to explain by comparative philology the forms he finds in Hebrew, and not, save in the last resort, to emend. Emendation is based upon the false assumption that all that can be known of Hebrew *is* known—it perpetuates the known as the norm by which language is gauged. Comparative philology, however, adventures into the unknown, and discovers new criteria by which language can be adjudged possible or impossible.

This revolt against emendation of the Hebrew text has restored the reputation of the Massoretic Text—a reputation which has been strengthened further by the study of the ancient Versions, especially of the Septuagint. Great caution must be exercised before apparent divergencies in the Septuagint text are accepted as real divergencies, representing a totally different text from the Massoretic Text. The examples given above of some Septuagint renderings of some words in Isaiah, Psalms, and Lamentations—where the Greek translators 'Arabize', 'Accadize', and so on—are significant for the evidence they afford that the Septuagint translations in these passages do not represent a different Hebrew text, as is sometimes thought to be the case, but on the contrary presuppose a text identical with the Massoretic Text.¹

¹ Reference may be made to J. Ziegler's *Untersuchungen zur LXX des Buches Jesaja* (1934), where it is clearly shown that the Hebrew text underlying the Septuagint text is practically identical with that of the Massoretic Text.

402 *The Language of the Old Testament*

It cannot be denied, of course, that the Septuagint text frequently does diverge from the Massoretic Text, and that sometimes its divergency represents a text superior to that of the Massoretic Text, which it must be admitted is not of uniform worth throughout the Old Testament. Yet it may safely be said that comparative philology and the study of the Versions are steadily combining to show that the Hebrew Old Testament preserves in general the most reliable record of the revelation of God to ancient Israel, and must constitute the starting-point for the study of it.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE HEBREW WORD רֵעֵן

BY

D. WINTON THOMAS

Cambridge

There are twenty occurrences of the adjective רֵעֵן in the Old Testament, and they are distributed over all four parts of the Hebrew Bible. It occurs once in the Pentateuch (Deut. xii 2), three times in the Former Prophets (1 Kings xiv 23; 2 Kings xvi 4, xvii 10), nine times in the Latter Prophets (Isa. lvii 5; Jer. ii 20, iii 6, 13, xi 16, xvii 2, 8; Ezek. vi 13; Hos. xiv 9), and seven times in the Writings (Ps. xxxvii 35, lii 10, xcii 11, 15; Cant. i 16; Dan. iv 1; 2 Chr. xxviii 4 = 2 Kings xvi 4). In fourteen instances tree is the subject—רֵעֵן (Hos. xiv 9), זֵית (Jer. xi 16; Ps. lii 10), אֶזְרָח ('native' (tree)? Ps. xxxvii 5, *v. infra*), עֵץ (Jer. xvii 2), and frequently in the phrase תַּחַת כֵּל-עֵץ רֵעֵן, descriptive of a place where idolatrous rites were practised (Deut. xii 2; 1 Kings xiv 23; 2 Kings xvi 4 = 2 Chr. xxviii 4; 2 Kings xvii 10; Jer. ii 20, iii 6, 13; Isa. lvii 5; Ezek. vi 13). The adjective is applied to leaves (עֵלֶה) in Jer. xvii 8, and to a couch (פֶּרֶשׁ) ¹ in Cant. i 16. The passages in which it is applied to oil (שֶׁמֶן, Ps. xcii 11) and to persons (Ps. xcii 15; Dan. iv 1) will be referred to later. The verb רֵעַן, with 'branch' (בִּקְעָה) as subject is found only in Job xv 32. In this article we shall record the renderings of the Hebrew word found in the chief ancient versions, the renderings of the Authorised and Revised Versions, and the Revised Standard Version, and of Luther's Bible, as well as some interpretations of the word offered by rabbinical authorities. We shall then review briefly the form of the word רֵעֵן and some philological explanations of it which have been proposed. Finally we shall suggest another explanation which, so far as I am aware, has not been advanced hitherto.

¹ For the possibility that עֵרֶשׁ here means 'arbour, espalier' (of grape vines)—cf. עֵרֶשׁ Mishn. Kil. vi. 1—see W. FEILCHENFELD, *Das Hohelied inhaltlich u. sprachlich erläutert*, p. 20; R. GORDIS, *The Song of Songs*, p. 80. Contra K. BUDDE, *Die fünf Megillot*, p. 6, who thinks that רֵעֵן as an epithet of 'couch' presents difficulties, and accordingly, but unnecessarily, emends the text.

First then the renderings of the ancient versions. In addition to Ps. xcii 11, 15 and Dan. iv 1, to which we shall refer later (*supra*), Ps. xxxvii 35 will also be left on one side for the moment. The LXX in Deut. xii 2 and Isa. lvii 5 renders by *δασύς* 'thick with leaves.' In 1 Kings xiv 23, Ezek. vi 13, and Cant. i 16 *σύσκιος* 'shady' is found, and in Jer. ii 20 *κατάσκιος* and in xi 16 *εὔσκιος*, with like meaning. In six passages the word is translated by *ἄλσώδης* 'woody, thickly leaved' (2 Kings xvi 4, xvii 10; Jer. iii 6, 13, xvii 8; 2 Chr. xxviii 4), and by *κατάκαρπος* 'fruitful' in Ps. lii 10. In two passages (Hos. xiv 9; Job xv 32) the verb *πυκαζω* 'cover thickly' is found. Jer. xvii 2 is wanting in the LXX. In the Minor Greek Versions *רענן* is translated *εὐθαλής* 'flourishing, thriving' in the following passages—Aquila in Deut. xii 2; 2 Kings xvii 10; Isa. lvii 5 (also Symmachus and Theodotion); Jer. iii 6, xi 16; Hos. xiv 9; Job xv 32 (also Theodotion; Symmachus *εὐθαλήσει*), and Cant. i 16; Symmachus Ezek. vi 13; Ps. lii 10.

The Vulgate translates by *frondosus* 'leafy' in Deut. xii 2; 1 Kings xiv 23; 2 Kings xvi 4; Isa. lvii 5; Jer. ii 20, iii 6, 13, and 2 Chr. xxviii 4, and by *frondens* in Jer. xvii 2. *Nemorosus* 'woody, thickly leaved' occurs in 2 Kings xvii 10 and Ezek. vi 13, *viridis* 'green' in Jer. xvii 8 (in Hos. xiv 9 *virens*), *fructifera* 'fruitful' in Ps. lii 10¹⁾, *uber* 'fruitful, abundant' in Jer. xi 16, *floridus* 'flowery, flourishing' in Cant. i 16, and in Job. xv 32 *רַעֲנָה לֹא* is rendered *arescent* 'become dry.'

The Targum renders throughout by *עבויף* 'densely covered, thick with leaves' (fem. *עבויפֿיא*,²⁾ Job. xv 32).³⁾ In the Peshitta *حصب* 'thickly grown, leafy, shady' is found nine times (1 Kings xiv 23; 2 Kings xvi 4, xvii 10; Jer. ii 20, iii 6, 13, xi 16, xvii 2; Hos. xiv 9), *حاص* 'thick, dense,' in Isa. lvii 5, *حجل* 'giving shade, shady' in Deut. xii 2; Ezek. vi 13, *سور* 'flourishing, thriving' in Jer. xvii 8, *محتفل* 'celebrated, glorious' in Ps. lii 10, *نحتف* 'find'⁴⁾ in

¹⁾ Jerome *virens* (J. M. HARDEN, *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi*, p. 63).

²⁾ J. LEVY, *Chald. Wörterb. über die Targumim*, II, p. 197.

³⁾ The Targum at Jer. xi. 16 for *חַס פְּרִי-תֶאֱדָר* has *הָא כְּאִילָן וְיָתָא* 'Behold, like an olive-tree beautiful in its appearance, and fair in its looks, whose branches give shade among the trees.'

⁴⁾ The M.T.'s *וּכְפָתוֹ לֹא רַעֲנָה* is translated *لَا نَحْتِفُ* 'and his hands shall not find' (*נַחֲטִיף* = *נָחִיף*; Vulgate *manus eius*).

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE HEBREW WORD רֵעַן 389

Job. xv 32, רֵעַן 'lovely, pleasing' in 2 Chr. xxviii 4, and רֵעַן 'dense, shaded by thick foliage' in Cant. i 16.

To these renderings we may add those of the Arabic version (in WALTON's Polyglott). رِيَان is translated by رِيَان 'flourishing and fresh, luxuriant' in Deut. xii 2; by مَظْلَلَة 'giving shade' in Isa. lvii 5; by ظِلِيلَة 'having constant, extensive shade, dense' in Jer. ii 20, iii 6, xvii 8; Ezek. vi 13; by ذَات اِنْتَان 'having many branches' in Jer. iii 13; by شَمْرَة 'fruitful' in Ps. lii 10; by تَجْلِيل 'covering' in Cant. i 16; and by غُصْبَة 'abundant with herbage' in Hos. xiv 9.¹⁾

The Authorised and Revised Versions always render by '(be) green.' The Revised Standard Version too always renders by '(be) green,' except in Jer. xvii 8, where 'remain green' is found, and Hos. xiv 9, where 'evergreen' occurs.²⁾ Luther also translates throughout by *grün*, *grünen*.

We return now to the passages which we have so far left on one side (*v. supra*). In Ps. xxxvii 35 the LXX translates כְּאַרְזֵי (ה) לְבָנוֹן 'like the cedar(s) of Lebanon,' which may indeed be the true reading.³⁾ The Vulgate similarly has *sicut cedros Libani*,⁴⁾ while the Targum has הֵיךְ אֵילָן יְצִיב וְעֹבֹךְ 'like a well-established and leafy tree,' and the Peshitta translates כְּעֵץ הַיַּדְּמָה לְעֵץ הַיַּדְּמָה 'like the trees of the wood.' The Authorised Version renders 'like a green bay tree,' the Revised Version 'like a green tree in its native soil,' and the Revised Stan-

¹⁾ The meanings given to the Arabic words are those given in E. W.

LANE, *Arab.-Engl. Lex.*—رِيَان, p. 1196; مَظْلَلَة, p. 1914; ظِلِيلَة, p. 1916; ذَات اِنْتَان, p. 2447; شَمْرَة, p. 353; تَجْلِيل, p. 436; غُصْبَة, p. 747. In Jer. xi 16 יֵסֶה רֵעַן יֵסֶה is rendered زيتونة بهية حسة الظل بالنظر 'a fine olive-tree beautifully shady in appearance'. IBN JANĀḤ (*The Book of Hebrew Roots*, ed. A. NEUBAUER, Col. 684) explains رֵעַן by خضر 'green' and غُص 'sappy.'

²⁾ W. NOWACK, *Lehrb. d. Hebr. Archäologie*, II, p. 11, believes that evergreen trees such as terebinths, oaks, and palms are meant by רֵעַן. Cf. B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaia*, p. 387 (on lvii 5).

³⁾ Cf. H. SCHMIDT, *Die Psalmen*, p. 70; R. KITTEL, *Die Psalmen*, p. 147, *et al.*

⁴⁾ Likewise also the Arabic and Ethiopic versions (in WALTON's Polyglott). Jerome *sicut indigenam virentem* (HARDEN, *op. cit.*, p. 44). Sexta's δακασιόσση appears to mean a happy and prosperous state, or perhaps רֵעַן was taken metaphorically as if it meant *probus*, *pius* (J. F. SCHLEUSNER, *Novus Thes. phil.-crit.*, I, p. 613).

dard Version 'like a cedar of Lebanon,' and Luther *grünte wie ein Lorbeerbaum*.

In Ps. xcii 11 רענן is descriptive of שמן 'oil.' The LXX here translates רענן בשמן רענן ἐν ἐλαίῳ πλόνι 'with rich oil' (Symmachus renders רענן by εὐθαλῆς). The Vulgate translates by *in misericordia uberi* 'with abundant mercy,'¹⁾ the Targum by במשח רבוחא רטיבא 'with fresh anointing oil of a leafy olive-tree,' and the Peshitta by כחשׁא כחשׁא 'with aromatic oil.' The English Versions all translate 'with fresh oil,' as does Luther (*mit frischem Öl*).²⁾

In Ps. xcii 15 רעננים (+דשנים) is used of persons, under the figure of trees, meaning 'flourishing, prosperous'.³⁾ The two words רעננים and דשנים are translated in the LXX by εὐπαθοῦντες 'prosperous,' and in the Vulgate by *bene patientes* 'flourishing.'⁴⁾ Symmachus translates רעננים by εὐθαλεῖς, the Targum by רטיבין 'green, fresh,' and the Peshitta by חפחא 'smooth, pleasant.' The Authorised Version has 'flourishing,' and the Revised Version and the Revised Standard Version 'green,' and Luther *frisch*.

In Dan. iv 1 רענן⁵⁾ is again used figuratively of a person (Nebuchadrezzar), with the meaning 'flourishing' (parallel with שׁלה 'at ease'). Its figurative use here may have been suggested by Ps. xcii 15.⁶⁾ The LXX translates by εὐθηνῶν 'flourishing' (Theodotion εὐθαλῶν, for שׁלה εὐθηνῶν), the Vulgate by *florens* 'blooming,' and

¹⁾ ἐλέω 'mercy' is the reading of B* (?R); see H. B. SWETE, *The Old Testament according to the Septuagint*, II, p. 338. Jerome in *oleo uberi* (HARDEN, *op. cit.*, p. 119).

²⁾ The Arabic version renders רענן here by دسم 'greasy.' IBN JANĀḤ (*op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*) explains it by طری 'fresh;' cf. KIMḤI, *Radicum Liber sive Hebr. Bibl. Lex.*, p. 357.

³⁾ KIMḤI explains רעננים and דשנים as meaning 'fresh, moist' (לחות), and שמן רענן as meaning oil that is 'new, fresh' (חדש; *ibid.*, *loc. cit.*). In Midr. Till. to this psalm, וית רענן is used as a simile of men's hopes in distress (M. JASTROW, *A. Dict. of the Targumim*, etc., p. 1488). The Arabic version

paraphrases with اجتهدهم نعمة 'their effort will be blessed.'

⁴⁾ Jerome *frondentes* (HARDEN, *op. cit.*, p. 119).

⁵⁾ The word is perhaps a loanword in Aramaic from Biblical Hebrew. See BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *A Hebr. and Engl. Lex. of the O.T.*, p. 113; KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER, *Lex. in Vet. Test. Libros*, p. 1125; F. R. BLAKE, *A Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses*, p. 95.

⁶⁾ Cf. R. H. CHARLES, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, p. 86.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE HEBREW WORD רענן 391

the Peshitta by נסד 'at rest'¹). The Authorised and Revised Versions have 'flourishing,' and the Revised Standard Version 'prospering,' while Luther translates *es wohl stand*.

The word רענן is variously explained by the rabbis. It is explained by רטוב 'moist, juicy, green' by Ibn Ezra at Deut. xii 2, and by Yehiel Hillel ben David Altschul at Jer. xvii 8, Ps. xcii 15 (in his commentary מצודת דוד) and at Ps. xxxvii 35 (in his commentary מצודת ציון).² In several places it is explained by reference to לח 'moist' (Ibn Ezra at Ps. xxxvii 35, Kimḥi and מ"צ at Jer. xvii 8; cf. Ibn Ezra at Ps. xcii 15). Then there is the combination לחות ורטיבות 'moistness and greenness' (מ"צ at 1 Kings xiv 23—amplified by מרבה בענפים 'increasing its branches'—Isa. lvii 5; Jer. ii 20, xvii 2; Ezek. vi 13; Hos. xiv 9; Ps. xcii 15; Cant. i 16; Dan. iv 1; cf. at Jer. iii 6, Ps. lii 10, and מ"ד at Hos. xiv 9). At Dan. iv 1 מ"ד explains רענן by רטוב ומלוחלח (cf. מ"צ at Jer. xi 16), and at Ps. xxxvii 35 by רטוב ומתלחלח (cf. Rashi at this passage). In Ps. xcii 11 both מ"ד and מ"צ explain רענן by לח דשן 'moist and fat.' Rashi's comment on רענן at Jer. xvii 2 is interesting, for he uses the word which the Targum habitually uses, namely, עבוף 'densely covered, thick with leaves.' At Jer. xi 16 מ"ד explains רענן as אילן מפואר 'a tree made glorious,' and in Ps. lii 10 the same phrase is explained by Rashi metaphorically by reference to children and grandchildren (כזית רענן בבנים ובנני בנים). His comment at Cant. i 16 is similar, but the reference this time is to sons and daughters (בבנותי ובנותי).

The adjective רענן is found in two passages in Ben Sira, namely, xiv 18 and l 10. In xiv 18 עץ 'tree' is subject—³ כפרה עלה על עץ רענן 'like the growing of leaves upon a tree thick with leaves (one withers and another grows up, so . . .)'. The LXX renders here by δασύς and the Old Latin by *viridis*. The Authorised and Revised Versions have 'thick tree,' and the Revised Standard Version 'spreading tree.' In l 10 זית is the subject of רענן—'like an olive-tree thick with leaves, full of fruit(berries)'—⁴ כזית רענן מלא גרגיר and the

¹) There is no known Targum to the book of Daniel.

²) These two commentaries are cited hereafter as מ"ד and מ"צ.

³) R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach Hebr. u. Deutsch*, p. 17 (of Hebrew text). The word פרח (cf. O.T. פֶּרֶח 'bud,' 'sprout') is probably a noun (cf. R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, p. 136). For רענן כפרה Syriac has only *ܠܝܬܐܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܬܐܝܢܐ* 'like the leaves of trees' (P. A. DE LAGARDE, *Libri Vet. Test. Apocryphi Syriace*, p. 14).

⁴) The LXX for מלא גרגיר has *ἀναθάλλουσα ἀάρπους* 'growing fruit'

verse continues **ענף שמן מרבה ענף** 'and like an oleaster abounding in branches.' ¹⁾ The LXX omits **רענן** here, but Codices 70 and 248 have εὐπρεπής 'fair' (cf. xxiv 14), ²⁾ while Syriac similarly has **ܣܗܝܠܐ** 'majestic, glorious.' ³⁾ The Authorised Version has 'fair olive-tree;' the Revised Version appears to omit **רענן**; and the Revised Standard Version has 'an olive tree putting forth its fruit.'

It is almost certain that the word **רענן** occurs in the Thanksgiving Hymns from the Dead Sea. Although only the letters **ענן** are legible in the photograph, the context strongly supports the reading **רענן**. The Hebrew text runs—⁴⁾ **ענן על פלגי מים לשת עלה ולהרבות ענף**

'thick with leaves beside streams of water, bringing forth leaves, and multiplying branches.'

The implicit subject of **רענן** must be 'tree,' but the filling up of the lacuna is a matter of guess-work. Suggestions that have been made are— '[But the righteous is like a] green [tree]' ⁵⁾, or 'For I am as a tree green' ⁶⁾, or '[but Thou hast placed me like a gr]een [tree].' ⁷⁾

II

The form **רענן** is only paralleled in the Hebrew Bible by **רענן**. ⁸⁾ These forms are commonly, and very probably rightly, regarded

(for the verb, cf. i 18, xi 22), and Syriac, presumably not understanding the Hebrew, **ܘܚܝܬܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ** 'whose branches are big' (Cf. SMEND, *Die Weisheit* . . . *erklärt*, pp. 483 f.; LAGARDE, *op. cit.*, p. 49).

¹⁾ SMEND's text (p. 58) reads **ܡܪܝܬܐ ܥܢܝܐ** (= Syriac **ܡܪܝܬܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ**, LAGARDE, *op. cit.*, p. 49) 'giving its branches to drink', but **ܡܪܝܬܐ** is the recommended reading in the critical apparatus. On p. 90 of the translation, SMEND renders 'reich an Zweigen.' The LXX's ὑψουμένη probably points to **ܡܪܝܬܐ**, and ἐν νεφέλαις represents **ענן** 'clouds,' an erroneous reading (SMEND, *Die Weisheit* . . . *erklärt*, p. 484). According to R. H. CHARLES, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T.*, I, p. 368, the LXX's translation represents **ענן**, but this is less likely.

²⁾ Cf. SMEND, *ibid.*, p. 483.

³⁾ LAGARDE, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

⁴⁾ E. L. SUKENIK, **אוצר המגילות הנצחות**, Col. 10, lines 25 f. (Plate 44). Ps. i 3 and Jer. xvii 8 may be compared for the phraseology.

⁵⁾ G. VERMES, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Pelican Book A 551), p. 184.

⁶⁾ T. H. GASTER, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect*, p. 173.

⁷⁾ A. DUPONT-SOMMER, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes), p. 235. In Col. 3, lines 29 f., of the Hymns the phrase **כל עץ לח ויבש** occurs—'every moist and dry tree;' cf. Ezek. xvii 24, xxi 3, and Col. 8, line 19. For the rabbinic explanation of **רענן** by **לח**, *v. supra*.

⁸⁾ The two words are linked together as written with double **nûn** by Ibn Ezra at Deut. xii. 2.

as belonging to the ground-form *qaṭlal*, with reduplication of the third radical (roots שָׁאן, רִעַן).¹⁾ Another view is that the ground-form is *qillan* (רִעַן, שָׁאן + *an*; cf. Arabic كسَلان 'lazy')²⁾. It has been suggested that רִעַנָה in Job xv. 32 is an adjective, not a verb³⁾, but it seems much more likely that it is the latter, a Pa'lel form of רִעַן, which occurs only here.⁴⁾

No etymology for רִעַן is given in the current lexica, but some suggestions have been made from time to time. Thus the root רִעַן has been compared⁵⁾ with Syriac ܪܝܚܢ⁶⁾ whence ܪܝܚܢܐ 'mallow,'⁷⁾ so called from its softness. Again, it has been compared with Assyrian *ren-nin* 'luxuriant,'⁸⁾ which would seem, however, to point to a root רִנן rather than to רִעַן, if indeed the Assyrian word is correctly read.⁹⁾ Further, the Arabic مَرْعَة 'place, garden with fresh plants, meadow'¹⁰⁾ (= مَرْعَة 'place abounding with herbage, meadow')¹¹⁾ has been compared, the Arabic word, like the Hebrew רִעַן, being used figuratively of a flourishing state.¹²⁾ It is, however, at least questionable whether مَرْعَة is not rather to be

¹⁾ GESENIUS' *Hebr. Gramm.* (KAUTZSCH-COWLEY), 84b k; J. BARTH, *Die Nominalbildung in d. Semit. Sprachen*, p. 214; H. BAUER and P. LEANDER, *Gramm. d. bibl. Aram.*, p. 193 k; cf. J. FÜRST, *Hebr. u. Chald. Handwörterb. über das A.T.*, p. 380.

²⁾ P. HAUPT in A. MÜLLER and E. KAUTZSCH, *The Book of Proverbs*, p. 35 (on i. 33). For the form *qillān*, see BARTH, *op. cit.*, p. 339.

³⁾ HAUPT, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

⁴⁾ Cf. BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, p. 947; KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER, *op. cit.*, p. 901; GES.-BUHL, *Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterb. über das A.T.*, 16th ed., p. 768; F. ZORELL, *Lex. Hebr. et Aram. Vet. Test.*, p. 782; C. BROCKELMANN, *Grundr. d. vergleich. Gramm. d. Semit. Sprachen*, I, p. 518; P. JOÜON, *Gramm. de l'hébreu biblique*, 59 b; F. DELITZSCH, *Bibl. Commentary on the Book of Job*, I, p. 272; IBN JANĀḤ, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*, and KIMḤI, *Radīcum Liber, etc.*, *loc. cit.*

⁵⁾ J. FÜRST, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*, who remarks that Arabic رَعَن is a byform of رَجَل 'sprouted forth.'

⁶⁾ This verb is not given by PAYNE SMITH, *Thes. Syr.*, or by C. BROCKELMANN, *Lex. Syr.*, 2nd ed.

⁷⁾ PAYNE SMITH, *op. cit.*, 3869. The Syriac word renders אָרַח in 2 Kings iv 39, Job xxiv 24. Cf. BROCKELMANN, *Lex. Syr.*, p. 722a.

⁸⁾ E. KÖNIG, *Hist.-krit. Lehrgeb. d. Hebr. Sprache*, II, 91b, following F. DELITZSCH, *Proleg. eines neuen Hebr. Aram. Wörterbuches z. A.T.*, p. 155.

⁹⁾ Cf. W. MUSS-ARNOLT, *A Concise Dict. of the Assyrian Language*, p. 974; F. DELITZSCH, *Assyr. Handwörterb.*, sub *ṣaḥarratu*, p. 650.

¹⁰⁾ J. G. HAVA, *Arab.-Engl. Dict.*, p. 273.

¹¹⁾ LANE, *op. cit.*, 1113.

¹²⁾ J. BARTH, *Wurzeluntersuchungen z. Hebr. u. Aram. Lex.*, p. 46.

read ^{מִרְעָה} 'a place rich in pasture.'¹⁾ A further suggestion is that the Arabic root رَعَن, which means 'was (mentally) lax, flaccid, weak,' may have had as its primary meaning 'fell abroad loosely;' in Hebrew the root will have been used literally of trees, whereas in Arabic it will have been applied figuratively to the mind.²⁾ Another suggestion is that רֶעֶן is to be compared with Arabic ^{أَعْرَل} 'fertile (year), spacious, comfortable life'³⁾, but غَرَلَ is rather Hebrew עָרַל 'was uncircumcised'⁴⁾. BEN IEHUDA's suggestion that רֶעֶן might have arisen through a combination of two words (like רֶחֶם-נֶעֱמָ, רֶךְ-נֶעֱמָ, רֶחֶם-נֶעֱמָ, רֶךְ-נֶעֱמָ), which in speech became one word⁵⁾ hardly carries conviction.

Since none of these suggestions appears to be satisfactory, another explanation of the root רֶעֶן may be proposed. In Arabic لَنَن means 'was tangled' (of plants), and the eleventh form ^{لَنَنَ} means 'was long and twisted' (of plants).⁶⁾ May then רֶעֶן be equated with this Arabic root? The interchange of *r* and *l* in Semitic languages is, as is well known, not uncommon⁷⁾, and examples need not be cited here.

¹⁾ See F. SCHULTHESS, *Götting. gelehrte Anzeigen*, 164, 1902, p. 669; cf. Lane, *op. cit.*, 1027. BARTH's proposal is approved by BEN IEHUDA (*Thes. totius Hebraicitatis*, 6658), but is rejected by A. S. RÜTHY, *Die Pflanze u. ihre Teile im bibl.-hebr. Sprachgebrauch*, p. 63.

²⁾ S. R. DRIVER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 139. The words of A. SCHULTENS, written over two hundred years ago may be recalled—'Nil desidero in versione recepta, *Et Ramus ejus non virescet*; tantum moneo verbum רֶעֶן proprie usurpari in *profusa laxitate*; unde רֶעֶן ut *Epitheton invaluit Arborum laete crescentium*, et *ramis prominulis ac propendulis superbientium*. Id *Arabibus* رَعَن *arēn* a رَعَن *arēn* *prominuit cum laxitate*. Hinc *geminata* tertia رֶעֶן *valde prominuit et propendit*. Hoc in *Arbore* non *virorem* tantum, sed et *vigorem summum* supponit (*Liber Jobi*, 1737, p. 391, on xv 32). For رَعَن, see Lane, *op. cit.* 1107; HAVA, *op. cit.*, p. 258. The South Arabian name of a man رَعْنِثَا is given the meaning 'Yaṭi' est lâche' by G. RYCKMANS, *Les noms propres sud-sémitiques*, I, p. 270.

³⁾ A. GUILLAUME, *Abr-Nahrain*, i, 1961, p. 13.

⁴⁾ See BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, p. 790.

⁵⁾ *Op. cit.*, loc. cit.

⁶⁾ HAVA, *op. cit.*, p. 690; A. DE BIBERSTEIN KAZIMIRSKI, *Dict. arabe-français*, II, p. 1006; G. W. FREYTAG, *Lex. Arab.-Lat.*, IV, p. 113.

⁷⁾ See W. WRIGHT, *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, p. 67; BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss*, I, p. 220; S. MOSCATI (ed.), *An Intro. to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, p. 32. Further

III

It will be seen from the foregoing that the evidence of the ancient versions suggests predominantly a meaning for רענן 'thick with leaves, luxuriant,' and that the Arabic etymology which has been proposed points in the same direction. The parallelism between כָּל-אֵלֶּה עֲבֹתָהּ and כָּל-עֵץ רֵעָנָן 'every leafy terebinth' in Ezek. vi 13 provides further support for this basic meaning. On the other hand, the meaning 'green' is only infrequently found in the ancient versions. If the basic meaning of רענן is indeed as has been suggested—'thick with leaves, luxuriant, dense'—it would seem that the meaning 'green,' which is the meaning given to רענן in most translations¹ and commentaries, is only justified in the sense that a flourishing, luxuriant tree, with thick foliage, can be described as green. It was indeed noted long ago that the translation of רענן as 'green,' when it is applied to an olive-tree (זית), is not at all suitable, for 'the colour of the leaves of this tree is not a *bright, lively*, green, but a dark, disagreeable or yellowish one.'² The description 'thick with leaves, dense,' and so shady, is entirely appropriate of trees under which altars were set up and worship,

BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, sub רָנָן and רָחַל (pp. 919, 932), and on the latter *Vivre et Penser* ii = *Rev. Biblique*, li, 1942, p. 164, n. 4.

¹ S. R. DRIVER, however, always translates by 'spreading' (*The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah*, *ad loc.*); cf. C. F. BURNEY, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, p. 193; *The Revised Psalter* (on Pss. xxxvii 35, lii 10, xcii 11, 15). JAMES MOFFATT (*A New Translation of the Bible*) renders רענן 'leafy' in Deut. xii 2, by 'spreading' in 1 Kings xiv 23; 2 Kings xvi 4, xvii 10; Jer. xi 16, xvii 2; 2 Chr. xxviii 4, and by 'flourishing' in Dan. iv 1. In Hos. xiv 9 he translates 'evergreen', in Ps. xxxvii 35 he adopts the LXX's reading, and in Ps. xcii 11 רענן is omitted in translation. In all other passages he renders by 'green.'

² J. PARKHURST, *An Hebr. and Engl. Lex.*, 1778, p. 642. He writes further—'Strictly speaking רענן does not mean a colour, but *vigorous, thriving*, or the like.' Cf. T. HARMER, *Observations on divers passages of Scripture*, 1776, ii, p. 203—'The beauty of the olive-tree . . . consisted in the spread of its branches, not its colour' (p. 205); F. DELITZSCH, *Commentary on the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes*, p. 39 (on Cant. i 16)—'רענן . . . is not a word of colour, but signifies to be extensible, and to extend far and wide, as *lentus* in *lenti salices*; we have no word such as this which combines in itself the ideas of softness and juicy freshness, of bending and elasticity, of looseness, and thus of overhanging ramification (as in the case of the weeping willow);' G. DALMAN, *Arbeit u. Sitte in Palästina*, i, p. 105, who emphasizes the renderings of the Targum and Peshitta in Ps. lii 10, and of the Peshitta and Arabic version in Deut. xii 2; E. L. CURTIS, *The Books of Chronicles* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 457.

often accompanied by rites of ritual prostitution, was offered.¹⁾ The leafy, hanging branches afforded suitable shelter for the practice of such illicit worship. Hos. iv 13 is here revealing—offerings were made, not only on the tops of mountains and upon the hills, but also under oak, poplar, and terebinth 'because their shade is good' *כִּי טוֹב צֶלֶה*.²⁾

To sum up, our conclusion is that, when *רענן* is used of trees, or leaves, or branches (verb, Job xv 32), it should be translated, not 'green,' but 'thick with leaves, luxuriant, dense, spreading,' and that, as trees in this state can be described as 'flourishing,' so too persons may be figuratively described as *רענן* 'flourishing.'³⁾ The lovers' rustic bower (Cant. i 16)—'the shepherd's booth of leafy branches'⁴⁾—is suitably described as *רענן*. And when oil is described as *רענן*, we may think that the Hebrew word may be rendered 'fresh'—it is usually translated so—for 'green,' which we have seen to be an extension of the original meaning of *רענן*, and 'fresh' are closely associated in several languages. Or if, as may be the case, *רענן* here expresses quantity rather than age, we may perhaps render it by 'thick' or 'rich.'⁵⁾ The picture then is of oil flowing in abundance, as a flourishing, luxuriant tree spreads its branches in profusion far and wide.

It is with great pleasure, and with a sense of high privilege, that I offer this small contribution to the volume which has been prepared in honour of Professor Walter Baumgartner, who has played

¹⁾ Leafy trees were especially suited to represent the secret life-power of nature (see RÜTHY, *op. cit.*, pp. 55, 63).

²⁾ In the next verse he goes on to refer to ritual prostitution. It would appear that worship under trees was not regarded as absolutely objectionable by Hosea and Isaiah (i 29). It seems that it was with the Deuteronomist and Jeremiah that sacrificing under leafy, shady, trees first became synonymous with idolatry. Cf. W. W. BAUDISSIN, *Studien z. Sem. Religionsgeschichte*, II, p. 229, and W. L. HOLLADAY, *VT*, xi, 1961, pp. 170-76, who suggests that the phrase *רענן כל-עץ ותחת גבהה גבעה כל-גבעה* was standardized by Jeremiah in this form in reference to the location of fertility cult practices.

³⁾ OLIVER GOLDSMITH (1728-74) speaks of 'luxuriant great ones of the world,' luxuriant here meaning excessively prosperous (*The Shorter Oxford Engl. Dict.*, p. 1180).

⁴⁾ A. S. HERBERT, *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. BLACK and H. H. ROWLEY, p. 470b.

⁵⁾ C. A. BRIGGS, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), II, p. 285—'he is anointed so richly with oil by Yahweh that he will be saturated with it.' As Horsley—'a penetration of the whole substance of the man's person by the oil' (*ibid.*, *loc. cit.*).

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE HEBREW WORD רַעַן 397

so eminent a part over so long a period of time in the promotion of Old Testament and Semitic studies. I hope that I may be allowed to express to him my gratitude and my sincere good wishes in words adapted from Ps. xcii 15—**יְעוֹד יָנוּב בְּשִׁיבָה דָּשָׁן וְרַעַן יִהְיֶה**—

A CONSIDERATION OF SOME UNUSUAL WAYS OF
EXPRESSING THE SUPERLATIVE IN HEBREW ¹⁾

BY

D. WINTON THOMAS
Cambridge

Hebrew, unlike Arabic, possesses no special forms for the purpose of indicating the comparative and superlative degrees. Forms like אֶכְזָר "cruel", אֶכְזֹב "deceptive", and אֵיתָן "enduring"—which are formed like the Arabic elative form أَفْعَلٌ—may indeed be survivals from a time when Hebrew knew elative formations ²⁾. If they are, they are survivals in form only, for they have entirely lost any emphatic value they once may have had. Hebrew, then, resorted to other means to express the superlative, and it developed a quite remarkable variety of ways of doing so. Some of these ways are familiar to every student of the language. There is, for example, the way in which Hebrew uses an adjective which is determined by the article, for example, הַקָּטָן "the youngest" (1 Sam. xvi 11); its use of an adjective followed by a determined noun, e.g., קָטָן בָּנוֹי "the youngest of his sons" (2 Chron. xxi 17); its use of a noun in the construct state before the same noun in the genitive and in the plural, e.g., עֶבֶד עֲבָדִים "a slave of slaves", i.e., "most abject of slaves" (Gen. ix 25); its use of מִן before כָּל, e.g., עָרוֹם מִכָּל חַיַּית הַשָּׂדֶה (Gen. iii 1) "more cunning than all the beasts of the field"; its use of an adjective followed by ב, e.g., הַיָּסָה בְּנָשִׁים "the fairest among women" (Song i 8); its use of מְאֹד following an adjective; and its use of substantives, such as מְבַקֵּר, מֵיטֵב and רָאשׁ with a following noun in the genitive in the

¹⁾ The Presidential Address delivered to the Society for Old Testament Study, on 30 December 1952, in London.

²⁾ Cp. GESENIUS, *Hebr. Gramm.* (KAUTZSCH-COWLEY), 2nd. ed., p. 429, n. 1; J. BARTH, *Die Nominalbild. in. d. Sem. Sprachen*, p. 224; E. KÖNIG, *Synt. d. hebr. Sprache*, p. 313.

sense of "best". All these means of expressing the superlative in Hebrew are well known. There are other ways besides which are less familiar, such as the use of synonymous nouns in a genitive and construct relation, e.g., שְׂמַחַת גִּילִי "my surpassing joy" (Ps. xliii 4) ¹⁾. It is not with any of these ways that I wish to deal in this paper. My aim is to consider three ways in which, it may be claimed, Hebrew expresses the superlative, which are generally less familiar than the ways already mentioned. I begin with the use in Hebrew of the divine names.

It will be convenient to begin by recording eight passages where the A.V. recognizes the divine names אֱלֹהִים and אֵל as epithets with an intensifying or superlative force. They are:

Gen. xxiii 6 נָשָׂא אֱלֹהִים A.V. "a mighty prince". A.V. mg. "a prince of God".

Gen. xxx 8 נִסְתַּחֲזְרֵי אֱלֹהִים A.V. "great wrestlings". A.V. mg. "wrestlings of God".

Ex. ix 28 קִלַּת אֱלֹהִים A.V. "mighty thunderings". A.V. mg. "voices of God".

1 Sam. xiv 15 חֲרָדַת אֱלֹהִים A.V. "a very great trembling". A.V. mg. "a trembling of God".

Jon. iii 3 עִיר-גְּדֹלָה לֵאלֹהִים A.V. "an exceeding great city". A.V. mg. "of God".

Ps. xxxvi 7 הַרְרֵי-אֵל A.V. "the great mountains". A.V. mg. "the mountains of God".

Ps. lxxx 11 אֲרָנֵי-אֵל A.V. "the goodly cedars". A.V. mg. "the cedars of God".

Jb. i 16 אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים A.V. "the fire of God". A.V. mg. "a great fire".

In this last passage the adjectival force of the divine name is relegated to the margin. In the seven others it is preferred.

The treatment of the Hebrew divine names as epithets with an intensifying or superlative force is to be found, however, earlier than the A.V. As far as the chief ancient versions are concerned, I have been able to find only one example, namely, in Ps. xxxvi 7, where the Targum renders הַרְרֵי-אֵל "mountains of God" by טורייא תקיפא ²⁾

¹⁾ P. JOÜON, *Gramm. de l'hébreu biblique*, p. 438.

²⁾ P. DE LAGARDE, *Hagiog. Chald.*, p. 19.

"mighty mountains" (as A.V.). I have found no examples in the LXX, Peshiṭta or Vulgate. When we turn to the mediaeval Jewish commentators, however, we find wide recognition of this force of the divine names. In at least six of the eight passages in the A.V. to which I have referred, these Jewish commentators give to the divine names the same force as is found in the A.V. As examples may be cited Ibn Ezra and Kimchi on 1 Sam. xiv 15 ¹⁾; Kimchi ²⁾ on Jon. iii 3; and Rashi ³⁾ and Kimchi ⁴⁾ on Ps. lxxx 11 ⁵⁾. This is what Kimchi, for example, says at Jon. iii 3: **כל דבר שרוצה להגדילו סומך**: "any word which it is desired to magnify is joined to the word **אל** as a means of magnifying it". In six other passages ⁶⁾ too the Jewish commentators I have mentioned—and others besides—who flourished earlier than the A.V., treat the divine names similarly—**יה** and **יהוה** as well as **אל** and **אלהים**. There can be little doubt whence the translators of the A.V. derived their renderings in the passages referred to. The exegesis of these passages by Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, Levi ben Gershon, and Obadiah ben Jacob Sforno—they cover between them a period of some five hundred years—lived on after them in Jewish circles. For example, about a hundred years later than Sforno, we find Yehiel Hillel ben David Altschul, who in the seventeenth century completed his father's commentaries on the Prophets and the Hagiographa ⁷⁾, continuing the tradition ⁸⁾. A hundred years later, towards the end of the eighteenth century, the tradition was being perpetuated by Christian scholars, for example, by S. GLASSIUS ⁹⁾, who finds a

¹⁾ See Ibn Ezra at Jb. vi 4 and Kimchi at 1 Sam. xxvi 12 and Ps. xxxvi 7. Cp. **רלבג** *ad loc.*

²⁾ *Ad loc.*, and at 1 Sam. xxvi 12 and Ps. xxxvi 7. Cp. Sforno at Gen. x 9.

³⁾ *Ad loc.*

⁴⁾ At Jon. iii 3 and Ps. xxxvi 7.

⁵⁾ For Gen. xxiii 6, see Ibn Ezra *ad loc.*; for Jb. i 16, see **רלבג** at 1 Sam. xiv 15.

⁶⁾ These passages are Gen. x 9 (Sforno *ad loc.*), 1 Sam. xxvi 12 (Kimchi *ad loc.*), Jer. ii 31 (Kimchi at 1 Sam. xxvi 12, Jon. iii 3, Ps. xxxvi 7), Jb. vi 4 (Ibn Ezra *ad loc.*), Song viii 6 (Ibn Ezra *ad loc.*; Kimchi at 1 Sam. xxvi 2, Jon. iii 3, Ps. xxxvi 7), and 1 Chron. xii 23 (Rashi *ad loc.*).

⁷⁾ He divided it into two parts, **מצודת ציון** and **מצודת דוד**. See *Jewish Encyclopedia*, I, p. 479b.

⁸⁾ 1 Sam. xiv 15 (**מצודת דוד**), Jer. ii 31 (**מצודת ציון**), Jon. iii 3 (**מצ'צ**), Ps. xxxvi 7 (**מצ'ד**), Ps. lxxx 11 (**מצ'ד** at 1 Sam. xiv 15, Ps. xxxvi 7 and **מצ'צ** at Jon. iii 3, Jb. i 16), Jb. i 16 (**מצ'ד**, **מצ'צ**, **מצ'ד**), Song viii 6 (**מצ'צ** at Jer. ii 31), 1 Chr. xii 23 (**מצ'ד**), 2 Sam. ix 3 (**מצ'ד**).

⁹⁾ *Philologia sacra his temporibus accommodata a J. A. Datthio*, 1776, I, p. 44 ff.

superlative force in the divine names in a number of passages ¹⁾, while denying it in others ²⁾; by G. C. STORR ³⁾, and by ROSEN-MÜLLER ⁴⁾. The tradition continued into the nineteenth century. Among lexicographers we may mention GESENIUS ⁵⁾ and FÜRST ⁶⁾; among grammarians KÖNIG ⁷⁾ deserves special notice—he lists no fewer than twenty-one examples; and among commentators reference may be made to DELITZSCH ⁸⁾ and HITZIG ⁹⁾. In the present century many representatives of the tradition are to be found. At the beginning of the century, in 1903, we find K. VOLLERS ¹⁰⁾ explaining עֲרָפֶל and כְּרָמֶל as composite nouns, with אֵל as an intensifying epithet—עֲרָפֶל means, according to him, “dreadful darkness” (he compares the Accadian *irpu* “cloud”), and כְּרָמֶל is said to mean “glorious plantation”. The lexicons of BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS ¹¹⁾, GESENIUS-BUHL ¹²⁾, ZORELL ¹³⁾ and KOEHLER ¹⁴⁾ all give examples; among grammarians J. LEFEVRE ¹⁵⁾ may be mentioned; and examples may be found in the commentaries of DRIVER ¹⁶⁾, MARTI ¹⁷⁾, STRACK ¹⁸⁾, BRIGGS ¹⁹⁾, EHRLICH ²⁰⁾, BEWER ²¹⁾ and PROCKSCH ²²⁾, to mention no others.

¹⁾ Viz., Gen. xxiii 6, xxx 8, Jer. ii 31, Jon. iii 3, Ps. xxxvi 7, lxxx 11, Song viii 6, Ezek. xxviii 2, Ps. civ 16, Ru. ii 20, iii 10, 2 Chr. xxviii 13.

²⁾ 1 Sam. xiv 15, xxvi 12, Jb. i 16.

³⁾ *Observationes ad Analogiam et Syntaxin hebraicam pertinentes*, 1779, pp. 258 f. (Gen. xiii 10, xxiii 6, Jer. ii 31, Jon. iii 3, Ps. xxxvi 7, lxxx 11, Song viii 6).

⁴⁾ *Scholia in veteris testamenti libros*, 1788 ff. (Gen. xxiii 6, Jer. ii 31, Jon. iii 3, Ps. xxxvi 7, lxxx 11).

⁵⁾ *Thes. philol. crit. ling. hebr. et chald.*, 1835, p. 98.

⁶⁾ *Hebr. u. Chald. Handwörterb.*, 1876, i.p. 89.

⁷⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 316 f.

⁸⁾ *Commentar über d. Psalter*, 1859, I, p. 286 (on Ps. xxxvi 7, lxxx 11).

⁹⁾ *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, 1881, p. 182 (on Jon. iii 3).

¹⁰⁾ *Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.*, XVII, pp. 310 f.

¹¹⁾ *A Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 513.

¹²⁾ *Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterb. über das A.T.*, 16th. ed., 1915, p. 40.

¹³⁾ *Lex. hebr. et Aram. vet. Test.*, p. 54.

¹⁴⁾ *Lex. in vet. test. libros*, p. 47.

¹⁵⁾ *Précis de gramm. hébr.*, 1945, p. 161.

¹⁶⁾ See especially *The Book of Genesis* (Westm. Comm.), 1904, p. 225.

¹⁷⁾ *Das Dodekapropheten*, 1904, p. 254 (on Jon. iii 3).

¹⁸⁾ *Die Genesis* (Kurzgef. Komm.), 1905, p. 84 (on xxiii 6).

¹⁹⁾ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), 1906, I, p. 318 (on xxxvi 7), II, p. 101 (on lxviii 16), p. 205 (on lxxx 11), p. 334 (on civ 16).

²⁰⁾ *Randglossen zur hebr. Bibel*, 1908-14, I, p. 99 (on Gen. xxiii 6), p. 145 f. (on Gen. xxx 8), p. 178 (on Gen. xxxv 5), p. 295 (on Ex. ix 28); III, p. 213 (on 1 Sam. xiv 15), p. 292 (on 2 Sam. ix 3); IV, p. 55 (on Is. xiv 13); V, p. 269 (on Jon. iii 3).

²¹⁾ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jonah* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), 1912, p. 50 (on iii 3).

²²⁾ *Die Genesis*, 1913, p. 337 (on xxx 8).

There is then a long tradition, from the Targum to the present day, that the divine names in Hebrew are used with an intensifying or superlative force. So far as I know, however, it was not until the beginning of the present century that anything like a systematic attempt to examine the question was made. The problem was taken up in 1900 by H. ZIMMERMANN, in his *Elohim, Eine Studie zur israelitischen Religions- und Literaturgeschichte*, a book which was not very well received at the time ¹⁾. ZIMMERMANN thinks that in several O.T. passages it is impossible that the divine name in the genitive should be understood of God ²⁾. For example, in 1 Sam. xiv 15 **חֲרֹדֶת אֱלֹהִים** can only mean, according to him, "a great fear" (cp. A.V.); and in Jb. i 16 **אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים** can only mean, as A.V. mg., "a great fire". Of much greater importance was an article contributed in 1901 to *Revue Biblique* ³⁾ by F. PRAT, entitled "Le nom divin est-il intensif en hébreu?". I mentioned just now that KÖNIG gives twenty-one passages in which a superlative force is said to be imparted by the presence of the divine name. All these passages are examined by PRAT in his article. His conclusion is that the divine name in the genitive never has an intensifying force—it is never equivalent to an epithet, but is always either a possessive genitive, which it is for the most part, or an objective genitive. PRAT's article was examined in turn by J. A. KELSO in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages* for 1902-03 ⁴⁾. In KELSO's judgment PRAT's statements are "sweeping" and "obviously made in the interests of uniformity" ⁵⁾. His own conclusion is that seven of the passages examined by PRAT and himself support KÖNIG⁶⁾; six can reasonably be explained in other ways ⁷⁾; while the rest are too doubtful to be adduced in support of a rule of syntax ⁸⁾. Later, in 1914, appeared F. BAUMGÄRTEL's *Elohim ausserhalb des Pentateuch* ⁹⁾, of which a few pages are devoted

¹⁾ See the reviews by GIESEBRECHT, *Deutsch. Literaturzeit.*, 1900, No. 46, col. 2965, and BEER, *Theol. Literaturzeit.*, 1901, No. 21, p. 561.

²⁾ See p. 17 of his work.

³⁾ Vol. X, pp. 497-511.

⁴⁾ Vol. XIX, pp. 152-158.

⁵⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 158.

⁶⁾ These passages are Gen. x 9, xxiii 6, Is. xiv 13, Jon. iii 3, Ps. xxxvi 7, xlv 7, 1 Chr. xii 22.

⁷⁾ Viz., Gen. xxxv 5, 1 Sam. xiv 15, xxvi 12, Ps. lxxx 11, civ 16, Jb. i 16.

⁸⁾ Gen. xiii 13, xxx 8, 2 Sam. xxiii 20, 1 Chr. xi 22, Jer. ii 31, Mal. ii 15, Ps. lxxviii 16, Song viii 6.

⁹⁾ *Beitr. z. Wiss. vom A.T.*, Heft 19.

to the use of Elohim as expressive of what is powerful and mighty. Familiar passages, such as 1 Sam. xiv 15, Jon. iii 3, Jb. i 16, are, with others ¹⁾, discussed, and a superlative force is claimed for the divine names which occur in them. A year later, in 1915, W. CASPARI wrote a weighty criticism of BAUMGÄRTEL's views in an article "Elohim als Elative?" ²⁾.

With whom does the verdict seem to lie, with those who, like the Jewish commentators who have been referred to, the A.V., KÖNIG, ZIMMERMANN, KELSO, BAUMGÄRTEL and others, believe that the divine names in Hebrew are used with a superlative force, or with those—a minority, it would seem—who, like PRAT and CASPARI, are critical of this view? A full answer to this question would entail a longer study than can be offered here. In this paper I content myself with a brief attempt to indicate the lines along which an answer may be sought.

First, I must mention two important preliminary considerations which demand our attention before we can proceed to attempt an answer. In the first place, the examples cited by lexicographers and others need to be examined carefully before they can be accepted as evidence. The number of examples in which a superlative force has been claimed for the Hebrew divine names is now much in excess of the twenty-one listed by KÖNIG and examined by PRAT and KELSO. The number of which I am aware is almost fifty, and there are doubtless more. Many of these examples are, however, open to objection. Some, for example, as KELSO reminds us, are too unsound textually to permit any view to be based upon them. Among these may be included six of the seven examples for which a superlative force for יה has been claimed, for example, by FÜRST ³⁾ (Jer. ii 31, xxxii 19, Ps. lxxvii 12, lxxxix 9, cxviii 5, Song viii 6). Others again occur in contexts too obscure to make them profitable for study in connection with our problem. As examples may be mentioned נִפְתָּלִי אֱלֹהִים in Gen. xxx 8, זָרַע אֱלֹהִים in Mal. ii 15, and הֵר־אֱלֹהִים in Ps. lxviii 16. Further, there are some examples, as again KELSO reminds us, which can be explained in other ways, for example, anthropomorphically. Examples may be seen in Ex. ix 28, where

¹⁾ E.g., 1 Ki. iii 28, 2 Chr. xx 29.

²⁾ *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morgenländ. Gesell.*, LXIX, pp. 393-401; further p. 558.

³⁾ *Op. cit.*, I, p. 490. FÜRST's remaining example, in Ex. xv 2, is to be explained otherwise; see the present writer, *The Expository Times*, July, 1937, p. 478.

the A.V. margin's "voices of God" for קִלְתֹּ אֱלֹהִים in the sense of "thunder" is entirely satisfactory, as is the A.V.'s "fire of God" for אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים in Jb. i 16 in the sense of "lightning". These illustrations must suffice to indicate that the number of examples which properly fall to be considered in the discussion of our problem has to be quite substantially reduced.

Our second preliminary consideration is this. It is essential that we understand clearly what precisely is meant by the claim that the divine names in Hebrew are used to express the superlative. It is possible to understand by it two quite different things. First, it may be understood to mean that the divine names when so used have no religious significance at all, and that they are used only as intensifying epithets in the sense of "great, mighty". It is in this sense that EHRLICH, for example, understands it. It may, on the other hand, be understood to mean that the presence of the divine names raises a person or object to a pre-eminent degree by virtue of the fact that the person or object in question is brought into relationship with God. The divine names, that is to say, do not lose their religious significance. This distinction which I am trying to draw needs to be much more clearly kept in mind than it generally seems to be.

With this distinction clearly before us, we can more surely approach, and hope to pass judgment on, those examples which claim our attention. Obviously they cannot all be examined here. I can do no more than give the conclusion I have reached after a fairly close examination of them. It is this. If, when we say that the divine names in Hebrew are used to express the superlative, we mean that they have no religious significance at all and are merely intensifying epithets, I do not find a single example which decisively supports such a view. If, on the other hand, we mean that the divine names have the effect of raising a person or thing to a pre-eminent degree, the person or thing being brought into relationship with God, we may hold that the divine names have in this sense a superlative force. Let an illustration or two be given from the examples cited earlier from the A.V. In Gen. xxiii 6 Abraham is addressed by the children of Heth as נָשִׂיא אֱלֹהִים. Has אֱלֹהִים here no religious significance? Does the phrase mean only "a mighty prince", as A.V.? There does not appear to be any decisive reason why we should think so. On the other hand, נָשִׂיא אֱלֹהִים "a prince of God" (so A.V. mg.) could well be descriptive of a prince who holds his authority from

God (LXX βασιλεὺς παρὰ θεοῦ), a prince whose noble qualities derive from his relationship to God ¹). Such a one could not but be an exceptional person, someone out of the ordinary. We should accordingly be justified in saying that אֱלֹהִים here has a superlative force. As a second example may be cited הִרְדֵּת אֱלֹהִים in 1 Sam. xiv 15. Does this phrase certainly mean “a very great trembling” (so A.V.), and not rather “a trembling sent by God”, and, as such, of exceptional intensity, resulting in a general panic ²)? And are אֲרֵי-אֵל in Ps. lxxx 11 necessarily “the goodly cedars” (so A.V.), and not “God’s cedars”, which he, and not man, has planted, and which owe their growth to his special care ³)? They will of necessity be no ordinary cedars. In Jon. iii 3, where we find the phrase עִיר-גְּדֹלָה לְאֱלֹהִים (LXX πόλις μεγάλη τῷ θεῷ), we have, of course, a quite different construction. The A.V.’s rendering of the phrase is “an exceeding great city”. Are we to say here again, as EHRLICH, for example, does, that אֱלֹהִים has no religious significance, but is employed only to intensify the adjective? It can equally well be argued that the city of Nineveh was “great to God”, that is, even to God, who has a different standard of greatness from men ⁴). Anything that is great even in God’s estimation must of necessity be of extraordinary dimensions. In all these examples it may be conceded that the divine names have a superlative force so long as we understand that the superlative force is imparted, not by the addition of the divine names as intensifying epithets, but by the fact that a person or thing is brought into relationship with God.

Is there any extra-Biblical material, we may now ask, which helps us in the study of our problem? Some scholars have found in the Ras Shamra texts examples of the use of *’il* in a superlative sense. It is claimed, for example, by T. H. GASTER ⁵) that *šdm ’il* means

¹) Cp. PRAT, *op. cit.*, p. 507.

²) Cp. S. R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, 1913, p. 109.

³) Cp. PRAT, *op. cit.*, p. 504.

⁴) Cp. BEWER, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.* Cp. further E. G. KRAELING, *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, XXXVIII, p. 217, who thinks that לִמְדָּה יְהוָה in Gen. x 9 means “measuring up to divine size”, therefore superhuman, extraordinary. With this he compares Gen. vi 11 and Jon. iii 3.

⁵) *Thespis*, 1950, p. 201. Cp. him further in *Act. Or.*, XVI (1938), p. 45, and in *Bull. of the Amer. Schools of Or. Research*, No. 101 (1916), p. 26.

"vast fields". C. H. GORDON¹⁾, however, takes 'il here as the name of the god 'Il. Again, H. BAUER²⁾ proposes a superlative sense for 'ilbm in the phrase *gdlt 'ilbm*, which he translates "Gotteskuh" in the sense of "Prachtkuh". GORDON³⁾, however, translates "a large beast of the gods". O. EISSFELDT⁴⁾ too maintains that 'il in these texts sometimes has a superlative force, but he points out at the same time that in some cases at least it is difficult to decide whether or not 'il is a proper name.

J. M. P. SMITH⁵⁾, who believes that רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים in Gen. i 2 means "a mighty wind", draws attention to an interesting, but obscure, phrase which occurs in a letter from Tell el-Amarna. In it the king of Alašia requests the king of Egypt to send him *kasap ilāni*. SMITH writes: "This *kasap ilāni*, literally "silver of the gods", is nothing more nor less than "the finest, or purest of silver". J. A. KNUDZON⁶⁾ translates the phrase by "Götter-Silber". Does this German phrase mean silver belonging to the gods, or originating from them, that is, created by them? C. BEZOLD⁷⁾ uses the same German phrase, but he questions whether *kasap ilāni* means "especially fine silver". S. A. B. MERCER⁸⁾ renders the phrase "godly silver"—a translation as ambiguous in meaning as the German "Götter-Silber". It may be observed that in another letter, when the king of Alašia's request is for "pure silver", the phrase used is not *kasap ilāni*, but *kaspa ša-ar-pa*⁹⁾.

When we turn to Arabic, we find that the use of ﷲ "to God", expressive of admiration, has frequently been compared with the use of ﷲ in Jon. iii 3. Several examples of this usage in Arabic are given by LANE¹⁰⁾. To give but one instance: ﷲ الْقَائِلُ means "to God be attributed (the eloquence of) the sayers", or, "how good

¹⁾ *Ugaritic Literature*, 1949, p. 46 (*Text* 49, IV, 26).

²⁾ *Zeitschr. f. d. alttestam. Wiss.*, N.F. X (1933), p. 85.

³⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 111 (*Text*, I, 3).

⁴⁾ *El im Ugaritischen Pantheon*, 1951, pp. 36 ff.

⁵⁾ *The Syntax and Meaning of Genesis i 1-3*, in *O.T. Essays* (Papers read before the Society for O.T. Study at its eighteenth meeting . . . , 1927), pp. 167 f.

⁶⁾ *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, Teil I, 1915, No. 35, l. 20 (p. 285).

⁷⁾ *Bab.-Assyr. Glossar*, 1926, p. 240, sub *šarpu*.

⁸⁾ *The Tell El-Amarna Tablets*, 1939, I, p. 197.

⁹⁾ KNUDZON, *op. cit.*, p. 290 (No. 37, l. 18).

¹⁰⁾ *Arab. Eng. Lex.*, p. 83. Cp. A. SCHULTENS, *Haririi . . . consessus*, 1736 (*Consessus quartus*, p. 37, n. 76); W. WRIGHT, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, II, p. 138.

is the saying of the sayer." It is of interest to recall here the use of $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \theta\epsilon\tilde{\omega}$ in the New Testament. In Acts vii 20 Moses is described as $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \theta\epsilon\tilde{\omega}$ "exceeding fair" (A.V.), "fair to God" (A.V. mg.). Another example, according to GLASSIUS ¹), is to be found in 2 Cor. x 4: "for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \theta\epsilon\tilde{\omega}$." Here the A.V. translates the Greek phrase "mighty through God" (A.V. mg. "to God"; R.V. "before God"). The phrase means, according to GLASSIUS, *eximie valida, validissima, potentissima*. As for Syriac, PAYNE SMITH ²) gives several examples of ܐܠܗܐ with a superlative force when it stands in the genitive after a noun. It should be noted, however, that all the examples he gives are taken from the O.T.—several of them from passages to which reference has been made. They have accordingly no independent value for us in our study ³).

Looking back over this extra-Biblical material, it cannot be said that it helps us very much. The examples adduced from the Ras Shamra texts are equivocal, as is shown by the different interpretations of them offered by different scholars. The meaning of *kasap ilāni* at Tell el-Amarna is by no means certain. It seems that the meaning which SMITH gives to it lacks supporting parallels. SMITH at any rate gives none. As for the Arabic evidence, it could be argued that in ٱللّٰه the divine name has not lost altogether its religious significance any more than it has in ٱلْإِلٰه in Jon. iii 3. On the other hand, in exclamations of the kind we have instanced the possibility of a certain weakening in the force of the divine name is not to be ruled out. The Syriac evidence, as has just been said, helps not at all. There is then nothing in this extra-Biblical material which necessarily conflicts with the conclusion we have reached so far as the O.T. is concerned. In the O.T. it is, I believe, difficult, if not impossible, to point to any unambiguous example of the use of the divine name as an intensifying epithet and nothing more. The onus of proof seems to me to lie upon those who maintain that such examples exist. This position is substantially the same as that held by PRAT. He would not, as I understand him, have denied the superlative force which results from the bringing into relationship with God of

¹) *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

²) *Thes. Syr.*, 196.

³) Cp. KELSO, *op. cit.*, p. 157, n. 15.

a person or thing. This position is indeed hardly different from that of A. B. DAVIDSON ¹⁾, who writes: "a kind of superl. sense is given to a word by connecting it with the divine name. Probably the idea was that God *originated* the thing (as Ar.) or that it belonged to Him, and was therefore extraordinary. Sometimes the meaning appears to be "in God's estimation" ". And I fancy that this position is not so very far removed also from that of KÖNIG himself.

It was said earlier that a full treatment of our problem would demand a longer study than can be offered here. Several interesting questions arise. For example, if the divine names in Hebrew really have on occasion only the force of an intensifying epithet—and this, I repeat, still awaits proof—should we have to recognize in such a usage of the divine names a relic of very ancient modes of thought, as expressive of the sense of the numinous ²⁾? Or should we see in such usage a weakening of the divine names in popular speech—colloquialisms perhaps—such as we are familiar with in the popular speech of our own day, when we say, for example, that a "hole" is "god-forsaken"? If it is a case of weakening, we might then ask whether it is not more likely that אֱלֹהִים and אֵל might have suffered it more easily than the personal name יְהוָה. And since the O.T. is predominantly a religious volume, may it not be that, just for this very reason, unambiguous examples in it of divine names used only as intensifying epithets fail us? These are only a few of the questions that would call for consideration if we would pursue our problem further. We must leave it, however, at this point, for a consideration of the second unusual way in which Hebrew expresses the superlative to which I wish to refer in this paper.

Very little has been written about the use of מוֹת "die" and מָוֶת "death" to express the superlative in Hebrew. Yet it seems clear that there are several examples in the O.T. where these two words are used, not in reference to death in a literal sense, but in the colloquial sense of "deadly", as when we say "deadly dull", when we mean "very dull, frightfully dull", or "bored to death", when we mean "extremely bored". A good example is to be found in Jud. xvi 16. Here Delilah is pressing Samson daily to tell her the secret of his

¹⁾ *Hebrew Syntax*, 1912, p. 49.

²⁾ Cp. ZIMMERMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 6. At Ras Shamra the use of 'il as an appellative goes back behind the use of it as a proper name of a god; see EISSFELDT, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

strength. The verse ends with the words **וַתִּקְצַר נַפְשׁוֹ לָמוּת**, which are translated in the A.V. "his soul was vexed unto death". The Hebrew phrase means no more, however, than that Samson was exceedingly vexed. He was, as we might say, tired to death of Delilah's importuning, and he could stand it no longer¹). In the next verse he capitulates—"and he told her all his heart". Again, in 2 Ki. xx 1, Hezekiah is described in the A.V. as "sick unto death" (Heb. **חָלָה לָמוּת**). He was in fact, however, only "very ill", for it is evident from Is. xxxviii 9 that he recovered (**וַיְחַי מְחֻלִּי**). Another example occurs in Jon. iv 9, where the prophet, in reply to Yahweh's question, "Doest thou well to be angry for the gourd?", says **הֵיטֵב חָרָה-לִּי מוֹת** "I do well to be extremely angry". If **הֵיטֵב חָרָה-לִּי** here means, as A.V. mg., "I am greatly angry", then **עַד-מוֹת** repeats and heightens the thought already expressed, thus: "I am greatly angry, yes, exceedingly so". An interesting example of the use of **מוֹת** in a superlative sense has been pointed out by TORCZYNER²). It occurs in 1 Sam. iv 20 in reference to Phinehas' wife. "And about the time of her death (Heb. **בְּצֵת מוֹתָהּ**), the women that stood by her said unto her, Fear not; for thou hast borne a son". So the A.V. TORCZYNER shows, however, that Phinehas' wife seems not to have died, and he suggests that **בְּצֵת מוֹתָהּ** could mean simply "at the time of the birth". We may agree that nothing fatal is suggested by the Hebrew phrase, rather intense difficulty in childbirth. In English we say of a mother that "she had a bad (hard) time". This seems to be the meaning of **בְּצֵת מוֹתָהּ** in this passage, and perhaps we may see in it a less formal phrase than that which is found in Gen. xxxv 17 to describe Rachel's difficult labour, viz., **בְּהִקְשָׁתָהּ בְּלִדְתָּהּ**. TORREY³) has found an example of the superlative force of **מוֹת** in Is. liii 12, in the phrase **הִעֲרָה לָמוֹת נַפְשׁוֹ**, which in the A.V. is translated "he hath poured out his soul unto death". Of this **לָמוֹת** TORREY writes: "unto death is the very same hyperbole which appears in English tired to death, frightened to death, the meaning being "utterly, to the very last degree"."

¹) Cp. G. F. MOORE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), 2nd. ed., 1918, p. 355.

²) *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morgenländ. Gesell.*, LXVI (1912), pp. 395 f.

³) *The Second Isaiah*, 1928, p. 423.

In the Song of Songs viii 6 **עֲזָה בְּמוֹת אֶהְבֶּהָ** should perhaps be translated, not "love is strong as death", but "love is extremely strong". Perhaps too in Ex. x 17, when Pharaoh asks Moses and Aaron to intreat the Lord to take from him "this death", **הַמָּוֶת הַזֶּה**, which refers to the plague of locusts, may be translated "this frightful thing". It is at any rate of some interest that PAYNE SMITH ¹⁾ gives to **מָוֶת** in the Peshitta in this passage the meaning *malum praegrave*. It is further possible that in Ps. xviii 5 **מָוֶת חֶבְלֵי-מָוֶת** may mean "most terrible sorrows" rather than "the sorrows of death", though there are difficulties of text here ²⁾, as also in Ps. lv 5 ³⁾, where **אֵימוֹת מָוֶת** is said by FÜRST ⁴⁾ to mean "frightful fears". It is worth noting that, whereas in 1 Sam. v 11 we meet the phrase **מָוֶת-מָוֶת** "a deadly destruction", according to the A.V., the phrase used in verse 9 is **מָוֶת גְּדוֹלָה מְאֹד**. The parallelism between **מָוֶת** and **גְּדוֹלָה מְאֹד** is not without interest for our study. A further example of the superlative force of **מָוֶת** occurs, it may be suggested, in Ben Sira xxxvii 2. The Hebrew text runs as follows ⁵⁾: **הֲלֹא דָן מָגִיעַ אֶל מוֹת רַע כְּנֹפֶשׁ נֹהֵפֶךְ לְצָר**, which we may translate: "Is it not a very great grief (lit. "a grief verging on death"; Greek text *ἔως θανάτου*) when a bosom friend becomes changed into an enemy?" In mediaeval Hebrew too the same usage is found. In a letter which R. Ḥisdai b. Shafrūt, a Jewish physician who held high office at the court of the Khalif 'Abdurrah-mān an-Nāṣir in Cordova in the tenth century, sent to Joseph, the Jewish king of the Khazars, he describes his grief at the premature return of a messenger whom he had sent to convey greetings to, and to bring news from, the Jews in that kingdom. He writes—"and when I heard this bad news, I was very angry" (**חָרָה לִי עַד מוֹת**)—the same phrase as in Jon. iv 9) "and I was very distressed (**וַיִּצַּר לִי מְאֹד**) because he had not fulfilled my command." The parallelism between **עַד מוֹת** and **מְאֹד** is specially to be noted ⁶⁾.

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, 2057.

²⁾ See KITTEL, *Bibl. Hebr.*, 7th. ed., *ad loc.*

³⁾ *Ibid.*, *ad loc.*

⁴⁾ *Op. cit.*, I, 716.

⁵⁾ As given by R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, hebr. u. deutsch*, 1906, p. 32.

⁶⁾ I am indebted to Professor D. DAUBE for drawing my attention to this example. The passage runs: **וְכִשְׁמוּעִי אֶת הַדְּבָר הָרַע הָיָה חָרָה לִי עַד מוֹת וַיִּצַּר לִי** וכשומעי את הדבר הרע הזה חרה לי עד מות ויצר לי (in P. K. KOKOVTSOV's critical edition of the

In the New Testament θάνατος "death" is used similarly with a superlative force. In Matth. xxvi 38 (= Mark xiv 34) Jesus says: περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἕως θανάτου "my soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death"—so A.V.—where ἕως θανάτου (= עַד מוֹת) has a superlative force. Syriac provides a point or two of interest in this connection. I have already mentioned the force given to ܡܠܝܬܐ by PAYNE SMITH in Ex. x 17. To this may be added the interesting rendering in the Peshiṭta of מְרָה נִפְשׁ כָּל-הָעָם in 1 Sam. xxx 6: "the soul of all the people was grieved" (so A.V.). For this phrase the Peshiṭta has ܡܠܝܬܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ ܚܒܠܐ, literally, "the soul of all the people died". TORREY¹) has drawn attention to the use in Syriac of ܠܡܝܬܐ "to death" in a superlative sense. He gives three references. Two of them occur in *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum*. In one ܠܡܝܬܐ is used in connection with extreme grief²), in another in connection with deep regret or repentance³). TORREY's third reference is to a passage in *Julian the Apostate*, but here I do not follow him, for the Syriac phrase in HOFFMANN's edition⁴), which he cites, is not ܠܡܝܬܐ but ܠܡܝܬܐ ܠܡܝܬܐ (in connection with acute distress). The use in Syriac of ܡܠܝܬܐ ܢܦܫܐ "the soul died" to express profound grief, which has just been noted in the Peshiṭta of 1 Sam. xxx 6, recalls the use in Arabic of مَاتَ "he became as though dead with grief". The tenth form of this verb has the sense "he tried every way, or did his utmost, in seeking a thing"⁵), which is perhaps not so very far from our colloquially exaggerated way of speaking when we say "he nearly died doing something", when we really only mean to imply extreme effort or such like.

The third unusual way of expressing the superlative in Hebrew which I wish to consider, very briefly, in this paper, has, so far as I am aware, hardly been noticed hitherto. There are indeed but few possible examples of it in the O.T., but these examples, though few, appear plausible enough to justify us in raising the question whether Hebrew may not have expressed the superlative in this particular

correspondence, Leningrad, 1932, p. 15, ll. 14 f.). On the essential authenticity of the correspondence, see P. KAHLE, *The Cairo Geniza* (Schweich Lectures, 1941), 1947, pp. 16 ff.

¹) *Op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

²) In BEDJAN's edition, 1894, IV, p. 615, l. 13.

³) *Ibid.*, p. 637, l. 18.

⁴) *Julianos der Abtruennige*, 1880, p. 25, l. 6.

⁵) See LANE, *op. cit.*, 2741.

way. I refer to the—no doubt colloquial—use of שָׂאוֹל. I suggested just now that in the Song of Songs viii 6, where love is described as עֲזָה בְּמֹות, the writer probably intended to say that love is “extremely strong”. In this same verse “jealousy” (קִנְיָה) is described as קָשָׁה בְּשָׂאוֹל. In the A.V. this phrase is translated “cruel as the grave”. But may it not mean simply “profoundly cruel”—as we might say, if the colloquialism may be forgiven, “hellishly cruel”? Again, if, as I suggested earlier, חֶבְלֵי-מָוֶת in Ps. xviii 5 means “most terrible sorrows”, may not חֶבְלֵי שָׂאוֹל in verse 6 mean “terrible pains”, “hellish pains” (A.V. “sorrows of hell”)? In passing I may mention that in Greek ἄδης in the genitive is used with a noun in an adjectival sense, viz., “devilish”. For example, the Cyclops, in Euripides’ play of that name, is called by Odysseus ἄδου μάγειρος “devilish cook”¹). A particularly interesting example of שָׂאוֹל in a superlative sense may be seen perhaps in Is. lvii 9. This verse occurs in a poem in which the faithless in Israel are attacked by the prophet “And thou wentest²) to the king with ointment, and didst increase thy perfumes, and didst send thy messengers far off, and didst debase thyself even unto hell”. So we read in the A.V. The phrase translated “and didst debase thyself even unto hell” is in Hebrew וַתִּשְׁפִּילִי עַד-שָׂאוֹל, and is commonly explained by commentators as a reference to the practice of necromancy or consultation of subterranean gods³). P. VOLZ⁴), however, who interprets the passage along political lines, thinks that the phrase is a figure of speech for abject servility. I believe he is right. But whereas he thinks that the suppliant is so servile that he does not just throw himself upon the ground, but deep down into the underworld, I would myself rather suppose that שָׂאוֹל here may have lost its literal force altogether, and that עַד-שָׂאוֹל

¹) A. S. WAY, *Euripides*, II (Loeb Class. Library), 1912, p. 558, l. 397, translates “this devil-cook”. Cp. further LIDDELL and SCOTT, *A Greek-Eng. Lex.* (ed. H. STUART JONES and R. MCKENZIE), p. 21.

²) G. R. DRIVER translates וַתִּשְׁפִּילִי “and thou wast drenched” (*Studies in O.T. Prophecy*, ed. H. H. ROWLEY, 1950, p. 58). A different view is expressed by J. REIDER, *Zeitschr. f. d. alttestam. Wiss.*, N.F. XII (1935), pp. 276 f.

³) See, e.g., K. MARTI, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1900, p. 369; B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1902, p. 390; E. J. KISSANE, *The Book of Isaiah*, II, p. 226.

⁴) *Jesaja II*, 1932, pp. 211 ff. Cp. TORREY, *op. cit.*, pp. 431 f., and H. ODEBERG, *Trito-Isaiah (Isaiah 56-66)*; *A Literary and Linguistic Analysis*, 1931, p. 85.

is equivalent to our phrase "to the lowest depths", no precise relationship to any particular locality being thought of in either the Hebrew or the English phrase. The Hebrew phrase here then would do no more than express the utter debasement of the apostate Israelites before a foreign king.

To conclude. Into all attempts at the interpretation of the Hebrew text of the O.T. an element of subjectivity inevitably enters. The interpretations offered in this paper are submitted in the full realisation that others will interpret them, or some of them, differently. As was said earlier, I do not claim to have treated the subject of this paper exhaustively. While it may well be that not all that I have said will appear persuasive, and while, moreover, I have presented but an outline treatment of a subject on which more could be said, it is my hope that this paper may have served to suggest that it is worth while to look at the divine names, at *מִוֶּתֶ* and *מִוֶּתֶת*, and at *שִׁוִּיל* as we meet them in the Hebrew Bible more closely than perhaps we have been wont to do, bearing in mind, as we do so, especially the expression of the superlative in Hebrew. This paper will, I hope, have suggested also that there is yet much to be discovered about the way in which the ancient Hebrews expressed themselves in ordinary, everyday speech. Like other peoples, the Hebrews had their colloquial language, and our study of the way in which, we believe, they sometimes expressed the superlative, will, I hope, have served to illustrate how examples of it may be recovered.

SOME FURTHER REMARKS ON UNUSUAL WAYS OF EXPRESSING THE SUPERLATIVE IN HEBREW

In an article in *Vetus Testamentum* (iii, 1953, pp. 209ff.) I discussed some unusual ways of expressing the superlative in Hebrew, more especially the use of the divine names אֱלֹהִים, אֵל, יְהוָה and of מוֹת and מֶנֶח. I now add some further remarks.

In Exod. xxxii 16 (cf. xxxi 18) it has been proposed, with some plausibility, that מִכְתָּב אֱלֹהִים, literally 'the writing of God', means 'fine work, as of a god, in contrast with the scratchings of a mere

¹) Cf. Hos. v 5.

²) Cf. the parallel passages in Hos. v 11 ff. and xii 2. In the former the prophet states that since the author of the nation's sickness is God, no one but God can cure it. For the latter, see H. L. GINSBERG, "Hosea's Ephraim, More Fool Than Knave", *JBL* 80 (1961), pp. 339-347, esp. p. 340.

man on a potsherd' ¹). In Num. xxii 22 אַף אֱלֹהִים, literally 'the anger of God', may well mean 'a divine, terrible anger', for elsewhere אַף, when followed by a divine name, is found with הָאֱלֹהִים, or אֱלֹהִים with suffix, or with יְהוָה. The Assyrian phrase (*is*) *kirûm šā ša ilium* 'that orchard is divine', that is, 'splendid', suggests that אֱלֹהִים in Ezek. xxviii 13 may mean 'a splendid garden'. In Isa. li 3 גִּן-יְהוָה will have the same force ²). In Ps. lxx 10 פְּלֵג אֱלֹהִים 'the stream of God' is described as מָלֵא מַיִם 'full of water'. The reference is to the heavy winter rain which pours down as in a stream, in contrast to the spring 'showers' (רִבִּיבִים, verse 11). E. J. KISSANE translates the Hebrew phrase 'the divine channel, heavenly stream' ³), which, if אֱלֹהִים is given an intensive force, means 'a mighty channel', מָלֵא מַיִם being then a further description of it. It may be suggested that אֱלֹהִים in מַכָּה אֱלֹהִים, descriptive of the Servant of Yahweh (Isa. liii 4), has a superlative force, and so means 'horribly smitten'. Isa. liii is indeed noteworthy for the build up of expressions with an intensive force, and מַכָּה אֱלֹהִים may be yet another such expression which has not hitherto been recognised.

Perhaps מַעַל כּוֹכְבֵי-אֵל (Isa. xiv 13), which is usually translated 'above the stars of God', should be translated 'above the highest, furthest, stars'. It is at least of some interest that DUHM ⁴) in this passage compares the phrase with הֶרְרֵי-אֵל (Ps. xxxvi 7) and אֲרֵצֵי-אֵל (Ps. lviii 11), both examples of אֵל with superlative force ⁵). By means of a clever emendation T. H. GASTER finds a further example of אֵל with superlative force in Job xii 6, where for לְמַרְצֵי אֵל 'for

¹) See G. R. DRIVER, *Semitic Writing* (Schweich Lectures, 1944), rev. ed., 1954, p. 79.

²) Cf. G. R. DRIVER, *Journ. of Semit. Stud.* vii, 1962, p. 95; cf. בְּרָמָל 'glorious plantation', K. Vollers, *Z.A.* xvii, 1903, pp. 310f.

³) *The Book of Psalms*, i, p. 276, 278f.

⁴) *Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 92.

⁵) Cf. *V.T.* iii, 1953, p. 210; A. B. EHRLICH, *Randgloss. z. hebr. Bibel* iv, p. 55, 213 n. 6.

those who provoke God' he reads לְמוֹ רִגְזֵי-אֵל 'in the face of violent disturbances (there is a sense of security)'¹).

In Ps. civ 16 עֲצֵי יְהוָה 'trees of Yahweh' probably means 'mighty, majestic, trees' (the phrase stands in parallelism with אֲרָזֵי לְבָנוֹן 'cedars of Lebanon', that is, 'majestic cedars')²). It is tempting to see a similar intensive use of the name Marduk in Nebuchadrezzar's account of his expedition to Syria—'At that time, the Lebanon (*La-ab-na-a-nu*), the [Cedar] Mountain, the luxurious forest of Marduk, the smell of which is sweet....'³).

Further examples of the superlative force of the divine name can now be cited from the Ugaritic texts. G. R. DRIVER translates *gl.ēl* and *klbt.ēlm* 'El's calf' and 'El's bitch'⁴), but he regards as possible the translation 'monstrous calf, monstrous bitch'. Again, *bšrt.ēl* is translated 'Wondrous good tidings!', literally 'good tidings of El' or 'of god', that is, divine, marvellous tidings⁵), and *bēl ḡl* is said to mean 'the reed-beds of El', that is, divine in the sense 'vast reed-beds'⁶). That *ēl* in this passage may have superlative force is the view also of Y. SUKENIK⁷). The phrase *mlbr ēl* is translated by DRIVER 'the vast wilderness', literally, 'the wilderness of El'⁸), and *šd.ēlm* 'a divine effluence', literally 'effluence of El'⁹). The expression *s.ēl*, translated by J. A. EMERTON¹⁰) 'a bowl [or bowls] for [or fit for] a god' provides a further possible example of the superlative force of *ēl* in the texts from Ugarit¹¹).

The phrase הֶעָרָה לְמוֹת נַפְשׁוֹ (Isa. liii 12) 'he gave of himself utterly'¹²) suggests a similar meaning for לְמוֹת in Jud. v 18. May we translate זְבולון נַפְשׁוֹ לְמוֹת 'Zebulun is a people which com-

¹) *Semitic Studies in memory of Immanuel Löw*, ed. A. SCHEIBER, 1947, p. 287 n.

²) Cf. J. REIDER, *Journ. of Jew. Stud.* i, 1948, p. 116; *V.T.* iii, 1953, pp. 211f; cf. אֲרָזֵי-אֵל (Ps. lxxx 11) 'the goodly cedars'.

³) *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, ed. J. B. PRITCHARD, p. 307.

⁴) *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, p. 86, lines 59f.; p. 87, n. 20.

⁵) *Ibid.*, p. 118, line 33, p. 119, n. 7.

⁶) *Ibid.*, p. 54, line 22, p. 55, n. 3.

⁷) *B.A.S.O.R.* 107, 1947, p. 14.

⁸) *Op. cit.*, p. 70, line 21f., p. 71 n. 7; for *mlbr*, see J. AISTLEITNER *Wörterb. d. ugar. Sprache*, ed. O. EISSFELDT, p. 167.

⁹) *Op. cit.*, p. 120, line 13, p. 121, n. 10.

¹⁰) *J.T.S.* xvi, 1965, p. 439. Cf. the nouns denoting some items of furniture followed by *ēl* on p. 440.

¹¹) Cf. further AISTLEITNER, *op. cit.*, pp. 17f.

¹²) Cf. *V.T.* iii, 1953, p. 220.

pletely disregarded his life'? It may be noted that the LXX, Pesh., Targ., and Vulg. all read לְמוֹת for לְמוֹת¹). A further example of לְמוֹת in this same sense—'utterly, completely'—may be seen in Isa. liii 8, where for נָנַע לְמוֹת the LXX has ἡθη εἰς θάνατον, that is, נָנַע לְמוֹת²) 'he was smitten to the utmost', that is, 'he was horribly smitten' (cf. on מָכָה אֱלֹהִים in verse 4, *supra*).

S. RIN's article 'The מוֹת of Grandeur'³) contains two points which invite comment. In the first place, he writes that in all Hebrew expressions which employ the divine name as superlative 'the divine name of course simply indicates the superlative or grandeur'. If by this he intends to imply that the divine name when so used is an intensifying epithet and nothing more, then we find his statement unacceptable, for it is difficult, if not impossible, to point to any unambiguous example in the Old Testament of the use of the divine name as nothing more than an intensifying epithet⁴). And in the second place, while it is possible that traces of Mot, the god of death and the underworld mentioned in the Ugaritic texts, may be found in such phrases as מְקַשֵּׁי-מָוֶת, מְשַׁבְּרֵי-מָוֶת (2 Sam. xxii 5f.) and הַבְּלִי-מָוֶת (Ps. xviii 5), where the reference is to the nether world, it may be doubted whether other examples adduced by RIN must necessarily be explained by reference to Mot. Thus מְהוֹמֵת-מָוֶת (1 Sam. v 11) need not necessarily mean 'a confusion of Mot'; the phrase could mean 'a deadly destruction (cf. verse 9 where מְהוֹמָה is found). Nor need אֵימֹת מָוֶת (Ps. lv 5) necessarily mean 'terrors of Mot'; the phrase could mean 'frightful fears'. In other words, מָוֶת in these last two examples appears rather to be the common word מָוֶת 'death' used colloquially with the meaning 'deadly' (cf. in English 'deadly dull' = 'extremely dull')⁵), and no connection with Mot need be postulated in explanation of them.

¹) εἰς θάνατον, (לְמוֹת, לְמוֹת, *morti*.

²) Cf. VITRINGA, *Comment. in Jesaiam, pars II*, 1724, p. 674; he reads נָנַע לְמוֹת. cf. IsaA נָנַע.

³) *V.T.* ix, 1959, pp. 324f.

⁴) *V.T.* iii, 1953, p. 218.

⁵) *Ibid.*, pp. 219ff, especially p. 223. The phrases מְקַשֵּׁי-מָוֶת in 2 Sam. xii 5 and מְשַׁבְּרֵי-מָוֶת in 1 Kings ii 26 (in the plural in 2 Sam. xix 26) have been interpreted as 'the deadly man, the arch villain' by A. PHILLIPS, *V.T.* xvi, 1966, p. 244.

In an article published elsewhere ¹⁾ I considered the use of the Hebrew word **נִנְצַח** as a superlative in Hebrew. Attention may be drawn here to a further possible example of this usage. In Isa. xxviii 29 E. J. KISSANE ²⁾ reads **כִּי לֹא לִנְצַח לֶחֶם יִדָּק** and translates 'For bread-corn is not crushed [outright]'. KISSANE does not himself make a point of the superlative force of **לִנְצַח** in this passage, but the meaning 'utterly, completely'—a meaning which **נִנְצַח, לִנְצַח**, bears in a number of passages—would suit the context well.

Cambridge

D. WINTON THOMAS

¹⁾ *Journ. of Semit. Stud.* i, 1956, p. 106ff.

²⁾ *The Book of Isaiah* i, pp. 312, 320.

THE USE OF נִצַּח AS A SUPERLATIVE IN HEBREW

By D. WINTON THOMAS, Cambridge

In an article published recently, I discussed some unusual ways of expressing the superlative in Hebrew, with special reference to the divine names, to מִיָּחָה and מִיָּחָה, and to שְׁאוּל.¹ In the present article I wish to consider the Hebrew word נִצַּח, which likewise seems to have a superlative force in some Old Testament passages. P. Saydon has drawn attention to this usage of נִצַּח, and he compares the usage in Maltese of *ahhar* "last", which corresponds to the Hebrew נִצַּח "end".² The superlative force of נִצַּח does not, however, I believe, derive from the meaning "end", but is to be explained in a different way.

According to Brown-Driver-Briggs,³ the root נִצַּח I means "was pre-eminent, enduring". For the true understanding of the meaning of this root we must start from its occurrence in Syriac. Here ܢܝܚ means (a) *splenduit, fulsit*, (b) *flornit, inclarnit, celebris evasit*, (c) *vicit, triumphavit*.⁴ From the primary meaning "shone, was bright, brilliant", was developed the meaning "was illustrious, pre-eminent", and then "was victorious, triumphed".⁵ In English we use the word "shining" or "brilliant" in the sense of "excelling, pre-eminent", as in the phrase "a shining (brilliant) example", and it may be suggested that it is the meaning "pre-eminence" which provides the clue to the explanation of נִצַּח when it is used with a superlative force, and not, as Saydon proposes, the meaning "end".

P. Joüon⁶ has noted that in certain passages—Ps. xiii. 2, lxxiv. 10, lxxix. 5, lxxxix. 47—where נִצַּח is closely associated with צִדְקָה, צִדְקָה, צִדְקָה, an impression of a logical contradiction is created, which is, he suggests, to be resolved by supposing that we have in these passages two separate ideas, or two forms of the same idea, which present themselves simultaneously—in

¹ See *Vet. Test.* III (1953), 209 ff.

² *Ibid.* IV (1954), 432 f. The passages to which Saydon refers are Ps. lii. 7, lxxiv. 3, lxxix. 5, lxxiv. 10 (?), lxxxix. 47 (?), Job xxxiv. 36.

³ *A Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 663.

⁴ Payne Smith, *Thes. Syr.* II, 2437.

⁵ Some notes on these three meanings of the root will be found in an Appendix to this article.

⁶ *Biblica*, VII (1926), 162 f.

THE USE OF נָצַח AS A SUPERLATIVE IN HEBREW

the case of Ps. xiii. 2, for example, "how long wilt thou forget me?" and "wilt thou forget me for ever?" Instead of expressing these two ideas one after the other, the poet amalgamates them into one linguistic unit, which can best be translated—"how long wilt thou forget me? Is it for ever?"¹

It will be convenient to consider first these four passages to which Joüon refers, and to ask whether the word נָצַח which occurs in them cannot be equally satisfactorily explained on the supposition that the Hebrew word is used with a superlative force in the sense "to a pre-eminence", that is, "to a pre-eminent degree", and so "completely, utterly", or the like.² Thus these passages may, it is suggested, be translated as follows.

Ps. xiii. 2. "How long, Yahweh, wilt thou forget me completely?"³

Ps. lxxiv. 10. "How long, Yahweh, will the adversary reproach, the enemy spurn, thy name outrageously?"⁴

Ps. lxxix. 5. "How long, Yahweh, wilt thou be extremely angry, thine anger burn like fire?"

Ps. lxxxix. 47. "How long, Yahweh, wilt thou hide thyself completely, thine anger burn like fire?"

In some other passages too נָצַח may have this same superlative force. For example:

Ps. lii. 7. "God will likewise drag thee down completely."

Ps. lxxiv. 1. "Why, O God, dost thou reject us completely?"

Job xiv. 20. "Thou prevailest utterly against him and he passeth away."

It may be suggested further that, in Ps. lxxiv. 3, the phrase נִשְׁאוֹר נָצַח means, not "the perpetual desolations" (so A.V.), but, literally, "the desolations of pre-eminence", that is, desolations of the utmost ruin.⁵

¹ C. von Orelli, *Die hebr. Synonyma, Der Zeit und Ewigkeit*, p. 99, thinks that the sense is—"how long must I think that thou hast forgotten me for ever?"

² Cp. J. Fürst, *Hebr. u. Chald. Wörterb. über das A.T.* II, 50.

³ B. Boothroyd, *Bibl. Hebr.* (1810-16), II, 58, writes (on Ps. xiii. 2)—"the sense of this word cannot be *for ever*; but must be what Houbigant suggests, *penitus*". C. A. Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Comm. on the Book of Psalms*, I, 102, observes that נָצַח here means "ever, continually", and is not a contraction of לְנֶצַח "for ever", the usual term, which is not suited to עַד-אֵנָה. H. Hupfeld, *Die Psalmen* (3rd ed. 1888), pp. 199 f., denies that נָצַח means *gänzlich*; according to him it means *immer*.

⁴ Cp. Saydon. The interrogative here governs both stichs, as in verses 1 and 2, and in Ps. lxxix. 5, lxxxix. 47, Lam. v. 20, etc.; cp. Joüon, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

⁵ Saydon, "irreparable ruins".

THE USE OF נִצַּח AS A SUPERLATIVE IN HEBREW

In Ben Sira xl. 14 it is said of the wealth of the unjust man—**כִּן פְּתָאִם לִנְצַח יָתֵם**, which may be translated “so suddenly it completely comes to an end”.¹

These examples of נִצַּח with a superlative force are not necessarily exhaustive.² They are sufficient, however, to illustrate the superlative force of the word, which derives, I believe, from the meaning “pre-eminence”. W. F. Albright has suggested that נִצַּח “eternity” should be connected, not with נִצַּח I, but with נִצַּח II, in the sense of “vigour, vitality, enduring quality”.³ If this view is correct, and it would seem to have much to be said for it, נִצַּח “end, eternity” has to be kept distinct from נִצַּח “pre-eminence”, which remains, as at present in the dictionaries, rightly entered under נִצַּח I.

APPENDIX

The three meanings which נִצַּח bears in Syriac, namely, “shone”, “was illustrious, pre-eminent”, and “was victorious” have been referred to above. It may be useful here to append some additional notes on these three meanings.

(a) “Shone”. Von Orelli⁴ refers נִצַּח to an unused root with the basic meaning “shone”, which belongs to the root נִצַּח, and he compares נִצַּח, the adjective נִצַּח (perhaps also נִצַּח), and Arabic words like **سَاح** “be clear”, **وَضَح** “gleam of dawn”, and Syriac **ܢܝܚܐ** “glow”. In Ben Sira xxxii. 10 נִצַּח, with **בֶּרֶק** “lightning” and **חֵן** “favour” as subjects, is translated “shine” by I. Lévi,⁵ but “hasten” by Smend⁶ who, however, finds a connexion between the meanings “hasten” and “shine”.⁷

(b) “Was illustrious, pre-eminent”. In the Behistun inscription, line 60, **אתנצחן** is translated “were especially distinguished” by A. E.

¹ R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*, Hebr. u. Deutsch, p. 71, rightly translates **לנצח** here by “völlig”; cf. his Commentary, p. 374.

² In Ps. ix. 7 **לנצח** is translated “to a pre-eminent degree, utterly” by G. R. Driver, *Semitic Writing*, Schweich Lectures (rev. ed. 1954), p. 204. In Job xxxiv. 36 **לנצח** is perhaps better translated “right to the end”, i.e. “till he ceases from his wicked answers” (see S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *A Crit. and Exeg. Comm. on the Book of Job*, p. 302) rather than “thoroughly”, as Saydon.

³ *Bull. of the Amer. Schools of Or. Res.* no. 110, p. 18. H. Torczyner (*The Lachish Letters*, p. 57) thinks that נִצַּח meant originally “was strong”, and that **לנצח** strictly means “with force, vigour, absolutely”, and that only from such phrases as **יִאבֵד לנצח** does the word come to mean “for ever”. Cp. his Hebrew edition of the letters (תעוררת לכיש), p. 72. With נִצַּח II may be compared South Arabic **ḥḥ**; see K. Conti Rossini, *Chrest. arab. meridionalis epigraphica*, p. 190.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 95.

⁵ *L'Éclésiastique*, II, 157. Cp. A. A. Bevan, *J.T.S.* I (1899–1900), 142.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 55 (of German translation at xxxv. 10).

⁷ *Ibid.* Commentary, p. 289.

THE USE OF נָצַח AS A SUPERLATIVE IN HEBREW

Cowley.¹ The root נָצַח occurs four times in the Aramaic documents published by G. R. Driver.² The meaning "distinguish oneself" is, however, regarded by the editor as less likely than "show oneself active, vigorous",³ after the Syriac *ܢܥܝܬ* *valuit, vigit*.⁴

(c) "Was victorious". For this sense as preserved in the LXX and other ancient versions, see S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, pp. 128 f. To what is given there may be added the renderings of נָצַח in the Pesh. by *ܢܥܬܐ* (Job xxiii. 7), *ܢܥܬܐ* (Isa. xxv. 8), *ܢܥܬܐ* (Ps. xvi. 11); cp. the renderings *ܢܥܬܐ* "strong" (Jer. xv. 18) and *ܢܥܬܐ* "strength" (Ps. lxxiv. 3). The Vulg. translates נָצַח by *victoria* in Prov. xxi. 28, I Chron. xxix. 11. In Job xxiii. 7 and Prov. xxi. 28 *לְנִצָּח* probably means "successfully".⁵ In Ben Sira xliii. 5 נָצַח, used of Yahweh's word, may mean "assure victory",⁶ and similarly in xliii. 13, with Yahweh's power as subject, "make victorious".⁷ T. K. Cheyne⁸ will not admit נָצַח into the vocabulary of Ben Sira, and he banishes it from several Old Testament passages (I Sam. xv. 29, Hab. i. 4, Job xxxiv. 36, Prov. xxi. 28, Lam. iii. 18). In a Phoenician inscription from Idalion, נָצַח means "I conquered".⁹ The Samaritan *naza, nasa* "conquered"¹⁰ should be entered in the dictionary. In the *Manual of Discipline* נָצַח may have the connotation "victory".¹¹ In post-Biblical Hebrew this meaning is very common.¹² The development in meaning from the sense "shone" to "was victorious" may be further illustrated by Accadian *barāru* "shine", Arabic *بَارِعٌ* "was pious, honest" (cf. Arabic *نَصَحٌ* "was pure, reliable" = נָצַח) which in the fourth form means "overcame, subdued".¹³

¹ *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* pp. 254, 259.

² *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* nos. vii. 4, 5; xi. 3; xiii. 1.

³ *Ibid.* p. 24b (on vii. 4).

⁴ Cp. C. Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.* 2nd ed. p. 442.

⁵ See G. R. Driver, *Z.A.T.W.* n.F. ix (1932), 145. Torczyner translates *לְנִצָּח* in Ps. xxiii. 7 and Hab. i. 4 by "victoriously" (*The Lachish Letters*, p. 57; cp. his Hebrew edition, p. 73).

⁶ Lévi, *op. cit.* i, 67.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 71; Smend, *op. cit.* (trans. p. 76) "jagt". In both these passages נָצַח is translated "make brilliant" by A. E. Cowley and Ad. Neubauer, *The original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus*, p. 17.

⁸ *Jew. Quart. Rev.* xi (1898-9), 400 ff.

⁹ See G. A. Cooke, *A Text-Book of North Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 76; M. Lidzbarski, *Handb. d. nordsem. Epigraphik*, p. 325; Z. S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, p. 125.

¹⁰ J. H. Petermann, *Brevis ling. samarit. Grammatica, Litteratura, Chrestomathia*, p. 60 (of glossary).

¹¹ See W. H. Brownlee, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline", *Bull. of the Amer. Schools of Or. Res., Supplem. Studies*, nos. 10-12, p. 17, n. 36.

¹² See M. Jastrow, *A Dict. of the Targumim*, etc., p. 928.

¹³ Lane, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.* pp. 175 f. Von Orelli, *op. cit.*, p. 95, adduces Arabic *ظَهَرَ* with a similar development of meaning.

צִלְמוֹת IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

By D. WINTON THOMAS

I

There are eighteen occurrences of the word צִלְמוֹת in the Old Testament. They all occur in poetical passages—four times in the prophetic writings (Isa. ix. 1; Jer. ii. 6; xiii. 16; Amos v. 8), four times in the Psalms (xxiii. 4; xlv. 20; cvii. 10, 14), and ten times in Job (iii. 5; x. 21, 22; xii. 22; xvi. 16; xxiv. 17 (*bis*); xxviii. 3; xxxiv. 22; xxxviii. 17).

We may begin our study of the word with a brief survey of the renderings of it in the chief ancient versions. In twelve passages the LXX renders by σκιά θανάτου "shadow of death".¹ In Job xvi. 16 σκιά alone appears.² In Job x. 21 צִלְמוֹת is rendered by γυνοφερός "dark", and in Job xxxviii. 17 by ἄδης. Especially noteworthy is the LXX's rendering ἀκαρπός "barren" in Jer. ii. 6. The Greek rendering is commonly taken to presuppose a Hebrew original גִּלְמוֹת,³ but it may well be that the LXX is here merely giving an explanatory paraphrase.⁴ In Job x. 22 the Greek text diverges markedly from the M.T.,⁵ and in Job xxxiv. 22 the words צִלְמוֹת וְאֵין חֵן-וְאֵין חֶסֶד are paraphrased⁶ (οὐδὲ ἔσται τόπος).

In the minor Greek versions⁷ σκιά θανάτου is the rendering of צִלְמוֹת in Jer. ii. 6 ἈΣΘ, xiii. 16 Ἀ; Job xxiv. 17a ΣΘ, 17b Θ,

¹ According to Rahlfs's text (Isa. ix. 1; Jer. xiii. 16; Amos v. 8; Pss. xxiii. 4; xlv. 20; cvii. 10, 14; Job iii. 5; xii. 22; xxiv. 17 (*bis*); xxviii. 3).

² ASc+ θανάτου (see Rahlfs, *ad loc.*).

³ Cf. for example Kittel, BH₃ *ad loc.*; A. W. Streane, *The Double Text of Jeremiab*, p. 35.

⁴ See J. Hehn, *Orientalistische Studien Fritz Hommel zum sechzigsten Geburtstag. . . gewidmet* (M.V.A.G. xxii, 1918), p. 85, n. 1.

⁵ The M.T. itself presents difficulties here. The words צִלְמוֹת אֶפֶס כִּמוֹ אֶפֶס are omitted by many (cf. for example Kittel, BH₃ *ad loc.*); W. B. Stevenson, *Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Poem of Job*, p. 41; and G. R. Driver, who regards the words as an explanatory gloss to לֹא סִדְרִים (*Suppl. to Vet. Test.* iii, 76). C. J. Ball, *The Book of Job*, p. 198, suggests that αἰωνίου (= עוֹלָם) represents צִלְמוֹת. An attempt at the restoration of the text on the basis of the LXX may be found in F. Wutz, *Das Buch Job*, pp. 45 f.

⁶ Cf. Ball, *op. cit.* p. 386, and G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint* 1. *Book of Job*, pp. 23 f.

⁷ The references are from Field, *Orig. Hexapl.*

צֶלֶמֶת IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

xxviii. 3 'ΑΣΘ; Ps. xlv. 20 'ΑΣΕ', cvii. 10 Ε' ('ΑΣΘΣ' σκιάς...). In Job xxxiv. 22 σκιά θανάτου renders צֶלֶמֶת וְאֵין חֹשֶׁךְ in 'ΑΘ. In Job x. 21 and Ps. xxiii. 4 Σ translates by σκεπτόμενος θανάτω. In Job xxiv. 17b Σ paraphrases (βιασθεὶς θανάτω).

In all but two instances the Targum renders צֶלֶמֶת by טוֹלָא מוֹתָא [7] [טוֹלָא] "shadow(s) of death". The two exceptions are Jer. xiii. 16 and Amos v. 8, where the word is translated by two different words meaning "darkness", namely, חֹשֶׁךְ and כָּבֵל respectively.

The Peshitta has ܐܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ "shadows of death" throughout.

In the Vulgate *umbra mortis* appears in twelve passages¹ (so Jerome in Ps. xlv. 20; cvii. 10, 14), and *tenebrae* in two² (in Job xxxviii. 17 *tenebrosa*). In Jer. ii. 6 *imago mortis* is the translation, and in Job x. 21 and xvi. 16 *opertam mortis caligine* and *caligaverunt* respectively.

The renderings of the A.V., R.V., R.S.V., and Luther's Bible may next be given. The A.V. has "shadow of death" throughout, and so too has the R.V., except that in six passages the R.V. marg. has "deep darkness".³ The R.S.V. generally has "deep darkness", but there are exceptions. In Ps. xxiii. 4 "the shadow of death" appears, with "deep darkness" in the margin; in Ps. cvii. 10, 14 we find "gloom", and in Job x. 22 the words צֶלֶמֶת אֶסֶל are left untranslated (marg. "as darkness, deep darkness"). Luther translates six times by *Dunkel*⁴ (in Job xvi. 16 *sind verdunkelt*), and five times by *Finsternis*⁵ (in four passages *finster*).⁶ In Job xxviii. 3 צֶלֶמֶת אֶסֶל is translated *tief verborgen*, and in Job x. 22 צֶלֶמֶת אֶסֶל is left untranslated.

There are a number of other passages in which, according to some scholars, צֶלֶמֶת, or צֶלֶמֶת,⁷ should be read. Thus in Job xxxiii. 22 לְמוֹ צֶלֶמֶת has been emended by Cheyne to לְמוֹ צֶלֶמֶת "to the dark world" (LXX εν ὕδατι),⁸ and the same writer emends מָוֶת in Ps. xviii. 6⁹ and דָּוָם in Pss. xciv. 17; cxv. 17, similarly.¹⁰

¹ Isa. ix. 1; Jer. xiii. 16; Ps. xxiii. 4 (Jerome *mortis*); xlv. 20; cvii. 10, 14; Job iii. 5; x. 22; xii. 22; xxiv. 17a; xxviii. 3; xxxiv. 22.

² Amos v. 8; Job xxiv. 17b.

³ Isa. ix. 1; Jer. ii. 6; xiii. 16; Amos v. 8; Ps. xxiii. 4; Job iii. 5.

⁴ Ps. cvii. 10, 14; Job iii. 5; x. 21; xii. 22; xxxiv. 22.

⁵ Amos v. 8; Ps. xlv. 20; Job xxiv. 17a, b; xxxviii. 17.

⁶ Isa. ix. 1; Jer. ii. 6; xiii. 16; Ps. xxiii. 4.

⁷ For this vocalization, see below.

⁸ *Encycl. Bibl.* 2484.

⁹ Cheyne's emendation מָוֶת is regarded as possible by C. F. Burney, *The Book of Judges*, p. 468, n.

¹⁰ *Encycl. Bibl.* 4420.

צִלְמוֹת IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

In Ps. xxxix. 7 בְּצִלְמוֹת has been emended to בְּצִלְמֵי.¹ Rashi explains בְּצִלְמֵי in this passage by בְּחֹשֶׁךְ “in darkness”, and he mentions Dunash Ibn Labrat’s rendering here by צִלְמוֹת. Ibn Ezra too remarks that בְּצִלְמֵי in this passage is צִלְמוֹת.² And in Ps. lxxviii. 15 בְּצִלְמוֹת was read as early as Berachoth (15b) as בְּצִלְמוֹת.³ It may be added that in Ps. lxxxviii. 7 מְצִלּוֹת is read by the LXX and Peshitta as צִלְמוֹת.

II

We turn now to the etymology of צִלְמוֹת. We need not linger on the etymology behind the Vulgate’s *imago mortis* (Jer. ii. 6), namely, צֶלֶם “image” and מָוֶת “death”.⁴ The traditional view of the word, that it is compounded of צֶלֶם “shadow” and מָוֶת “death”—so “shadow of death”—has, as has been shown, weighty support in the ancient versions. It is the view also of Saadiah, Kimchi,⁵ and Ibn Janāḥ.⁶ Many scholars, however, regard the form צִלְמוֹת as having arisen through folk-etymology from a form צִלְמוֹת meaning “darkness”, which reading is, they believe, to be preferred.⁷ This reading, formed on the analogy of words like מְרִידוֹת, עֲבָדוֹת, קְדָרוֹת, is referred to a root צִלַם “was dark”, cognate with Akkadian *ṣalāmu*, Arabic ظلم iv, and

¹ M. Lambert, *R.E.J.* xxviii (1894), 261 ff. He suggests that the letters ית of יתחלך led to the loss of ות.

² Similarly, the commentary מצודת ציון.

³ א"ת בצלמן אלא בצלמות. The Targ.’s paraphrase טולא דמות and Theodot.’s εἰκὼς are worth noting. Cheyne (*Encycl. Bibl.* 5377) thinks צִלְמוֹת (Krochmal) is the most plausible emendation.

⁴ Cf. Streane, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

⁵ *Radicum Liber sive hebr. lex. bibl.* (1847), p. 313.

⁶ *The Book of Hebrew Roots*, ed. A. Neubauer, p. 611.

⁷ See, for example, Koehler-Baumgartner, *Lex. in vet. test. libros*, p. 805; Ges.-Buhl, *Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterb.* p. 684; M. Jastrow, *Dict. of the Targumim*, etc. p. 1285; Ges.-Kautzsch, *Heb. Gramm.* (2nd ed., A. E. Cowley), p. 103, n. 1; E. König, *Lehrgeb. d. hebr. Sprache*, II, i, 415; C. A. Briggs, *The Book of Psalms* (ICC), I, 383; K. Budde, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 12; F. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia*, p. 7; C. J. Ball, *op. cit.* p. 121; E. Sellin, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch*, p. 188; Elieser ben Iehuda, *Thes. totius hebr.* xi, 5501. J. Olshausen, *Die Psalmen*, 1853, p. 130, thinks that the use of צִלְמוֹת as a poetical proper name for the underworld, or perhaps only a confusion with such a name, led to the supplanting of the form צִלְמוֹת. As will be shown later, however, צִלְמוֹת has no specific reference to the underworld—certainly it is not a proper name for it. König, *op. cit.* p. 204, n. 1, rejects Wetzstein’s view that צִלְמוֹת is originally only the feminine form of an old Semitic צִלַם “darkness”.

צֶלְמוֹת IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Ethiopic *ṣalma*, in the same sense.¹ Suggested variations from this root are צֶלְמוֹת,² or צֶלְמוֹת (intensive plural; cf. Arabic غُلْمَةٌ, plur. غُلُمَات),³ and *ṣalmot*.⁴

Though the reading צֶלְמוֹת, or some similar form, has been widely adopted by commentators and lexicographers, voices have from time to time been raised in defence of the traditional explanation of the word. In 1892 F. Schwally⁵ argued that in the north Semitic languages צֶלֶם does not mean "was dark", and the fact that in Akkadian *ṣalmu* is commonly used for "dark" does not justify imposing this meaning on the Hebrew צֶלֶם. He held further that צֶלֶם מוֹת "shadow of death" has reference in almost every Old Testament passage to the underworld.

The traditional explanation of צֶלְמוֹת has been powerfully upheld also by Th. Nöldeke.⁶ In a review of A. von Kremer's *Altarabische Gedichte über die Volkssage von Jemen...*, Nöldeke, in 1867, rejected Kremer's vocalization *ṣalemôth* (plural of צֶלֶם), which, Nöldeke remarks, should at least be pronounced צֶלְמוֹת, for the existence of a word צֶלֶם "shadow" was unknown to him. Thirty years later, in 1897, Nöldeke⁷ wrote at greater length in defence of the traditional explanation of צֶלְמוֹת, and against the alleged connexion between צֶלְמוֹת "image" and a root צֶלֶם "was

¹ Cf. *ṣlmt* "deep darkness" in Ugaritic (G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, p. 150b).

² J. Wellhausen (cited in W. R. Harper, *Amos and Hosea* (ICC), p. 117).

³ P. Haupt, *A.J.S.L.* xxiii (1905), 142; also in *Z.D.M.G.* lxiiv (1910), 704, and in Wellhausen, *Festschrift*, p. 221. On غُلُمَات (Cor. ii. 17) Maulvi Muhammad Ali (*The Holy Qur-ân*, Lahore, 1920, p. 17, no. 31) writes—"the plural is used to denote the intensity of the darkness, as if there were layers of darkness, one above another". "Utter darkness" is his equivalent of the plural form.

⁴ So A. Schultens, *Liber Jobi* (1742), p. 73; G. Beer, in Kittel, *BH* 3 on Job iii. 5; J. Barth, *Nominalbild. in d. semit. Sprachen*, p. 411, n. 3 (he believes that the change, through folk-etymology, as he thinks, is more easily explained if the word was originally צֶלְמוֹת (צֶלֶם-מוֹת) rather than צֶלְמוֹת; V. Maag, *Text, Wortschatz u. Begriffswelt des Buches Amos*, p. 94. A new word צֶלְמוֹת "blackness" has been coined by F. Wutz, *op. cit.* p. 193. On צֶלְמוֹת (Ps. lxxviii. 15) W. F. Albright writes—"The name ('Dark one') refers to the volcanic character of its rock so different from the limestone of Lebanon ('White One')" (*H.U.C.A.* xxiii, 1950-1, 23). E. König, *Heb. u. Aram. Wörterb.* p. 388, compares "Schwarzwald".

⁵ *Das Leben nach dem Tode* (1892), p. 194.

⁶ *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, i, 456 ff.

⁷ *Z.A.W.* xvii, 183-7.

צֶלֶמֶת IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

dark". He made the following points. First, to the argument that shade is for the oriental a figure for protection from the sun's heat,¹ or for protection simply, and is accordingly out of keeping with death, Nöldeke replied that it depends on the object that casts the shadow, so that "the shadow of death" would be very different from shade provided, for example, by a rock.² Secondly, he remarks that צֶלֶמֶת occurs in late Hebrew—Ps. xlv. 20 is to be assigned to the second century B.C. and Ps. cvii. 10, 14 is hardly older—so that the tradition behind the LXX's σκιά θανάτου is not likely to be a false one. And thirdly, he states that it is unlikely that a word with the termination מ- was formed from a root which was unused in Hebrew or Aramaic. Words ending in מ- usually have one or more derivatives from the same root with related meanings.

K. Budde,³ who had previously adopted the reading צֶלֶמֶת, found Nöldeke's arguments convincing,⁴ and others who gave their support were K. Marti,⁵ W. Nowack,⁶ and Brown-Driver-Briggs.⁷ In 1918 J. Hehn⁸ took up the question again and addressed himself to the two objections against the traditional explanation which are to be found in Gesenius-Buhl.⁹ Here it is stated that shadow in the Old Testament is always a blessing. Nöldeke, as has been said, had rejected this argument, and Hehn, after an examination of the relevant passages, regards it as untenable. "Shadow" often has, he thinks, the meaning "in the neighbourhood of", and so perhaps "shadow of death" was thought of as "sphere, nearness, of death".¹⁰ To the second objection that the word צֶלֶמֶת does not always mean "underworld", Hehn replies that it need not always mean this, for the

¹ Cf. A. Dillmann, *Hiob*, 4th ed. (1891), p. 24. To an oriental, shade is "ein Bild des Erquickenden".

² Cor. lxxvii. 30 f. is compared. Of the shadow of the smoke of hell it is said لا ظليل ولا يغنى من اللهب "it gives no shade and does not avail against the flame".

³ *Op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

⁴ *Expos. Times*, VIII (1896-7), 384.

⁵ *Das Buch Jesaja* (1900), pp. 91 f.

⁶ *T.L.Z.* xxix (1904), 700.

⁷ *A Hebrew and Engl. Lex. of the O.T.* p. 853.

⁸ *Op. cit.* pp. 79-90. Hehn's vocalization צֶלֶמֶת is approved by H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Histor. Gramm. d. hebr. Sprache*, p. 506. König, however, finds his arguments unconvincing (*Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 130).

⁹ *Op. cit.* p. 684.

¹⁰ How the Babylonians feared the darkness of a shadow is illustrated in Hehn, *op. cit.* p. 89.

צֶלְמוֹת IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

expression corresponds to the context in which it occurs, and, rightly understood, "shadow of death" gives throughout the best sense, while "darkness" is in some passages quite unsuitable—it spoils the whole strength and beauty of the passage (as in Ps. xxiii. 4), or it is tautological (as in Jer. xiii. 16; Job iii. 5; x. 21 f.), or it does not provide the necessary heightening (*Steigerung*—as in Isa. ix. 1; Ps. cvii. 10; Job xxxiv. 22), or it is less poetical (as in Job xxviii. 3), or simple darkness provides a less good parallel (as in Job xii. 22).¹

That Nöldeke's views are open to criticism at some points is evident—for example, his argument drawn from the LXX and his contention that a word ending in מ- is unlikely to have been formed from a root not otherwise known in Hebrew or Aramaic.² And Hehn's belief that "shadow of death" gives throughout the best sense, while "darkness" is sometimes not at all suitable, is, as will be suggested later, unacceptable. Yet we believe that Nöldeke and Hehn, and those who share their view, are right in thinking the traditional vocalization צֶלְמוֹת is correct as against צֶלְמוֹת (or some similar form).³ At the same time we believe that those scholars are right who give to צֶלְמוֹת the meaning "darkness". How then is the meaning "darkness" to be obtained from צֶלְמוֹת, literally "a shadow of death"?⁴

III

A new approach to this question has been made possible since the recognition of the superlative force which attaches to מוֹת "die" and מָוֶת "death" in Hebrew; to ܡܘܬ "die" and ܡܘܬܐ "death" in Syriac; and to مَات "died" in Arabic. In Greek θάνατος is used similarly, and we may compare such an English phrase as "deadly dull" when we mean "very dull", or "bored to death" when we mean "extremely bored". In the Hebrew Bible examples of this superlative force of מוֹת, מָוֶת, may be seen in Judg. xvi. 16; II Kings xx. 1; Jonah iv. 9; I Sam. iv. 20; v. 11; Isa. liii. 12;

¹ Hehn, *ibid.* p. 89, parts company with Nöldeke in connecting צֶלְמוֹת "idol" with צֶלֶם "was dark". He suggests that צֶלְמוֹת may be a loan-word in Hebrew.

² See, for example, S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *The Book of Job* (ICC), p. 18 (of philol. notes).

³ Budde, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*, points out that Job xxxviii. 17, in which מָוֶת and צֶלְמוֹת both occur, may be significant for the true vocalization.

⁴ For this translation, rather than "the shadow of death", see below.

צִלְמוֹת IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Exod. x. 17; Pss. xviii. 5; lv. 5; Song Sol. viii. 6. All these examples, and some others, have already been discussed by the present writer.¹ It may now be suggested that מָוֶה in צִלְמוֹת is yet another example of מָוֶה with a superlative force, and that צִלְמוֹת “(a) shadow of death” means accordingly “(a) very deep shadow, thick darkness”, which is just the meaning given to צִלְמוֹת by those who prefer this vocalization of the consonants. If indeed צִלְמוֹת does mean “(a) very deep shadow, thick darkness”, nothing is to be gained by reading צִלְמוֹת, and a great deal is lost since a specific Hebrew idiom goes unrecognized.

On this explanation there is no intrinsic reference in צִלְמוֹת to physical death, or to the underworld of Sheol.² That it is used in passages where the thought is concerned with death or with Sheol is easily intelligible in the light of the close connexion in Hebrew thought between death, Sheol, and darkness. As against Schwally and Hehn, we believe that צִלְמוֹת means properly “deep, thick darkness” in every passage in the Old Testament in which it occurs,³ whether of literal darkness, or figuratively of dire distress or extreme danger,⁴ or of the underworld of which it is a characteristic⁵ (cf. the renderings of R.V. marg., R.S.V., and Luther given above). Those passages in which it is found accompanied by חֹשֶׁךְ “darkness” strengthen the case for this meaning.⁶ Hehn indeed admits that in some passages, for example Amos v.

¹ “A consideration of some unusual ways of expressing the superlative in Hebrew”, *Vet. Test.* III (1953), 219–22.

² Against scholars like B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, 3rd ed. p. 65; F. Feldmann, *Das Buch Isaias* (1925), p. 116; H. Gunkel, *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, 2nd ed. p. 62. J. Hermann, *O.L.Z.* XIX (1916), 110 ff., goes so far as to see in Isa. ix. 1 a reflection of Egyptian belief in death; cf. T. K. Cheyne, *The Book of Psalms*, pp. 67 f.

³ This is the view of H. Ewald (who reads צִלְמוֹת; see his *Ausführliches Lebrb. d. hebr. Sprache*, 8th ed. 1870, 270c, p. 664).

⁴ In the Korān ظُلُمَات (plur. of ظُلْمَة “darkness”), which is etymologically unconnected with צִלְמוֹת, is used similarly of hardships, troubles and dangers; see Maulvi Muhammad Ali, *op. cit.* p. 300, n. 784, and p. 655, n. 1653. Light and darkness are, of course, often used in the O.T. as figures of happiness and calamity (e.g. Isa. xiii. 10; lviii. 8 ff.; lix. 10; lx. 1 ff.).

⁵ Cf. Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.* In Job xxxviii. 17 ἄδου is a paraphrase of צִלְמוֹת, unless it points to a reading עֲשׂוֹל; see W. B. Stevenson, *op. cit.* p. 150; C. J. Ball, *op. cit.* p. 419. Cf. Iras’s words—“Finish, good lady; the bright day is done, And we are for the dark” (*Antony and Cleopatra*, v, ii).

⁶ Isa. ix. 1; Ps. cvii. 10, 14; Job iii. 5; x. 21; xxxiv. 22. Cf. Jer. xiii. 16 (עֲרִסָה || צִלְמוֹת).

צִלְמוֹת IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

8; Job xxxiv. 22, the meaning "darkness" is possible, but, as has been said, he rejects this meaning altogether for reasons which sometimes at any rate seem to be purely subjective.¹ It may be pointed out that in all the passages under discussion צִלְמוֹת has been translated "darkness" by one commentator or another. They do not share Hehn's hesitations.

One passage may be singled out for special comment, namely, Ps. xxiii. 4. Here the translation of גִּיא צִלְמוֹת by "the valley of the shadow of death" (cf. EVV. and Bunyan's use of it in *Pilgrim's Progress*) has become entrenched in the English language and is a phrase beloved and comfortable to many.² For most, it may be surmised, the emphasis in this translation rests upon the word "death" rather than upon the word "shadow". This is a mistaken emphasis if the explanation of צִלְמוֹת which has been offered here is correct. The word צִלְמוֹת here, as elsewhere, has no reference to physical death, and does not derive its intensity of darkness from any supposed connexion with the darkness of Sheol. It means, as always, in its own right "thick darkness", and the reference is to one of the wadis of the wilderness of Judah, deep in shadow. Then, late in the day, is the time when beasts of prey emerge, and robbers and evil spirits are abroad.³ These are the things the psalmist fears, and from which Yahweh, his good shepherd, will protect him with rod and staff. The correct translation is, we believe, "valley of deep darkness, darkest valley",⁴ that is, darkness in a superlative degree. This

¹ He quotes with approval Schwally's rather curious remark, which he cites in reference to Jer. ii. 6, that he is not aware that darkness is especially characteristic of the desert. The close relation between the ideas of the desert and darkness has been well pointed out by J. Pedersen, *Israel, its Life and Culture*, I-II, 463 ff., and by A. Haldar, *The Notion of the Desert in Sumerian-Accadian and West-Semitic Religions*.

² Was it as a concession to this consideration that the translators of the R.S.V. retained here "the shadow of death", and relegated "deep darkness" to the margin?

³ Cf. L. Koehler, *Z.A.W.* LXVII, N.F. xxvii, 231; H. Schmidt, *Die Psalmen*, p. 41; R. Kittel, *Die Psalmen*, p. 97; B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen*, p. 74; C. A. Briggs, *op. cit.* I, 381. S. R. Driver comments on "deep darkness" in Jer. ii. 6—"Figurative of the dangers and uncertainties which beset a traveller in a wild and unknown region" (*The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah*, p. 7). Somewhat astonishingly Hehn, *op. cit.* p. 85—"Ist denn das Wandern in einem dunklen Tale etwas so Furchtbares? Der Satz ist so geradezu nichts-sagend. In einem dunklen Tale kann das Wandern sehr angenehm sein."

⁴ "Darkest valley" is the translation in *The Old Testament: an American Translation*, ed. J. M. P. Smith (1927), p. 897. In *The Revised Psalter* (The

צִלְמוֹת IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

translation is favoured by Rashi,¹ R.V. marg., R.S.V. marg., Luther, and by all those scholars, and, as we have seen, they are many, who read צִלְמוֹת “darkness” in place of צִלְמוֹת. It may be added that the translation of צִלְמוֹת יֵאֵל is strictly not “the valley of the shadow of death” but “a valley of the shadow of death” (= “deep darkness”). The use of the definite article in the translation should be avoided, since it tends to suggest to the modern reader a particular valley² and the shadow which is cast by approaching death. The strict translation by the use of the indefinite article brings out more clearly that the psalmist is thinking of one or another of the many Judaeian ravines when darkness falls. It is of some interest that the LXX never uses the article when it renders צִלְמוֹת by σκιά θανάτου.

Finally, a few remarks on the formation of the word צִלְמוֹת. Vocalized in this way it has generally been regarded as a compound noun, compounded of צֶל “shadow” in the construct state and מוֹת “death” in the genitive.³ With צֶל,⁴ the construct of צֶל, may be compared קֶן, construct of קֵן (Deut. xxii. 6), and the analogous form בְּצִלְאֵל has been compared.⁵ The prevailing view is that compound nouns are very rare in Hebrew except in proper names. It would seem, however, that the time has come to re-

First Report of the Commission to Revise the Psalter appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York), 1961, p. 31, appears the footnote—“The Commission agreed that the most probable rendering of this phrase is ‘the darkest valley’, and a minority felt that this translation should be incorporated in the text.”

¹ At Ps. xxiii. 4 כל צִלְמוֹת לִשְׁחָדָה “in every case צִלְמוֹת means darkness”. The commentary דוד מצודת דוד similarly explains by עמק אפל “valley of darkness”.

² Cf. the attempt to identify the valley with a particular locality made by J. M. Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, pp. 78, 160 f., and by F. Hitzig, *Der Prophet Jesaja* (1833), p. 109, before him.

³ See P. Joüon, *Gramm. de l'hébreu bibl.* p. 188; S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *op. cit.* p. 18 (of philol. notes).

⁴ In the Babylonian tradition צֶל- is found; see P. Kahle, *Masor. des Ostens*, p. 196.

⁵ Hehn, *op. cit.* p. 82, compares also צִלְמוֹת. Kimchi, *op. cit.* adds צִלְמוֹת וְצִלְמוֹת. For בְּצִלְאֵל, see M. Noth, *Die israelit. Personennamen im Rahmen d. gemeinsemit. Namengebung*, p. 152. E. König, *Lehrgeb. d. hebr. Sprache*, II, i, 415, thinks that these proper names do not guarantee the originality of the formation צִלְמוֹת. Possibly the name צִלְמוֹת (LXX Σαλπασ) comes in for consideration here (Cheyne, *Encycl. Bibl.* 5400; Koehler-Baumgartner, *op. cit.* p. 805); but see M. Noth, *op. cit.* p. 256.

צֶלֶמֶת IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

examine the whole question.¹ For the time being there does not seem to be any weighty objection to regarding צֶלֶמֶת as a compound noun. It is possible, however, that צֶלֶמֶת is in fact not one word but two, thus צֶל מֶת, as suggested by Nöldeke.² In this case the shortness of the first word led to its being written together with the second so as to form one word. Whichever be the correct explanation, whether צֶלֶמֶת is a true compound, or whether it results from the writing together of two separate words, the meaning is the same—"deepest shadow, thick darkness". It may in fact be the strongest word that Hebrew possessed for darkness.

¹ For compounds in Akkadian, see A. Ungnad, *Gramm. d. Akkad.* 3rd ed. (1949), pp. 35 f.; in Syriac, Th. Nöldeke, *Compendious Syr. Gramm.* (1904), pp. 85 f. Ugaritic *blmt* (= *bl* "not" + *m(w)t* "death") "immortality" (G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, p. 165 a) links up with the many compounds formed in Hebrew with לֹא "not" and a substantive or adjective (see Ges.-Kautzsch, *Heb. Gramm.* 152 a, no. 1, p. 478), and in Syriac with ܠܐ "not" (see Nöldeke, p. 86). In an article to be published elsewhere, the present writer has tried to show that צֶלֶמֶת, which is commonly supposed to be a compound noun, is in fact not so, and is to be explained otherwise.

² *Z.A.W.* xvii (1897), 184; cf. K. Marti, *op. cit.* p. 92.

בְּלִיעַל IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The word בְּלִיעַל occurs twenty-seven times in the O. T., being found in all four parts of the Hebrew Bible – twice in the Pentateuch, fifteen times in the Former Prophets, twice in the Latter Prophets, and eight times in the Writings¹.

The first part of this article consists of three sections. In I (a) the ways in which בְּלִיעַל is rendered in the chief ancient versions are recorded; in I (b) the renderings of the A. V., R. V., R. S. V., and of Luther's Bible are given; and in I (c) some further passages are noted in which it has been proposed to read the word בְּלִיעַל. In the second part of the article, explanations of the word בְּלִיעַל which have been suggested at different times are briefly reviewed. And in the third part another explanation is proposed which, so far as I am aware, has not been advanced hitherto.

I (a). *Renderings in the Ancient Versions*

LXX. In 11 passages בְּלִיעַל is rendered by παράνομος², and in 5 by λοιμός³. In 3 passages ἄφρων is found⁴, in 2 passages ἀνομία⁵, and ἀνόμημα⁶ and ἐναντίος⁷ each occur once.

¹ It occurs once in Ben Sira (11:32, בְּלִיעַל שִׁשׁ).

² Deut. 13:14; Judges 19:22; 20:13 (LXX^A ἀσεβής + Βελιαμ); 2 Sam. 16:7; 20:1; 23:6; 1 Kings 21:10, 13 (A) – the second בְּלִיעַל is left untranslated; Ps. 41:9; 101:3; 2 Chron. 13:7. Cf. Job 34:18 παρανομεῖν.

³ 1 Sam. 1:16; 12:12; 10:27; 25:17, 25; in 1 Sam. 30:22 בְּלִיעַל שָׁרִי is translated λοιμός καὶ πονηρός. In 1 Sam. 29:10 λοιμός may represent בְּלִיעַל, which is not in M. T. ⁴ Prov. 6:12; 16:27; 19:28.

⁵ 2 Sam. 22:5 = Ps. 18:5. It has been suggested by Bousset that ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας in 2 Thess. 2:3 may be a translation of Belial (see *Encycl. Biblica* 525). ⁶ Deut. 15:9.

⁷ Nahum 1:11. Nahum 2:1 εἰς παλαίωσιν is obscure. J. F. Schleusner, *Novus Thes. philol.-crit. sive Lex. in LXX*, . . . , IV, p. 171, suggests that it represents בְּלִיעַל (i. e. לָע = לָא and בְּלִיעַל is referred to בָּלָע "be worn out").

D. Winton Thomas

*Minor Greek Versions*⁸. Renderings are – Βελιαλ (Theodot. Judges 19:22; 'Εβρ. Prov. 16:27); ἀποστασία (Aq. Deut. 15:9; Judges 19:22; 1 Sam. 2:12; 10:27; 25:17; Nahum 1:11; Ps. 18:5; 41:9 (also Quinta); Prov. 16:27; Theodot. 1 Kings 21:13); παράνομος (Symm. 1 Sam. 30:22; Ps. 41:9; Aq. Theodot. Prov. 19:28); ἀποστάτης (Aq. 1 Sam. 30:22); ἀπαίδευτος (Symm. Judges 19:22); ἀνυπότακτος (Symm. 1 Sam. 2:12; 10:27); ἄνομος (Symm. 1 Sam. 25:17); ἀφροσύνη (Theodot. 1 Sam. 25:17); and ἀνυπόστατος (Symm. Prov. 16:27).

Targum. In 21 passages בליעל is rendered by רשע "wickedness" or רשע "wicked". In 4 passages טלום "oppressor" appears⁹, once דיגאלא "lying"¹⁰, and once חייבא "guilty"¹¹.

Peshitta. In 21 passages בליעל is rendered by the noun 'awlā "wickedness" or the adjective 'aw(w)ālā "wicked"¹², in 3 by ḥtā "sin"¹³, and in 1 by ḥtāhā "sin"¹⁴.

Vulgate. Belial occurs in 12 passages¹⁵, iniquus in 4¹⁶, iniquitas in 1¹⁷, Impius¹⁸ and apostata¹⁹ appear twice each; diabolus and diabolicus²⁰ once each; praevaricator and praevaricatio once each²¹, and injustus once²².

⁸ The references are from Field, *Orig. Hexapl.*

⁹ Ps. 18:5; 41:9; Prov. 6:12; 16:27.

¹⁰ Prov. 19:28.

¹¹ 2 Sam. 22:5.

¹² So also Ben Sira 11:32; P. A. de Lagarde, *Libri Vet. Test. Apocr. Syr.*, p. 12.

¹³ Deut. 13:14; 1 Sam. 2:12; 10:27.

¹⁴ 1 Sam. 1:16. In 1 Sam. 25:17 the translator has altered the unbecoming words of Nabal's slaves (וְהוּא בְּרִי־לֵיעֵל טֹרֵר אֱלִיּוֹ) into "and Nabal is with the herdsmen"; cf. P. A. H. de Boer in *Oudtest. Stud.*, vi (1949), p. 63. In 25:25 for הוּא עַל־נָבָל Pesh. has simply "concerning this man Nabal" ('al gabrā bānā nābāl).

¹⁵ Deut. 13:14; Judges 19:22; 1 Sam. 1:16; 2:12; 10:27; 25:17; 2 Sam. 16:7; 20:1; 22:5; 1 Kings 21:10; Nahum 2:1; 2 Chron. 13:7.

¹⁶ 1 Sam. 25:25; 30:22; Ps. 41:9; Prov. 19:28.

¹⁷ Ps. 18:5.

¹⁸ Deut. 15:9; Prov. 16:27.

¹⁹ Job 34:18; Prov. 6:12.

²⁰ Both in 1 Kings 21:13.

²¹ 2 Sam. 33:6; Nahum 1:11.

²² Ps. 101:3. In Judges 20:13 בְּנֵי־בִלְעֵל is translated *qui hoc flagitium perpetravit*.

*בְּלִיַּעַל in the Old Testament**I (b). Renderings in the A. V., R. V., R. S. V.,
and Luther's Bible*

A. V. In 16 instances the A. V. treats בְּלִיַּעַל as a proper name and renders "Belial"²³. In 9 passages "Belial" is found in the margin²⁴. 5 times the word is rendered by "wicked"²⁵, 4 times by "ungodly"²⁶, once by "evil"²⁷, and once by "naughty"²⁸. The last rendering appears also once in the margin²⁹.

R. V. בְּלִיַּעַל is treated as a proper name in 14 instances³⁰. In 3 passages "Belial" is found in the margin³¹. In 3 cases בְּלִיַּעַל is rendered "base" in the text³², and 6 times in the margin³³. 3 times it is translated "worthless" in the text³⁴, and "worthlessness" appears 13 times in the margin, frequently second margin³⁵. "Wickedness" and "wicked" appear once each³⁶, and "wicked" appears 4 times in the margin³⁷. Twice בְּלִיַּעַל is translated "ungodliness"³⁸ and once "ungodly"³⁹. "Evil" and "vile" appear once each⁴⁰.

R. S. V. בְּלִיַּעַל is rendered 10 times by "base"⁴¹ and 9 times by "worthless"⁴². "Ill-natured"⁴³ and "perdition"⁴⁴ are found

²³ Deut. 13:14; Judges 19:22; 20:13; 1 Sam. 1:16; 2:12; 10:27; 25:17, 25; 30:22; 2 Sam. 16:7; 20:1; 23:6; 1 Kings 21:10, 13; 2 Chron. 13:7.

²⁴ Deut. 15:9; 2 Sam. 22:5; Nahum 1:11; 2:1; Ps. 18:5; 41:9; 101:3; Prov. 16:27; 19:28.

²⁵ Deut. 15:9; Nahum 1:11; 2:1; Ps. 101:3; Job 34:18.

²⁶ 2 Sam. 22:5 (= Ps. 18:5); Prov. 16:27; 19:28.

²⁷ Ps. 41:9. ²⁸ Prov. 6:12. ²⁹ Deut. 13:14.

³⁰ Judges 19:22; 20:13; 1 Sam. 1:16; 2:12; 10:27; 25:17, 25; 30:22; 2 Sam. 16:7; 20:1; 1 Kings 21:10, 13, 13; 2 Chron. 13:7.

³¹ 2 Sam. 22:5; Nahum 2:1; Ps. 18:5.

³² Deut. 13:14; 15:9; Ps. 101:3.

³³ Judges 19:22; 20:13; 1 Sam. 10:27; 25:17, 25; 30:22.

³⁴ Prov. 6:12; 16:27; 19:28.

³⁵ Deut. 13:14; Judges 20:13; 1 Sam. 1:16; 2:12; 10:27; 25:17, 25; 30:22; 2 Sam. 16:7; 20:1; 1 Kings 21:10; Nahum 2:1; 2 Chron. 13:7.

³⁶ Nahum 1:11; 2:1.

³⁷ 1 Sam. 1:16; 2:12; Nahum 1:11; Ps. 41:9.

³⁸ 2 Sam. 22:5 = Ps. 18:5. ³⁹ 2 Sam. 23:6. ⁴⁰ Ps. 41:9; Job 34:18.

⁴¹ Deut. 13:14; 15:9; Judges 19:22; 20:13; 1 Sam. 1:16; 30:22; 1 Kings 21:10, 13, 13; Ps. 101:3.

⁴² 1 Sam. 2:12; 10:27; 2 Sam. 16:7; 20:1; Prov. 6:12; 16:27; 19:28; Job 34:18; 2 Chron. 13:7.

⁴³ 1 Sam. 25:17, 25. ⁴⁴ 2 Sam. 22:5 = Ps. 18:5.

D. Winton Thomas

twice each, and "godless"⁴⁵, "deadly"⁴⁶, "villainy"⁴⁷, and "wicked"⁴⁸ once each.

Luther. 8 times בליעל is translated by *heillos*⁴⁹, 7 times by *böse*⁵⁰, 7 times by *los*⁵¹, twice by *Verderbnis*⁵², once by *Bubenstück*⁵³, and once by *Arge*⁵⁴.

I (c). *Some Passages where it has been proposed to read בליעל*

In addition to these 27 passages – 28 with Ben Sira 11:32 – בליעל has been read in some other passages. Proposals to read בליעל which are known to me are:

1) Jer. 17:11. קרא דגור ולא ידור has been emended to בליעל נקור "cursed is the pernicious man"⁵⁵.

2) Ps. 12:7. בעליל לארץ. S. Mowinckel⁵⁶ finds these words incomprehensible and believes that they have nothing to do with verse 7. He accordingly emends בעליל into בליעל טאנשי and transposes the phrase after חשומר, for which חשטר should be read, in verse 8: "from dangerous men (sorcerers) wilt thou keep (me)".

3) Ps. 16:2 seq. בלעליך; לקדושים. F. Buhl⁵⁷ emends בלעליך לקדושים "useless are all the holy ones".

4) In the following passages בליעל has been read: for בלע Ps. 52:6⁵⁸; for בלב עולות Ps. 58:3⁵⁹; for סביליו Job 18:15⁶⁰; for בליו Job 24:6⁶¹ and for בלישם Job 30:8⁶². In Prov. 11:21 יד ליד has been emended to ער בליעל "the malignant witness"⁶³.

⁴⁵ 2 Sam. 23:6. ⁴⁶ Ps. 41:9. ⁴⁷ Nahum 1:11. ⁴⁸ Nahum 2:1.

⁴⁹ Deut. 13:14; 1 Sam. 25:17, 25; 2 Sam. 16:7; 20:1; 23:6; Prov. 6:12; Job 34:18.

⁵⁰ Deut. 15:9; Judges 19:22; 20:13; 1 Sam. 2:12; Ps. 101:3; Nahum 1:11; 2 Chron. 13:7.

⁵¹ 1 Sam. 1:16; 10:27; 30:22; 1 Kings 21:10, 13 (the second occurrence is left untranslated); Prov. 16:27; 19:28. ⁵² 2 Sam. 22:5 = Ps. 18:5.

⁵³ Ps. 41:9. ⁵⁴ Nahum 2:1. ⁵⁵ T. K. Cheyne, *Encycl. Biblica* 3588.

⁵⁶ *Psalmstudien 1. Āwān und die individuellen Klagepsalmen* (1921), pp. 54 seq.

⁵⁷ BH3 *ad loc.*; cf. Mowinckel in *TLZ* (1957), p. 653.

⁵⁸ Buhl, BH3 *ad loc.*

⁵⁹ Cheyne, *Encycl. Biblica* 526, "deeds of destruction".

⁶⁰ Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob* (1897), p. 96 (he thinks of leprosy).

⁶¹ C. J. Ball, *The Book of Job*, p. 311. ⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 349.

⁶³ Cheyne, *op. cit.*, 1951. Cf. Prov. 19:28.

בְּלִיעַל in the Old Testament

II. Explanations of בְּלִיעַל which have been offered

1) בְּלִי + עַל "without a yoke", that is "uncontrolled". The oldest source for this etymology appears to be *Sanhedr.* 111b: בני בְּלִיעַל בָּנִים שֶׁפָּרְקוּ עוֹל שְׁמַיִם מִצְוָרֵיהֶם "sons of Belial – sons who have torn off the yoke of heaven from their necks"⁶⁴. This explanation is found in an interesting gloss to בְּלִיעַל in the Vulg. in Judges 19:22 (*id est, absque jugo*)⁶⁵.

2) Explanations which connect בְּלִיעַל with the verb עָלָה "went up".

(a) בְּלִי + עָלָה "he who does not stand high", that is בְּלִיעַל is the opposite of בֶּן עֲלִיָּה "one who is excellent, exalted"⁶⁶.

(b) בְּלִי + יַעַל, where יַעַל, which is a substantive of the same form as יָעַר, יַעֲרֵי, means "not-height", that is "deep", for example in Ps. 18:5, where it is to be taken as a personification of the dangers of death⁶⁷.

(c) בְּלִי + יַעֲלֶה "one who will not come up again", that is from the underworld (יַעַל being treated as an apocopated imperfect). This explanation is regarded as folk-etymology by some⁶⁸, by others as the most probable explanation of the Hebrew word⁶⁹. Job 7:9 יוֹרֵד שָׂאֵל לֹא יַעֲלֶה is compared⁷⁰, and also Ps.

⁶⁴ Cf. Rashi at Deut. 13:14.

⁶⁵ Cf. S. Hieronymi, VII, *Comment. in Epist. ad Ephes.* III, ch. iv, 629 (PL XXVI): "Belial (2 Cor.), hoc est, absque jugo quod de collo suo Dei abjecerit servitutem".

⁶⁶ J. Levy, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.* I, p. 233; J. D. Michaelis, *Suppl. ad lex. Hebr.* III, pp. 1119 seq. בְּלִיעַל – "not high" (*minime altus*), referring to the deep of Sheol.

⁶⁷ J. Fürst, *Hebr. u. Chald. Handwörterb.*, I, p. 192. Cf. Levy, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

⁶⁸ E. g. Cheyne, *Encycl. Biblica* 526, who compares *mat lā tārāt*, the Assyrian equivalent of a Sumerian title of the underworld, meaning "the land without return". Cf. A. Bertholet, *Oriental Studies published in commemoration . . . of Paul Haupt* (ed. C. Adler and A. Ember [Baltimore and Leipzig, 1926], p. 14).

⁶⁹ E. g. F. Baethgen, *Die Psalmen* (HAT) (1892), p. 51. Cf. W. Baudissin in *Expos. Times*, ix (1897–8), p. 44.

⁷⁰ By F. Nicolsky, "Spuren magischer Formeln in den Psalmen" in Beiheft ZAW, xlv (1927), p. 85, who remarks that Ps. 18:5 seq. lends strength to this view. Like some other scholars he takes יַעֲלֶה as Hiph. "he who does not allow coming up from the dead". The causative nuance is felt to be difficult by P. Joüon in *Biblica*, v (1924), p. 182, n. 1.

D. Winton Thomas

41:9 לא־יִיוֹסִיף לָקוּם following on בָּדָר בַּלֵּעַל "fatal disease"⁷¹. Kimchi⁷² explains: בָּל יַעֲלֶה וְבִל יַעֲלֶה "he does not excel and does not prosper", a ne'er-do-well. If, however, יַעֲלֶה is abbreviated in בָּלֵעַל to יַעֲלֶה, it would be strange, and the use of בָּל as a negative of a verb is rare⁷³. It has been pointed out too that both good and bad went to Sheol, and therefore no moral distinctions can be drawn⁷⁴.

3) בָּעַל + יָעַל "lord of goats", another name of the wilderness demon Azazel, who was probably thought of in the form of a goat⁷⁵.

4) בָּלִי + יָעַל "without value, worthless". This etymology is favoured by a large number of scholars⁷⁶, and the Assyrian *mār lā manāma* "son of a nobody" is compared⁷⁷. Neither Hebrew, nor any other Semitic language, however, knows a word יַעֲלֶה "worth"⁷⁸.

5) בָּלֵעַל has been thought to be an early Canaanite modification of the Babylonian Bililu, goddess of the underworld (and of vegetation), so as to suggest a derivation בָּלִי יַעֲלֶה "one who returns not". The Hebrews took the Babylonian name, altered to בָּלֵעַל, as a synonym of the abyss of Sheol. Thus in Ps. 18:5 נַחֲלֵי בָלֵעַל

⁷¹ So Lagarde, *Proph. Chald.*, p. XLVII; cf. his *Übersicht über die im Aram., Arab. u. Hebr. übliche Bildung der Nomina*, p. 139.

⁷² *Radicum Liber sive Hebraeum Bibliorum Lexicon* (Berlin, 1837), sub בָּל.

⁷³ Cf. E. König, *Lehrgeb. d. hebr. Sprache*, III, p. 309.

⁷⁴ *Idem*, loc. cit.

⁷⁵ Nicolsky, *op. cit.*, p. 86. בָּלֵעַל was the name of the first and most important evil spirit. Prov. 6:12 is a clear case of a sorcerer (so Mowinckel); he works in the name of and through the power of בָּלֵעַל (pp. 84 seq.).

⁷⁶ E. g., H. Torczyner in *ZDMG*, lxx (1916), p. 557, thinks it is the only possible one; C. H. Toy, *The Book of Proverbs* (ICC), p. 131; J. A. Montgomery – H. S. Gehman, *The Books of Kings* (ICC), p. 334; Brown – Driver – Briggs, *A Hebr. and Engl. Lex.*, p. 116; F. Zorell, *Lex. Hebr. Aram.*, p. 114; J. Pedersen writes: "יַעֲלֶה means carry through a good, normal action"; with בָּלִי it denotes the negative action (*Israel I–II*, p. 431; cf. p. 539 n.). Joüon, *op. cit.*, p. 179, treats בָּלֵעַל not as an abstract, but as concrete: "a (being) without value", that is the Devil.

⁷⁷ W. F. Albright, *P. Haupt Commemoration Volume*, p. 146.

⁷⁸ Cf. C. F. Burney, *The Book of Judges*, p. 467; G. R. Driver, *ZAW*, lii, N. F. xi (1934), p. 52, remarks that the Qal in place of the Hiph. would be strange.

בליעל in the Old Testament

are "streams of the underworld"⁷⁹. This view has been heavily criticised by F. Hommel⁸⁰ and W. Baudissin⁸¹.

6) בלי + יעל, where יעל is related to the Arabic *wa'ala* "sought safety on a height". Special importance is here attached to the noun *wa'lu* (*waghlu*); cf. *mā laka 'anhu wa'lu* "thou hast no way out of it", that is, you cannot escape. The Canaanites, it is said, simply translated the Babylonian *mat lā tārat* by בליעל "(land) without exit", and the Babylonians took the word over as Belili⁸².

From these explanations, all of which assume that בליעל is a compound⁸³, we turn to two explanations which have been offered which refer the word to the root בלע.

1) In בליעל, it is suggested, the second radical is reduplicated, and the word resembles in meaning שָׁטָן "adversary" and חֲשָׁמָה "hostility". Another personal name from the stem is Balaam (בָּלָעַם; בלע = Arabic *baliya* "swallowed"), whose father's name, Beor (בְּעוֹר), also denotes "destruction", both words perhaps being substitutes for the real names⁸⁴.

2) G. R. Driver⁸⁵ explains בליעל as a noun בלע with suffixed *lamedh*⁸⁶ which means "confusion" (בלע = Arabic *balagha*). The

⁷⁹ So Cheyne in *Expos. Times*, viii (1896-7), p. 423; cf. his earlier article in *The Expositor*, 5th series, i (1895), pp. 435-9.

⁸⁰ *Expos. Times*, viii (1896-7), p. 472; further ix (1897-8), p. 567.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, ix (1897-8), pp. 40 seq.; cf. J. A. Selbie, *ibid.*, viii (1896-7), p. 360; P. Jensen, *ibid.*, ix (1897-8), pp. 283 seq., allies himself with Baudissin.

⁸² F. Hommel, *ibid.*, viii (1896-7), p. 472.

⁸³ Compound nouns in Hebrew are generally thought to be very rare, except in proper names. See, e. g., G. R. Driver, *The People and the Book* (ed. A. S. Peake), pp. 77 seq. (בליעל is regarded as the only undoubted one in Hebrew); Ges. - Kautzsch, *Hebr. Gramm.* 2nd ed. A. E. Cowley, p. 225, and P. Joüon, *Gramm. de l'hébreu biblique*, p. 188. Ugaritic has *blmt* (< *bl* "not" + *m(w)t* "death, immortality"; G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, p. 165a). The whole question of compound nouns in Hebrew seems due for re-examination.

⁸⁴ J. Finkel, *The Macdonald Presentation Volume. A Tribute to Duncan Black Macdonald* (Princeton, 1933), p. 157. In 2 Sam. 22:5 he thinks that בליעל may stand for a supramundane being.

⁸⁵ *ZAW*, lii, N. F. xi (1934), p. 52. D. de Gunzburg derives בָּלָעַם from בלע = Arabic *balagha* "qui arrive à ses fins" (*REJ*, xlvii [1903], p. 8). Cf. Koehler - Baumgartner, *Lex. in Vet. Test. Libros*, p. 130 sub בלע III.

⁸⁶ Cf. גִּבְעֵל, כְּרִמְל, עֲרִמְל. For שְׂאוֹל = ל + שָׂאָה, see Koehler - Baumgartner, *op. cit.*, p. 935.

D. Winton Thomas

original form may have been *belā'al* (like בִּלְעָל), with a tendentious *yōdh* inserted later in accordance with a Massoretic (?) interpretation, or *beli'al* (formed like בִּלְיָן) with a *yōdh* properly indicative of the formation.

III. A new explanation

The two suggestions just mentioned, advanced by Finkel and Driver, point the way, we believe, to the most likely explanation of בִּלְעָל. We may accept a derivation from the root בִּלַע = Arabic *baliya* "swallowed"⁸⁷, rather than from בִּלַע = *balagha*. We may accept further the suggestion that the original form of the word was either *belā'al* or *beli'al*. How then are these forms to be interpreted? The correct starting point is, as Cheyne⁸⁸ and others have seen, 2 Sam. 22:5 = Ps. 18:5. Here בִּלְעָל is parallel with death (מָוֶת), and in verse 6 שָׁאוּל and מָוֶת are parallel. The word בִּלְעָל should accordingly have a similar meaning, and we believe that Cheyne is right in seeing here the meaning "abyss", but incorrect in the way he obtained it, viz., through a supposed connection with the Babylonian Belili. May not בִּלְעָל have been thought of as "the swallower", the abyss that engulfs?⁸⁹ Prov. 1:12 pictures Sheol as "swallowing"⁹⁰, and in Syriac *bla'* "swallowed" is used with Sheol as subject⁹¹. In Arabic *bālū'a* (plur. *bawālī'*, *balālī'*), from the root *baliya* "swallowed", means "gulf, whirlpool, subterranean conduit"⁹². And in Old English the noun "swallow" was used of "a deep hole or opening in the earth; a pit, gulf, abyss, a depth or abyss of water, a yawning gulf, a whirlpool"⁹³.

⁸⁷ Prov. 19:28 (בִּלְעָל, בִּלְעָל) is suggestive.

⁸⁸ *Encycl. Biblica* 526. Cf. Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 468.

⁸⁹ So "the floods that would swallow me up" (Ps. 18:4 in *The Revised Psalter* [1961]).

⁹⁰ G. A. Barton, *The Religion of Israel*, p. 194, asks if בִּלְעָל may not be an old name for Sheol.

⁹¹ Payne Smith, *Thes. Syr.* 537; cf. *A Compendious Syriac Dict.*, p. 47 (*shyāl bālā'thā* "grave that swallows up").

⁹² J. G. Hava, *Arab.-Engl. Dict.*, p. 45; Kazimirski, *Dict. arabe-français*, I, p. 161.

⁹³ *Shorter Oxford Dictionary*, p. 2096.

בְּלִיעַל in the Old Testament

From this meaning "swallow, abyss", the other uses of בְּלִיעַל can, it is suggested, be satisfactorily explained. The phrase בְּלִיעַל אִישׁ (בְּנִי, בְּנִי) thus indicates one whose actions or words engulf a man, bring him to the abyss, to the underworld. Such a wicked man is, in colloquial English, "an infernal fellow". Perhaps the phrase was a colloquial one also in Hebrew, בְּלִיעַל being used with superlative force, just as מָוֶת "death", and Sheol, with which, as we have seen, it keeps company in 2 Sam. 22:5 = Ps. 18:5, are both used in the O. T. with superlative force⁹⁴. An עֵד בְּלִיעַל or יוֹעֵץ בְּלִיעַל is similarly a witness or counsellor whose testimony or advice brings a man finally to ruin, just as דָּבָר בְּלִיעַל is "something which engulfs one in ruin"⁹⁵, a thing or thought which inevitably brings a man down to the abyss (cf. דְּבָרֵי קִלְעַ "words of swallowing", that is, of destruction, Ps. 52:6). From such an original sense as "swallow" (= abyss, Sheol), the word could without difficulty be transferred later to designate a demon or Satan, the Belial (Beliar) of the apocalyptic writings⁹⁶ and of the New Testament (2 Cor. 6:15).

D. Winton Thomas

⁹⁴ See the present writer in *VT*, iii (1953), pp. 219 seq.

⁹⁵ Deut. 15:9. With the phrase עֵד בְּלִיעַל cf. עֵד הָקֵס, a witness who promotes violence and wrong. For the connection in Semitic between the ideas of the abyss and abysmal wickedness, see Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 468. In Greek ἀδής is used in the genitive of persons who are "fatal, deadly" (Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-Engl. Lex.*, rev. H. S. Jones, I, p. 21), and in seventeenth-century English "swallow" = "abyss" is used figuratively of evil (*Shorter Oxf. Dict.*, *loc. cit.*).

⁹⁶ Often in Test. XII Patr.; e. g., Test. Rub. 4:7; 6:3; Test. Levi 19:1; and Jubilees 15:33 (R. H. Charles, *The Apoc. and Pseudepigr. of the O. T.*, *ad loc.*).

NOTES ON SOME PASSAGES IN THE BOOK OF PROVERBS

IN Proverbs xix 10 the Hebrew text runs as follows :—

לֹא נִאֻזָּה לְכֹסִיל הַעֲנוּג
אֶף כִּי־לְעֶבֶד מִשְׁלַב בְּשָׂרָיו;

which is translated in the English Versions :

‘Delicate living (A.V. Delight) is not seemly for a fool ;
Much less for a servant to have rule over princes.’

That the connexion of ideas between the clauses is obscure has already been pointed out by commentators ; delicate living forms no real parallel to rulership.¹ The inadequate parallelism must remain so long as *הַעֲנוּג* is referred to the $\sqrt{\text{עננ}}$ ‘be soft, delicate, dainty’, cognate with the Arabic *عَنَجَ* ‘used amorous behaviour, affected languor’.² It seems preferable, however, to explain *הַעֲנוּג* here, not by reference to *עננ* = *عَنَجَ*, but to *עננ* = *عَنَجَ* ‘drew, pulled’ (a camel’s head by means of the halter), in IV ‘ordered affairs in a good manner’ ; *עֵנַךְ* means ‘rope, cord’, and is used also of ‘management’ (of an affair), while *עֲנֵכָה* means ‘great, large’, and *מְעַנֵּךְ* ‘one who applies himself to affairs’.³ If *הַעֲנוּג* be referred to this root, it will mean ‘management or direction of affairs’ i.e. administration, government, a meaning which furnishes an excellent parallel to rulership in the second half of the verse. We may now translate :

‘Administration is inappropriate⁴ for a fool,
Much less (appropriate) for a servant is rulership over princes.’

¹ See W. O. E. Oesterley *Book of Proverbs* (Westminster Comm.) p. 156.

² So Brown-Driver-Briggs *Heb. Lex.* 772, and all the Versions.

³ Lane *Arab. Eng. Lex.* 2169 f.

⁴ This is better than ‘seemly’ ; see Oesterley *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.* Cp. *Toy Proverbs* (Intern. Crit. Comm.) 371.

NOTES AND STUDIES

401

Thus two Hebrew roots are to be distinguished, first the comparatively common עננ (עֲנַן) 'be soft', and secondly עננ (עֲנַן) 'take the reins' (of government), which, so far as I am aware, is to be found in this passage only.

It has hitherto been assumed that the word דַּעַה in פֶּן דַּעַה חֲכָמָה Prov. xxiv 14 is from ידע 'knew'.¹ If this be the case, the translation is not easy. Toy,² for example, similarly R.V.,³ has to supply the words 'to be'—'so know wisdom (to be) to thy soul'. Further, the vocalization of דַּעַה, whether it be pointed דַּעַה or דַּעַה—the manuscripts vary⁴—is curious for the more normal דַּעַה.⁵ I suggest, however, that we have here not an imperative form of ידע, but an imperative of a $\sqrt{\text{דע}}$ cognate with the Arabic دَعَا 'sought, desired, asked, demanded'.⁶ The translation will then run:

'So seek wisdom for thyself,
If thou find it,' &c.

Should this equation of דַּעַה = دَعَا be accepted, the vocalization דַּעַה becomes quite normal.⁷

This same root may also underlie דַּעַת in Prov. xxix 7. The Hebrew text is as follows:—

יָדַע צְדִיק דִּין בְּלִים
רָשָׁע לֹא־יָבִין דַּעַת:

which is translated in the English Versions:

'The righteous taketh knowledge of (A.V. considereth) the cause of the poor:

The wicked hath not understanding (A.V. regardeth not) to know it.'

Oesterley rightly remarks that the words 'hath not understanding to know it' are in this connexion 'somewhat pointless', and he approves Toy's emendation לֹא יָדִין עֲנִי 'doth not plead for the needy'.⁸ Clearly some parallel is required in the second half of the verse to the thought of the first half. No such parallel is suggested by the Versions which take דַּעַת as the ordinary noun meaning 'knowledge'. A comparison with

¹ So Brown-Driver-Briggs *op. cit.* p. 393, the Versions and commentaries generally.

² *Op. cit.* p. 447.

³ The A.V. seems to imply דַּעַת 'knowledge'.

⁴ See Ginsburg *Hebrew Bible*, *ad loc.*

⁵ For explanations of the form דַּעַה see Toy *op. cit.* p. 451, and Gesenius, *Heb. Gramm.* (Kautzsch-Cowley), 2nd ed. 481. Beer in Kittel *Bibl. Hebr.*, *ad loc.* reads דַּעַה.

⁶ Lane *op. cit.* p. 883.

⁷ Cp. Hos. vi 3; ought דַּעַה to be read as דַּעַה also there? [G. R. D.]

⁸ *Op. cit.* p. 260; cp. Toy *op. cit.* p. 508.

402 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

דעא, however, produces a very satisfactory parallel. This root, as stated above, means 'sought, desired, demanded'. In VIII יִדְעִי it means 'claimed, demanded for oneself', while דִּעְוִי is a 'claim, suit', מְדַעִי is 'claimed' (property), and מְדַעִי עָלַי is 'one upon whom a claim is made' (for property)—a 'defendant in a law-suit'—while מְדַעִי means 'claiming' (property)—a 'plaintiff in a law-suit'.¹ Referring then דעת here to a root דעא = דעא we may regard it as a forensic term meaning 'law-suit' and translate:

'The righteous considereth the cause of the poor:
(But) the wicked man regardeth not (his) suit.'

In Prov. xxv 17 the word הִקֵּר in the phrase הִקֵּר רַגְלֶךָ is usually explained as the Hiph'il imperative of יָקַר 'be precious, prized'—so 'make rare (i.e. withhold) thy foot'.² It seems probable, however, that though הִקֵּר is rightly regarded as the Hiph. impv. of יָקַר, it is not to be translated 'make precious', but 'make heavy', as in Arabic قَرَّ means 'was heavy, still, motionless, rested'.³ The first half of the verse may then be translated—'Make heavy (make still) thy foot (in keeping away) from thy friend's house'.⁴ In this connexion it is interesting to recall the Arabic proverb رَحِمَ اللَّهُ مَنْ زَارَ وَخَفَّ 'God bless him who pays visits, and short visits', خَفَّ meaning 'lighten', 'cause to be less heavy', i.e. shorten.⁵

Perles⁶ has already suggested that חָקַר = حَقَّرَ 'despised'⁷ is to be found in Prov. xxv 27. Another occurrence of it may be seen perhaps in Prov. xxviii 11, where the Hebrew text runs:

חָכֶם בְּעֵינָיו אֵישׁ עָשִׂיר
וְדָל מִבֵּין יִחְקְרוּנוּ:

translated in the English Versions:

'The rich man is wise in his own conceit;

But the poor that hath understanding searcheth him out.'

If חָקַר here has the sense 'search, examine thoroughly'—and it is

¹ Lane *op. cit.* p. 883 f.

² Brown-Driver-Briggs *op. cit.* p. 429, and commentators generally.

³ Lane *op. cit.* p. 2960.

⁴ For similar sayings cp. Eccles. xiii 9, xxi 22, and Achikar ii 74 (R. H. Charles *Apoc. and Pseudepigr.* ii 738). In Syriac ܚܝܩܐ Aph. followed by ܚܝܩܐ means *oneri fuit, molestus fuit*, for example in ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܚܝܩܐ (Payne Smith *Thes. Syr.* 1624) which may be translated 'do not be a bore' (*A Compendious Syr. Dict.* ed. J. Payne Smith 196).

⁵ Burckhardt *Arabic Proverbs* 96, No. 303.

⁶ *Analekten zur Textkritik des A. T.* (1922) p. 20.

⁷ Lane *op. cit.* p. 611 ff. For the root in Ethiopic with the same meaning, see Dillmann *Lex. Ling. Aethiop.* p. 98.

NOTES AND STUDIES

403

usually given this sense¹—the meaning of the second half of the verse will be that 'the poor man who has discernment is able to see through him'.² This sense of the root is preserved by the renderings of the Vulg. (*scrutabitur*) and of Aq. and Theod. (ἐξετάσσει αὐτόν).³ The renderings of the Targ. and Pesh. (בסר ליה, حسد) are strikingly different, and suggest the possibility that underlying יחקרנו here is a distinct root חקר = حَقَر. This equation provides good sense. The rich man is frequently devoid of wisdom, yet his wealth gives him a certain confidence in himself. The poor man, on the other hand, frequently has a finer sense of values and consequently despises the rich man for his false assumption of wisdom. It may be noted that one of the meanings of καταγχνύσσω (the word which the LXX uses to translate יחקרנו here) is 'despise'.⁴

The $\sqrt{\text{רָוַם}} = \text{רָאָה}$ 'desire eagerly'⁵ has already been detected by Perles⁶ in Ps. cxi 9 and Isa. xxx 18. It is possible that the phrase אִישׁ תְּרוֹמוֹת in Prov. xxix 4 is to be explained by reference to this same Arabic root. The translation of תְּרוֹמוֹת here has caused much difficulty, and some such translation as Toy's 'a man of exactions' has become customary—it being held that the term is used in this passage, and apparently nowhere else, in a non-ritual sense.⁷ If, however, תְּרוֹמוֹת here is to be explained by reference to $\sqrt{\text{רָוַם}}$ —it will then mean 'desires'—it will, of course, having nothing at all to do with the ritual term, with which in form it is identical. We may now translate:

'A king by judgement establisheth the land,
But one who is covetous (lit. a man of desires)⁸ overthroweth it'.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

[Note on Prov. iii 35. May not $\text{וּבְסִילִים מְרִים קָלוֹן}$ be altered to $\text{וּמְרִים בְּסִילִים קָלוֹן}$ 'and the desire of fools is shame(ful)'? If so, the erroneous transposition may be explained as due to an endeavour to make sense of a sort out of the unfamiliar מְרִים . G. R. D.]

¹ So Brown-Driver-Briggs *op. cit.* 350, and commentators generally.

² Oesterley *op. cit.* p. 251.

³ Field *Orig. Hexapl.* ii 367.

⁴ Liddell & Scott *Gk. Eng. Lex.* (ed. Stuart Jones and McKenzie) 886.

⁵ Hava *Arab.-Eng. Dict.* 279; Freytag *Lex. Arab.-Lat.* ii 213.

⁶ *Op. cit.* pp. 66, 76. See further H. Bauer *Die Gottheiten von Ras Schamra* in *Z.A.T.W.*, N.F. xii 59, where the meaning of the proper name מְרִים is given as 'Wunsch(kind)', and Margoliouth *Arabs and Israelites* 15 before him.

⁷ Toy *op. cit.* p. 507. The exactions are 'all sorts of demands for money'. Cp. Oesterley *op. cit.* p. 259 f, who notes that some emend to תְּרִמִּית 'deceit' (cp. LXX) but prefers M.T.

⁸ Cp. Vulg. *vir avarus*. The LXX renders by ἀνὴρ παρὰ νόμος, the Pesh. by חַסָּל , and the Targ. by נְבִרָא עוֹלָא . The plural in תְּרוֹמוֹת is intensive; see Gesenius, *op. cit.* 124°.

A NOTE ON דַּעַת IN PROVERBS XXII. 12

THE text of Prov. xxii. 12 runs as follows:

עֵינֶיךָ יְהִנֶּה נִצְרוּ דַּעַת וְיִסְלַף דְּבָרֶיךָ בְּגֵד :

The translation of דַּעַת by 'knowledge' yields no adequate sense, as is generally admitted by commentators, who are driven either to regard 'knowledge' as the equivalent of 'one who possesses knowledge'—an interpretation which O.T. usage does not permit—or to emend the text, sometimes drastically.³ Emendation is, however, unnecessary if it is recognized that דַּעַת in this passage has no connexion with יָדַע 'knew', and accordingly does not mean 'knowledge', but rather with דַּעַה cognate with Arabic دَعَا ('sought, desired, asked, demanded').

I have already suggested that in Prov. xxiv. 14 דַּעַה is the imperative of this root דַּעַה and means 'seek'; and that in Prov. xxix. 7 דַּעַת, from the

¹ *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford, 1927), p. 33.

² G.-K., § 52e.

³ See, e.g., F. Hitzig, *Die Sprüche Salomo's*, pp. 223 f.; W. Frankenberg, *Die Sprüche*, p. 126; C. H. Toy, *The Book of Proverbs (I.C.C.)*, p. 418; G. Beer, in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, 3rd ed., ad loc.; B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos*, p. 64.

same root, means 'lawsuit'.¹ This forensic sense, it may be suggested, is the probable meaning of דָּעַת in Prov. xxii. 12—'the eyes of Yahweh watch over a lawsuit'. From this we are led to expect legal language in the second half of the verse also. And indeed it is not far to seek. In Exod. xxiii. 8 we read—וְעֵינֵי יְהוָה בְּדֹבְרֵי צְדִיקִים וְיִסְלֵף דְּבַר יָשָׁר וְיַעֲדֵם (a bribe blindeth clear-sighted men and subverteth the case of the righteous'). In the parallel passage Deut. xvi. 19 חֲכָמִים (wise men) takes the place of פְּקָהִים. S. R. Driver,² commenting on דְּבַרִי in this latter passage, writes—'i.e. statements, arguments, pleas, which in the aggregate are tantamount to a man's "case" or "cause"', and he compares Exod. xxiv. 14, 2 Sam. xv. 3, and Josh. xx. 4. The phrase סֵלַף דְּבָרִים 'subvert a case, cause' thus provides the legal language required in the second half of Prov. xxii. 12. The whole verse may then be translated:

The eyes of Yahweh watch over a lawsuit,
And he subverteth the case of the deceitful.

The aphorism thus reaffirms Yahweh's concern for justice and the certainty that a case built upon deceit will fail.

It is not impossible that the verb בָּגַד, which is found frequently in passages in connexion with the marriage relationship and with matters of property, or right, in covenants,³ itself belongs to the Hebrew legal vocabulary, expressing as it does in such connexions failure to respect one's obligations. This needs further investigation, however.

D. WINTON THOMAS

A NOTE ON דָּרְכִים IN ISAIAH XLIX. 9b

WHEREAS verse 7 of Isa. xlix is concerned with the mission of the Servant to the outside world, the theme of verses 8–12 is Israel's restoration from exile under the figure of sheep led by Yahweh. The Hebrew text of verses 9b and 10, which should probably be read together,¹ runs as follows:

וּבְכָל-שְׂפָיִים מְרִעִתָם:	עַל-דָּרְכִים יָרְעוּ	9b
וְלֹא-יָבֹם שָׂרָב רָשָׁמֶשׁ	לֹא-יִרְעֻבוּ וְלֹא-יִצְמָאוּ	10
וְעַל-מִבְרְעֵי מַיִם יִנְהָלֻם:	כִּי מִרְחֻקָם יִנְהָגֻם	

Professor G. R. Driver has convincingly argued the case for the meaning 'swept earth', 'dust', and so 'sand-dune' for שְׂפִי, rather than 'bare height' as it is commonly translated.² May it be then that דָּרְכִים, which stands in parallelism with שְׂפָיִים, conceals a similar meaning? The suggestion I wish to make is that a suitable parallel to שְׂפָיִים 'sand-dunes' can be obtained by means of a very simple emendation, namely, the reading of כ for ר, so that the text would read עַל-דָּרְכִים, or, with the LXX and Arabic versions, עַל-כָּל-דָּרְכִים,³ דָּרְכִים being the plural of a noun דָּךְ (cf. הָרִים, plural of הָר, and עֲמָמִים, plural of עָם),⁴ which is the equivalent of the Arabic كَلْ 'even, level, sand'.⁵ דָּרְכִים may then perhaps be translated 'sand-flats' in contrast to שְׂפָיִים 'sand-dunes', that is, sand swept by, carried by, the wind and piled high. In Arabic كَلْ means 'crushed, pounded',⁶ and Ugaritic *dk*,⁷ Aramaic דִּכְךְ,⁸ and

¹ So, for example, BH₃; C. C. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah*, p. 385; E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, ii, p. 135; B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, p. 335.

² *Occident and Orient* (Gaster Memorial Volume, ed. B. Schindler and A. Marmorstein), pp. 78 ff.; cf. C. R. North, *The Second Isaiah*, p. 101 (on xli. 18).

³ So Kissane, North, *et al.*; *contra* Torrey, who believes that כָּל could have come in as a result of an attempt to conform with the following clause. Perhaps it fell out of the text through its similarity to עַל (cf. Duhm). IsA has it, reading כֹּל הָרִים 'every mountain'. It is omitted in the Pesh., Targ., and Vulg.

⁴ Cf. H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Hist. Gramm. d. hebr. Sprache des A.T.*, p. 570t.

⁵ Lane, *Arab.-Engl. Lex.* 898, where a noun كَدَاك is also cited meaning 'sand that is compact and cleaving to the ground, not elevated, or sand containing dust and earth compacted together, or sand pressed, and even, or level'.

⁶ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

⁷ J. Aistleitner, *Wörterb. d. ugarit. Sprache* (ed. O. Eissfeldt), p. 77.

⁸ G. Dalman, *Aram.-neuhebr. Wörterb.*, p. 92; J. Levy, *Chald. Wörterb. über die Targumin*, i, p. 175.

204

NOTES AND STUDIES

post-biblical *שָׁבַר* have the same meaning. The root is not found in biblical Hebrew, but the adjective *שָׁבַר* 'crushed' and the noun *שִׁבְרָה* 'crushing' occur.²

Verses 9b-10 may accordingly be translated as follows:

On (every) sand-flat shall they graze,
 and on every sand-dune shall be their pasture;
 They shall neither hunger nor thirst,
 neither shall scorching wind nor sun strike them,
 For he who has compassion upon them shall lead them,
 and by springs of water shall he guide them.

D. WINTON THOMAS

The Meaning of רִי in Psalm lxxx. 14

In his note on רִי in Ps. 80¹⁴ (English verse 13) Mr Peddi Victor, relying upon the translation of רִי by *μυῖς* in LXX א^o, א, R^a, T and the parallels in Greek literature cited by Liddell and Scott, translates רִי here and in Ps 50¹¹ 'the leader boar' (the 'lonely ferocious leader of the swine herd').¹ The rendering of the LXX manuscripts just mentioned is found also in Symmachus,² and the Vulgate's *singularis (ferus)* may be compared with it. Since, however, the rendering of רִי in other LXX manuscripts, and in the other chief ancient versions, suggests a different tradition concerning the meaning of the word, it is of some interest to take a look at them, and further to consider what the most probable meaning of רִי is in these passages in the light of comparative Semitic philology.

Ps 80¹⁴. LXX B and S render רִי by *δυνας* 'ass', with which Quinta's *δυναπος*³ agrees. The Targum translates by חֲרִינָה 'cock',⁴ while Jerome renders more generally by *bestiae* 'beasts',⁵ as does the Syriac version (*haywāthā*).⁶

Ps 50¹¹. The rendering of רִי in this passage by Quinta, Targum, and Syriac is the same as in Ps 80¹⁴. The LXX, however, translates it by *ὡπαιότης* 'beauty', and the Vulgate similarly (*pulchritudo*).⁷ This latter rendering points to a reading רִי 'brightness, splendour' (cf. Dan 2²¹ 4²² etc.),⁸ which in fact is found in four Hebrew manuscripts.⁹

¹ THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxxvi., 1965, pp. 294f.

² Cf. Field, *Orig. Hexapl.*, II, p. 232.

³ *Ib.* The Arabic version too has 'ass' (Walton, *Polyglot*, ad loc.).

⁴ P. de Lagarde, *Hagiogr. Chald.*, p. 48.

⁵ J. M. Harden, *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi*, p. 103.

⁶ Also the Ethiopic version (Walton, *Polyglot*, ad loc.).

⁷ So also the Arabic and Ethiopic versions (Walton, *ad loc.*).

⁸ See Brown-Driver-Briggs, *A Heb. and Engl. Lex.*, p. 1091.

⁹ Cf. Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, 3rd. ed., ad loc.

So far as I know, there is no cognate word in any Semitic language which supports a meaning 'boar' or 'cock' for רִי. Only two Semitic words seem to come in for serious consideration. The first is the Akkadian *zizānu* 'a kind of locust', which is found in the phrase *zizānu qīstī* 'forest locust'.¹⁰ The second is the post-biblical and Aramaic רִי, רִי' 'mite, worm', literally 'that which moves' (root רִי).¹¹ A meaning like 'locusts' or 'worms', both small but destructive creatures, would stand in effective contrast to the mighty boar in Ps 80¹⁴; ¹² both in their own way devour the 'vine out of Egypt' (verse 9, Engl. 8). In Ps 50¹¹ the same meaning, here parallel with birds, would suit the context quite well.

Briefly to summarize, we may say that the evidence of the ancient versions does not point to any clear conclusion as to the meaning of רִי in these two Psalm passages, while Semitic philology, so far as at present known, suggests some kind of locust or worm. In Rabbinic literature רִי is grouped with Hebrew words meaning flies, locusts, and gnats.¹³

It may be added that Aquila's translation of רִי by *παιροδανία* (Ps 50¹¹) and *παιροδανών* (Ps 80¹⁴), and Symmachus' translation of it in Ps 50¹¹ by *πληθος*,¹⁴ point to רִי 'abundance, fullness'.¹⁵ Jerome's *universitas*¹⁶ in Ps 50¹¹ too appears to reflect this second רִי.

D. WINTON THOMAS

¹⁰ C. Bezold, *Bab.-Ass. Glossar*, p. 112. Cf. Ges.-Buhl, *Handwörterb. über das A. T.*, 16th ed., 1915, p. 196.

¹¹ G. H. Dalman, *Aram.-Neuhebr. Wörterb.*, p. 120; J. Levy, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.*, etc., I, p. 527; M. Jastrow, *Dict. of the Targumim*, etc., p. 393.

¹² H. P. Chajes thinks the meaning is 'worm' in this passage (*REJ*, xlv., 1902, pp. 224f.).

¹³ Cf. A. Cohen, *AJSL*, xl, 1923-24, p. 170, and the dictionaries referred to in note ¹¹ above. Ben Yehuda (*Thes. totius hebraitalis*, 1321) describes the Hebrew word as a collective name for all small animals.

¹⁴ Cf. Field, *ad loc.*

¹⁵ Cf. Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 265.

¹⁶ Cf. Harden, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

A Note on Exodus xv. 2.

DR. T. H. GASTER's suggestion in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, October 1936, that the word וְסָרַח is to be connected with the Arabic *dhamara*, 'protect,' is already to be found in Elieser Ben Yehuda's *Thesaurus Totius Hebraitalis*, p. 1363, where וְסָרַח, which is described as one of the difficult words of the Old Testament, is explained here (and in Ps 118¹⁴ and Is 12²) by the words נָבֹר וְאִמָּץ מַנְעוֹת וּמַכְרִיעַ, 'a mighty man and strong, conquering and subduing his enemies.' On p. 1364 he remarks that the two roots וְסָר, 'sing,' and וְסָר=*dhamara*, have become confused, and that related to *dhamara* is another Arabic word *safira*, 'conquer.'

His explanation of וְסָרַח in this passage is also worth recording. He thinks that it has nothing to do with וְסָר, 'strength' (root עָוָה), but is to be connected with a root עָוָה which should be compared with the well-known Arabic word *ghasā*, 'go forth to war' (*ghāsin*, 'warrior'). The translation of the first half of the verse may then run—'A warrior and protector is Yah.'

The usefulness of Ben Yehuda's dictionary is well illustrated by his remarks on this verse. It is to be regretted, therefore, that it can be consulted only by those who are able to read the Hebrew in which it is written.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Durham.

THE MEANING OF תְּשׂוּאָה IN PROVERBS X. 16

THE Hebrew text of Prov. x. 16 runs as follows:

פְּעֹלַת צַדִּיק לְחַיִּים תְּבוּאָת רָשָׁע לְתַשְׁתָּא :

and the verse is translated in the R.V.—

The labour of the righteous *tendeth* to life;

The increase (A.V. 'fruit') of the wicked to sin.

The word לְחַיִּים 'to life' is interpreted by Toy as meaning 'to long life and earthly happiness',² and, since he finds the word תְּשׂוּאָה in the sense 'sin' difficult, he proposes to emend it either to לְמַחֲתָה 'to destruction' or to לְמוֹת 'to death'.³ In xxvii. 27 he rightly gives to חַיִּים the meaning 'maintenance'⁴ (cf. Vulg. *ad victum*), and this, it may be suggested, is the meaning which it has also in x. 16. Further examples of חַיִּים in the sense 'sustenance, maintenance' occur in Eccclus. iv. 1 and xxxix. 26, and the Greek ζωή is used in the same sense in xxix. 21 and xxxi. 25.⁵

¹ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job* (Edinburgh, 1921), p. 181, and part ii, p. 142.

² *The Book of Proverbs* (ICC), p. 209; similarly W. Frankenberg, *Die Sprüche*, p. 68.

³ p. 211; cf. G. Beer, in *Bibl. Hebr.*, 3rd ed., ad loc.

⁴ p. 494; so also F. Hitzig, *Die Sprüche Salomo's*, p. 291, Frankenberg, p. 151, and B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos*, 2nd rev. ed., p. 96, and the dictionaries generally. Gemser, p. 114, aptly compares ancient Egyptian *ḥw* 'nourishment' and modern Egyptian Arabic *ayṣ* 'life' (for 'bread').

⁵ Cf. R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, p. 34 (on iv. 1).

* * *

What then of תְּשׂוּאָה in this passage? 'Sin' provides no suitable parallel to 'maintenance'. A suitable parallel can, however, be obtained if תְּשׂוּאָה, which is supported by all the ancient versions, is taken in the sense of the Ethiopic *ḥaṭi'at* 'penury'.¹ The verse may accordingly be satisfactorily translated as it stands:

The wages of the righteous lead to their maintenance;
But the revenue of the wicked to their penury.

The point of the verse then is that, whereas money properly acquired and used by the righteous man enables him to live at a reasonable standard, it brings to the wicked man who acquires and uses it improperly only poverty.²

D. WINTON THOMAS

A NOTE ON מַחֲלָצוֹת IN ZECHARIAH iii 4.

THE Hebrew word מַחֲלָצוֹת occurs only here and in Is. iii 22. In Zechariah it is used of the garments of the high-priest with which he is to be clothed instead of the 'filthy garments'. In Isaiah it is included among the articles of finery of the ladies of Jerusalem.

The English Versions understand by the word either a change of raiment or rich (festival) robes. The Hebrew Lexicon (Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 323) offers a similar explanation ('robe of state') because such a garment is 'taken off' (חָלַץ) in ordinary life—a rendering which is adopted by most commentators.

But the idea of a mere change of raiment, or of costliness or magnificence inherent in a festival or state robe, is not the sense required here. The context calls for the sense 'clean, pure'. The 'filthy garments', symbolic of sin, are to be removed from the high-priest, who wears them as the representative of the people's guilt, and hereafter he is to be clothed in pure, clean robes, symbolic of the removal of sin, both from the people and himself, and of his renewed eligibility for the high-priestly office. That this is the sense required is shown by the 'fair' (Heb. "clean") mitre of verse 5; Kittel's restoration of טְהוֹרִים 'clean' after בְּגָדִים in the same verse would therefore seem to be justified.

The Hebrew Lexicon connects חָלַץ with the Arabic root خَلَصَ in the sense of 'to withdraw, retire'. The primary meaning of the Arabic root, however, is 'to become clear, pure, genuine, white' (Lane, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.* I. ii. 785). The adjective خَالِصٌ means 'clear, pure, white', and is actually used of garments. Lane (*op. cit.* I. ii. 786) gives قَبَاءُ أَزْرَقُ خَالِصٌ 'a garment of a clear or pure white', and قَبَاءُ الْبِطَانَةِ 'a garment of the kind called قَبَاءُ blue with a white lining'.

280 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

The use of the root in a figurative sense of purity or sincerity of mind is, of course, quite common.

That this root in the sense of 'be clear, pure' is an ancient one, is shown by its use in Assyrian, where *ḫalāṣu* means 'to purify' (oil); and a glossary equates *šamna šāba* (Heb. שֶׁן טוֹב 'good (pure) oil') with *šamna ḫalša* (Rawlinson, *C.I.W.A.* iv. 60 d. 25; see Muss-Arnolt *Ass. Dict.* p. 1060).¹

The word מוֹחֲלָצוֹת, therefore, is not to be connected with חָלַץ 'to withdraw', but with חָלַץ 'to be clean, pure'. In the Hebrew Lexicon the latter root has been merged in the former, but they must be considered as distinct roots, as perhaps must the Arabic roots with corresponding meanings. In Zechariah these clean garments become the substitute for the filthy garments and the appropriate accompaniment of the clean mitre; while in Isaiah the inclusion of clean raiment among the finery of the women of Jerusalem is far from inappropriate.

D. WINTON THOMAS

¹ I am indebted to Mr G. R. Driver for this Assyrian parallel.

A NOTE ON חִלְצוֹתָם IN JUDGES xiv 19

IN a recent number of this JOURNAL⁵ I drew attention to two passages (Is. iii 22 and Zech. iii 4) where the Hebrew root חִלַץ receives its best explanation when equated with the Arabic خَلَصَ 'was clean, pure, white'. To these two passages I now add Judges xiv 19, where חִלְצוֹתָם is to be regarded as a derivative from the same root.

In xiv 12 Samson promises those who succeed in guessing his riddle thirty סְדִינִים (A.V. 'sheets', R.V. 'linen garments') and thirty חִלְפוֹת בְּגָדִים 'changes of raiment'. The word סְדִין means a 'linen wrapper',⁴ a rectangular piece of 'fine, thin, and therefore costly, linen stuff',⁶ and so something superior to בְּגָד, which indicates a robe of any kind.⁶

When, therefore, in xiv 19 Samson slays thirty men of Ashkelon and takes from them חִלְצוֹתָם, he takes from them 'their fine (pure, white) robes' (סְדִינִים; cf. the margins of the English Versions 'apparel', LXX τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν and Pesh. (لَحْدَمَمَس)). His promise is fulfilled only if חִלְצוֹתָם is derived, not from חִלַץ 'strip off' (and so 'spoil'⁷), but from חִלַץ = خَلَصَ 'was clean, pure, white'.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

A NOTE ON לִיקְנֶהָ IN PROVERBS xxx. 17

THE word לִיקְנֶהָ, occurring only in 1 Sam. xix. 20, has been plausibly explained by Professor G. R. Driver by reference to the root לִהָק, cognate with the Eth. ለሀቀ 'was old' (cp. Ar. لَهَقَ 'was white', e.g. hair).¹ The discovery of this Hebrew root provides, we believe, one clue to the correct explanation of לִיקְנֶהָ in Prov. xxx. 17, while the LXX's rendering of it by γῆρας² provides another. Our suggestion is that לִיקְנֶהָ here has nothing to do with יִקְנֶהָ³ 'obedience', with which it is usually connected, but that beneath it lies concealed some derivative from לִהָק meaning 'old age'—the ל being radical, and not,

¹ See *J.T.S.* xxix. 394.² So also Pesh., Targ., and Rashi.³ A word doubtful both in form and meaning, according to C. H. Toy, *The Book of Proverbs*, pp. 530, 532.

* * *

NOTES AND STUDIES

155

as is generally thought, the preposition.¹ What the precise form of the derivative may have been we cannot know for certain; but some such form as לִהָקָה (cstr. לִהָקֶת) or לִהִיקָה (cstr. לִהִיקֶת) may be suggested. The first half of the verse may then be translated:

'The eye that mocketh a father,
And despiseth the old age of a mother' (cp. xxiii. 22^b).

The emendation לִיקְנֶהָ, adopted by some commentators,² is therefore seen to be unnecessary. Like so many emendations, it is based upon a mistaken view as to the Hebrew original which the LXX's translation reflects.

D. WINTON THOMAS

»A Drop of a Bucket«? Some Observations on the Hebrew
Text of Isaiah 40¹⁶

By D. Winton Thomas

(4 Grantchester Road, Cambridge)

V. 12–31 of Is 40 have as their theme the omnipotence of Yahweh, and in v. 12–16 his might is seen manifested in the creation of the sea, the heavens, and the earth, and his wisdom knows no bounds. The divine majesty transcends all creation, the nations are of no account before Yahweh, and not even the wood of Lebanon and its denizens would suffice to make a worthy sacrifice to him. V. 15, a triple line¹, runs in Hebrew as follows:

הֵן גִּזְיִם כְּמֵר מְדִלִי
וּכְשֶׁחֶק מֵאוֹנִים נִחְשְׁבוּ
הֵן אֵיִים כִּדְק יִטּוּלִי

which is translated in the English Versions²:

»Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance; behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing«.

The meaning »a drop of a bucket« for **כְּמֵר מְדִלִי** is found in all the chief ancient versions. Thus the LXX translates the phrase by ὥς σταγὼν ἄπο κάδου, the Vulg. by *quasi stilla situlae*, the Pesh. by **כְּכֵסֶמֶת מְדוּלָּה**, and the Targ. by **כְּכֵסֶמֶת מְדוּלָּה**³. This same meaning is found in the commentaries of Rashi and Kimchi. The former's comment on the two Hebrew words is **כְּכֵסֶמֶת מְדוּלָּה מְשׁוּלֵי הַדִּלִּי** »משקע טעפת המים ודוקבין העץ לימניד"א בלע"ז from the rim of a bucket and deposits at the bottom the impurity of

¹ For the verse of three members in Second Isaiah, see C. C. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah*, p. 154ff.

² R. S. V. »a drop from a bucket«; so B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 263, cf. E. König, *Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 356; Torrey, *op. cit.*, p. 226; C. R. North, *The Second Isaiah*, p. 33; P. Volz, *Jesaja II, übersetzt u. erklärt*, p. 7.

³ Similarly the Arabic version (B. Walton, *Polyglot*, ad loc.), and the Ethiopic version (J. Bachmann, *Der Prophet Jesaja nach d. aethiop. Bibelübersetzung*, p. 69). The Wisdom of Solomon 11:22 may be compared — ὅτι ὥς ῥόπη ἐκ πλαστῆργων βλος ὁ κόσμος ἐναντίον σου.

the water and it rots the wood—*l'immonde* in the gentiles' language⁴. Kimchi's comment is כִּמְוֵה הַטִּיפָה מִדְּלִי שֶׁהוּא דִּבְרַ מִעֵט כְּגֵד מִי הַדְּלִי »Like a drop from a bucket which is a small thing compared with the water in the bucket«. This traditional meaning »a drop of a bucket« is found generally in commentaries⁵ and lexicons⁶. The aim of this article is to raise the question whether this meaning, despite the long tradition behind it, is in fact correct. Before we proceed to suggest another possible translation, it is necessary first to consider the precise meaning of two other phrases in this verse, namely, כִּשְׁחָק מֵאוֹנִים and כִּדֵּק יִטּוֹל. We shall consider them in turn.

The basic meaning of the Hebrew root שָׁחַק, which occurs only four times in the Hebrew Bible, is »rubbed away, beat fine, pulverized«. In Job 14⁹ waters »rub away« stones; in Ex 30³⁶ Moses is commanded to »beat fine« the incense; and in II Sam 22⁴³ (= Ps 18⁴³) the verb is used of »beating small as dust, crushing« enemies (here שָׁחַק is parallel to דָּקַק »crushed«). The same verb is found in Sir 6³⁶⁷ רֵאֵה מִי יִבִּין וְשִׁחְרִירוֹ וְתִשְׁחֹק בְּסִטְפוֹ רֵגְלֵךְ »If thou seest one who is understanding, be sure to seek him out, and let thy foot wear out (rub away, LXX ἐκτριβέτω) his door-step«, that is, make thy visits to him frequent (cf. Lat. iter terere)⁸. This basic meaning »rubbed away, pulverized«, is that which is borne by the cognate verbs in other Semitic languages. Thus in Arabic سَحَقَ (a synonym of دَقَّ = Hebrew דָּקַק) means »bruised, pounded, pulverized«, also »wore out« (of a garment)⁹, and in Aramaic¹⁰ שָׁחַק and in Syriac¹¹ ܫܚܩ bear similar meanings.

The Hebrew substantive שָׁחֻק thus basically means »that which is rubbed, crushed, made fine« like dust, and is used in the Hebrew

⁴ The French *l'immonde* renders only the Hebrew word טִיפָה. J. L. Teicher has kindly discussed this passage from Rashi, which is not without its difficulties, with me.

⁵ Cf. n. 2 above, and E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, II p. 11.

⁶ See the lexicons of Brown-Driver-Briggs, Gesenius-Buhl, Zorell, and Koehler-Baumgartner.

⁷ See R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*, Hebr. u. Deutsch, p. 6 (of Hebrew text); *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, p. 61.

⁸ Cf. H. L. Strack, *Die Sprüche Jesus', des Sohnes Sirach*, p. 6.

⁹ Lane, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.*, 1318.

¹⁰ G. Dalman, *Aram.-Neuhebr. Wörterb.*, etc., p. 400.

¹¹ P. Smith, *Thes. Syr.*, 4122f. The Akkadian *šahāqu* »sneeze« is compared by Koehler-Baumgartner, p. 96, but this meaning is regarded as doubtful by C. Bezold, *Bab.-Assyr. Glossar*, p. 268. The form *i-si-hi-iq* in a Babylonian medical text is compared with Hebrew שָׁחַק »rubbed away« by C. Frank, *OLZ* 12 (1909), 482; cf. Ges.-Buhl, *Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterb. über das A.T.*, 16th. ed., p. 819.

Bible twenty times of »(thin) clouds«, usually in the plural שְׁחָקִים. It frequently stands in parallelism with שָׁמַיִם (e.g., Dtn 33 26 Is 45 8 Jer 51 9 Ps 36 6 Job 35 5¹²); twice it is opposed to תְּהוֹם (Prov 3 20 8 28); in II Sam 22 12 (= Ps 18 12) the phrase עָבֵי שְׁחָקִים »thick clouds« occurs; and in Job 37 18 (plural) and Ps 89 7.38 (singular) it means »sky«¹³. In Arabic سَحَابٌ means »thick clouds«, which are likened to an old and worn out garment¹⁴ (as rubbed away; cf. Aramaic שְׁחָקְתָּ »worn out, thin, clothes«)¹⁵. The one example of the singular שְׁחָק in the Hebrew Bible is in the passage at present under discussion. Most commentators and lexicographers, as well as the English Versions and the Revised Standard Version, give the meaning here »fine dust«, the phrase »fine dust of the scales« being a simile of insignificance; fine dust in the scales is too small a thing to be reckoned of any account in weighing. This meaning »fine dust«, literally »what has been rubbed away, crushed, pulverized«, may be accepted as correct for Is 40 15¹⁶, even though elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible the meaning (in the plural) »clouds« predominates. The two meanings »fine dust« and »(thin) cloud« are, however, not so dissimilar that they cannot be brought into association (cf. the English phrase »a cloud of dust«)¹⁷.

The substantive שְׁחָק occurs again with the meaning »dust« in Sir 42 4. The Hebrew text runs — על שֹׁחַק מֵאֻזִּים וּפִלִּס וְעַל תְּמָחֹת אֵימָה וְאֵבֶן — »(Do not be ashamed) concerning the dust on the scales and the tongue of the balances nor of testing the ephah measure and weights«, that is, do not hesitate to take account even of the fine dust on the scales in watching the merchant's balances for exactness (for על שֹׁחַק מֵאֻזִּים the LXX has περιλαβειναι ζυγῶν). R. Smend sees in שֹׁחַק an in-

¹² Possibly also in Ps 68 35, where השמים may have to be read in place of ישראל; cf. BH³ ad loc.

¹³ For the meanings in these passages, see Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 1007; P. Joüon argues that שְׁחָקִים never means »clouds«, but always »heaven«. It is a poetic synonym of שָׁמַיִם, with the nuance »the high part of heaven« (שְׁחָק II »was high«); it means »the heights«, just as שָׁמַיִם (Arabic *samā* »sky« is from *sāmi* »high«), ZKTh 27 (1903), p. 592f. For a similar view, see M. Lambert, REJ 68 (1914), p. 113f. The LXX renders שֹׁחַק here by ἡσυχία, the Vulg. by *momentum*, the Pesh. by ܐܝܠܐ, and the Targ. by עֵיִל; similarly the Arab. and Eth. versions. Ibn Janāḥ (ed. A. Neubauer) explains by سَحَابٌ »filings, particles« (p. 714).

¹⁴ Lane, op. cit., 1319.

¹⁵ Dalman, op. cit., loc. cit. Cf. כְּתָן שְׁחָקִים »an old coat« (A. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C., 42 10, p. 142, 144).

¹⁶ North, op. cit., p. 33, translates »moisture on scales«, which »in a market place would not need to be taken into reckoning« (p. 84). Dust on scales, however, seems a more likely phrase when an oriental market is in mind.

¹⁷ According to Midr. Till. to Ps 18, the clouds are called שְׁחָקִים »because they rub against one another« (M. Jastrow, A Dict. of the Targumim, etc., p. 1550).

finitive¹⁸, but since, as he himself remarks, there is a clear connection between this verse in Sir and Is 40 15, it is preferable to regard it as a substantive¹⁹, and to give it the same meaning which, as we believe, it has in the Isaiah passage, namely, »dust«.

Since in our view כֶּשֶׁחַק מְאוֹנִים means »like the fine dust of the scales« in Is 40 15, we find unacceptable H. Torczyner's suggestion that it means »like the rags of the clouds«. This suggestion has a twofold basis. In the first place it is argued that שְׁחִיקִים in the sense »rags« is used metaphorically for שְׁחִיקִים »clouds« — »For do we not see also the clouds of the rainy season ragged and torn by wind and weather, as black shreds of garments!«²⁰ And secondly, it is argued that מְאוֹנִים here does not mean »scales«, but »clouds«. Comparing the Arabic مَزْنٌ »cloud«, Torczyner reads מְאוֹנִים in place of מְאוֹנִים, and he finds support for this reading in the Isaiah scroll, which has מְאוֹנִים in v. 15, whereas in v. 12, where it is agreed that it means »scales«, it is spelt מְאוֹנִים²¹. It must, however, be considered hazardous to attach much significance to this difference in spelling, for not infrequently the Isaiah scroll exhibits similar differences in the spelling of a word, *hōlem* sometimes being written with an accompanying שָׁשׁ and sometimes not. In illustration it will suffice to refer to מְשָׁלָה (40 10), but מְשָׁלִים (49 7, both participles); to the participle אוֹמֵר (42 22), but אָמַר (45 8); to עוֹנָה (40 2), but עוֹנָכָה (43 24); and to חֲטָאֵתִיכָה (plural, 43 25), but חֲטָאֵתִיכָה (44 22)²². There would appear, therefore, to be no compelling reason for differentiating, on the basis of spelling, between מְאוֹנִים and מְאוֹנִים in the scroll, for the former could have been pronounced exactly the same as the latter. It is worth remarking in this connection that in the scroll v. 15 is written by a different hand from that of v. 12. Where different scribes are concerned, it is surely unsafe to argue from the spelling of the one to that of the other. It does not appear to the present writer that Torczyner has made out his case, and his view

¹⁸ Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, Hebr. u. Deutsch, p. 74 (»Wage und Setzwage zu prüfen«); and of the verb he says »Eigentl. abreiben, dann ins Gleichgewicht bringen«. He suggests that the word תְּמַחֶה should be read תְּמַחֶה or תְּמַחֶה (noun; N. H. מַחַּה Hiph. »tested weights«; the basic meaning of מַחַּה also is »rubbed away«; Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt, p. 389).

¹⁹ So I. Lévi, L'Écclesiastique ou la sagesse de Jésus, fils de Sira, Première Partie, p. 46f.; N. Peters, Hebr. Text d. Buches Ecclesiasticus, p. 397.

²⁰ St Th 1 (1948), p. 190. He continues—»out of this very conception we have to understand the English word *cloud* (unsatisfactorily explained till now), simply as another pronunciation and spelling of *clout*, a ragged piece of cloth«.

²¹ Ibid. 2 (1949/50), p. 98; cf. Ben Iehuda, Thes. totius Hebraeae, 7032f.

²² See M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery I, The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary, ad loc.

seems all the more unlikely since Is 40 15 is concerned throughout, as will be suggested later, with the idea of weighing, so that the meaning »scales« for מאזנים is entirely consonant with the context, as too is שחוק in the meaning »dust«. The meaning »scales« has been rightly handed down by the chief ancient versions (LXX ζυγῶν, Vulg. staterae, Pesh. *ܡܥܬܪܐ*, Targ. *מאזניא*), as also by Kimchi במאזנים *העפר הדק שהוא אשר*, »that thin dust which is on the scales«.

We pass now to a consideration of the phrase כדק יטול, translated in the English Versions »he taketh up (the isles) as a very little thing«²³, the subject being Yahweh. The verb יטול has been connected with the root טול »cast, threw«²⁴, but is more generally connected with נטל. This latter root, as used in the Hebrew Bible, normally means »lifted up, bore«, and this is the meaning commonly given to it by commentators and lexicographers in Is 40 15, the sense being that as given by the English Versions. Much more likely, however, נטל here has the sense it bears in Syriac (ܢܬܠ) »turned the scale, weighed heavy, was weighty«²⁵. Several derivatives meaning »weight«, »weighty«, »heaviness«, are known in Syriac²⁶, and Hebrew knows the substantive נטל »burden, weight« (Prov 27 3 || כֶּבֶד) and the adjective נטיל (in נטילי כֶּסֶף »laden, weighed down, with silver«, Zeph 1 11). If, with some commentators²⁷, the plural יטולו be read in place of יטול (cf. the plural verbs in the LXX and Pesh.) — the final *awaw* may have been assimilated to the following *laban*²⁸ — the whole phrase יטולו כדק יטול may then be translated »the isles weigh only as fine dust«. The root דקק runs throughout the Semitic languages²⁹ in

²³ LXX ὥς σέλος λογισθήσονται (כדק read as כֶּדֶק, an ocular error on the part of the Greek translator; see J. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?*, p. 54). Hieron, »quasi saliva reputantur ... Aiunt autem Hebraei hoc verbo significari tenuissimum pulverem« (F. Field, *Orig. Hexapl.*, II p. 511); Pesh. *ܢܬܠ ܕܥܦܪ ܕܥܦܪܐ*; Vulg. *quasi pulvis exiguus*; Targ. *כדוקא דעפר* »like fine dust that flies about«. See further J. Ziegler, *Isaias (Septuaginta Vet. Test. Graec., Göttingen)*, p. 269.

²⁴ So Kimchi מביין נפעל משרש טל. In more recent times the connection with טל has been held by P. A. H. de Boer, though he regards נטל as possible (*Second-Isaiah's Message*, OTS 11 (1956), p. 4, 41).

²⁵ See Volz and North, *ad loc.*; F. Feldmann's objection to נטל = ܢܬܠ can hardly be sustained (see his *Das Buch Isaias*, II p. 35).

²⁶ P. Smith, *op. cit.*, 2349 f.

²⁷ E.g., Marti, Volz, North, *op. cit.*

²⁸ Cf. North, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

²⁹ Akkad. *daqāqu* (Bezold, *op. cit.*, p. 109), Arab. دَقَّ (Lane, *op. cit.*, 895), Aram. ܕܩܩ (Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 98), Syr. ܕܩܩ (P. Smith, *op. cit.*, 936 f.), Eth. *daqqa* (Dillmann, *Lex. Ling. Aeth.*, 1009 f.). The adjective דק is found in Phoenician (»thin,

the sense »crushed, pulverized, broke in pieces«, the sense which, as we have seen, is the basic meaning of the verb שחק, and as שחק literally means »what is crushed, pulverized«, and so »fine dust«, so too דָּק here similarly means »what is crushed, pulverized«, and so again »fine dust« (as the Revised Standard Version). While דָּק is normally an adjective, it is here used substantively³⁰. To give to דָּק here the meaning »thin foil«³¹ — as if דָּק here has the same meaning as דָּק in v. 22 — is to miss the point of the parallelism between שחק and דָּק.

Since then the second and third members of the verse under consideration should, as we believe, be translated »and like fine dust of the scales are they (the nations) reckoned«, and »behold, the isles weigh only as fine dust«, respectively, it may well be asked whether the first member also contains a reference to dust and scales. Certainly, in view of the translation of the other two members favoured here, the first member in its traditional translation — »behold, the nations are like a drop of a bucket« — seems out of context. Is there any basis for the belief that in the first member of the verse there is some reference to weight? We may suggest that there may be. Before we advance a suggestion, we may take a brief look at the etymologies which are commonly given for the words מֵר and דָּלִי, both of which occur in this passage only.

According to Brown-Driver-Briggs³², מֵר in the sense »drop« is derived from a root מֵר, unused in Hebrew, but known in Arabic (مَرَّ »passed by, ran, flowed« [of water], مَرَمَرَة »made [water] to pass, go, upon the surface of the ground«³³). If »drop« is in fact the meaning of מֵר, then this etymology may be thought to be reasonably, but only reasonably, satisfactory. Torczyner, however, goes so far as to say that there is no linguistic justification for the sense »drop«³⁴.

fine«, Z. S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, p. 96), and in Ugaritic *dq* means »fine, small« (G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, p. 153; J. Aistleitner, *Wörterb. d. ugar. Sprache*, ed. O. Eissfeldt, p. 81).

³⁰ So Brown-Driver-Briggs, op. cit., p. 201; Ben Iehuda, op. cit. 981; cf. Kimchi כִּמְחֵי הַדָּבָר דָּק. As an adjective דָּק is used with אֶדְקָא »dust« in Is 29 5. For the verb דִּקַּק used with עֶסֶר (»crushed to dust«), cf. Dtn 9 21; further, Ex 30 36, 32 20 II Kings 23 6.15 II Chr 15 16 34 4. In Is 40 22 דִּקַּק »veil«, »curtain« (as thin) is distinguished from דָּלִי, a distinction which is not recognized by the Targ. (דְּלוּר) or by Aq. Symm. and Theod. (λεπτρόν).

³¹ So Koehler-Baumgartner, op. cit., cf. E. König, op. cit., p. 357 (»wie ein dünnes Blättchen«).

³² P. 601.

³³ Lane, op. cit., 2699f.

³⁴ StTh 1 (1948), p. 196.

This meaning perhaps owes its origin, at least in part, to the interpretation of דָּלִי as »bucket«, an interpretation which is quite uncertain³⁵. It was said above that דָּלִי, like מֵר, occurs only in this passage. This statement needs justification, since דָּלִי in Num 26 7 is generally connected with דָּלִי »bucket«. It must suffice here to say that the Hebrew text in Num 26 7 is very dubious. W. F. Albright, for example, abandons all attempt to translate it³⁶, while others drastically emend the text so that דָּלִי disappears from it³⁷. In these circumstances a connection between דָּלִי in Is 40 15 and דָּלִי in Num 26 7 must remain problematical.

How then may we explain כִּמְרֵי מְדִלִי in a sense consistent with the meaning of the rest of the verse as we have interpreted it? L. G. Rignell has, we believe, pointed the way to an answer. While allowing that the traditional interpretation of the phrase may be correct, he thinks that it »may also be possible that מְדִלִי as well as the following מֵאוֹנִים refers to a type of balance«, and he remarks that Ethiopic has a verb *dalawa* »weighed«³⁸. To this it may be added that from this verb a noun *madlôt* (plural *madâlewe*) »weight, scales« is formed³⁹, and that in South Arabic *mdlw* is found with the meaning »weight«⁴⁰. Nouns with prefixed *mem* from ל"ה roots are generally formed, as is well known, on the pattern מְרָאָה, מְשֻׁתָּה, and so on, and so from a root דלה (= Eth. *dalawa*) a noun מְדִלָּה or מְדִלָּה »scales« would be expected, whereas מְדִלִי is the form found in the Massoretic text. Is מְדִלִי, מְדִלִי, a possible vocalization? In the Isaiah scroll there are several examples of the representation of an *e*-sound at the end of a word by *yôdh* instead of *hê*. Thus, for example, in 21 9 the scroll has ויעני for ויענה (MT ויען); in 37 19 60 21 מעשי (MT מעשה); and in 65 10 לטי (MT לטה). Others scrolls too provide examples of similar spelling⁴¹. Perhaps then

³⁵ Ibid., loc. cit. In Akkadian *madlu* means »draw-well«, and Ugaritic *mdl* and Arabic *dalwu* both mean »bucket« (cf. G. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 161).

³⁶ JBL 63 (1944), p. 218.

³⁷ See BH³ ad loc.; cf. S. Mowinkel, ZAW 48 (1930), p. 245f.; A. v. Gall, B. Stades-Festschrift, ed. W. Diehl et al., p. 34f.; E. Burrows, The Oracles of Jacob and Balaam, ed. E. F. Sutcliffe, p. 72 (דליו) »his testicles«, comparing the LXX's paraphrase τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ). Rignell, op. cit., p. 16, »perhaps a special irrigation arrangement, not necessarily a bucket«. Torczyner, op. cit., 1 (1948), p. 196, »his boughs«, with Jewish commentators, like דליותיו, Jer 11 16 Ez 17 6 f.

³⁸ Op. cit., loc. cit.

³⁹ Dillmann, op. cit., 1082f.

⁴⁰ K. C. Rossini, Chrest. Arab. Meridionalis Epigraphica, p. 126; cf. W. W. Müller, ZAW 75 (1963), p. 308.

⁴¹ See M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, JJS 4 (1953), p. 43f. (reprinted in: Text and Language in Bible and Qumran, p. 86f.).

in our passage there is a case of like orthography (cf. מִדְּרִי Dtn 7⁵, for which forty-eight manuscripts have מִדְּרִה).

It remains to find a suitable meaning for מִר. Can it mean »dust«, like שִׁחֵק and דָּךְ? Perhaps we may think of Arabic مَارَ moved from side to side, to and fro « مَارَ السَّيَّار means »the dust moved to and fro«, or »became raised by the wind«. From this verb there is a derivative مَوَّر »dust moving to and fro in the air«, »dust raised by the wind«, or »carried to and fro by the wind«⁴². Was there in Hebrew a word מוֹר (מֶר) meaning something similar? (For the form, cf. רִיחַ = Arabic رُوح). If such a word with this meaning is postulated⁴³, the whole verse is then seen to consist of three well balanced members, a similar thought being expressed in each. We may accordingly translate it, with the sole change of יְשׁוּלֵי to יְשׁוּלֵי —

»Behold, nations are like the dust of the balances,
And like the fine dust of the scales are reckoned,
Behold, the isles weigh only as fine dust«.

Philological advance in the study of Hebrew must proceed by trial and error, and if the present writer has not succeeded in answering completely the question posed in this article, he may perhaps at least hope that he may have given a fresh turn to the discussion of the text and meaning of Is 40¹⁵.

This small contribution is offered in gratitude to the memory of a great orientalist, to whose outstanding work all students of the text of the Hebrew Bible stand indebted.

⁴² Lane, op. cit., 2743f.

⁴³ It may be pointed out that from a biliteral root מר a number of triliteral roots are formed in the Semitic languages with the meaning »rubbed, made smooth« (e. g. Akkad. *marāsu*, Syr. مَرَس, Heb. מָרַח; in Ethiopic *marēl* means »dust«). Is some derivative from such a root concealed beneath the Hebrew מִר? If it were, the parallelism between מִר, שִׁחֵק, and דָּךְ would be complete.

⁴⁴ The emendations of Torczyner (בָּמָרִים דָּלִי, »he lifts up (the isles) as the heights«, דָּלִי standing for דָּלִי, op. cit. 1, 1948, p. 196), and of Kissane, op. cit., p. 13, who substitutes מַיִם »water« for נַחֲלִים »nations« and reads וַשְׁחָקִים כְּמַיִם-וְנַחֲלִים »and the sky like water-skins«, comparing Job 26 : 38³⁷ are thus unnecessary.

JOB XL 29b: TEXT AND TRANSLATION

Job xl 25-xli. 26 contains the well-known description of Leviathan, which in this passage is generally taken to mean the crocodile. Ch. xl 29 runs in Hebrew as follows:

הַתְּשַׁחֲקֶנּוּ בּוֹ כַּצִּפּוֹר וְתִקְשְׁרֵנִי לַנְּעוּרוֹתָיִךְ

and is usually translated:

‘Canst thou play with him as with a bird?
Or canst thou bind him for thy maidens?’

While the first half of the verse presents no difficulty ¹⁾, the text and translation of the second half is less certain. It may be noted in the first place that the LXX adds ὡς περ σποῦθιον ‘like a sparrow’ after ותקשרני, thus supplying the parallel comparison which seems required. Commentators accordingly insert a word parallel to כַּצִּפּוֹר, such as כַּתוֹר ‘like a turtle-dove’ ²⁾, or כַּיוֹנָה ‘like a dove’ ³⁾, or כַּדְרוֹר ‘like a swallow’, or כַּעֲנוֹר ‘like a crane’ ⁴⁾. Such an insertion would require that הַתְּשַׁחֲקֶנּוּ should be read with two stresses, giving 3 + 3 in place of M.T.’s 2 + 2 ⁵⁾.

Secondly, the meaning of נְעוּרוֹתָיִךְ is not clear. As has been said, it is most frequently translated ‘thy maidens’ (so Vulg. *ancillis tuis*, Targ. *טליתך*). While נְעוּרָה is predominantly used of girls attending upon women (as in Gen. xxiv 61, Exod. ii 5, 1 Sam. xxv 42, Esth. ii 9, iv 4, 16, Prov. ix 3, xxxi. 15), the girls who gleaned for Boaz are called נְעוּרוֹת (Ruth ii 8, 22f., iii 2; cf. Prov. xxvii 27). The picture of Job tying a string to a crocodile and so making it a pet for his serving girls seems, however, an unlikely one. It would be more to the point if the pet was intended for his children. Some scholars

¹⁾ H. TORCZYNER is alone, so far as I am aware, in translating-‘Canst thou play with him as the little bird (plays)? The little bird is the ‘Krokodilwächter’ (*Das Buch Hiob*, p. 323). J. J. REISKE, *Coniecturae in Jobum*, p. 24, remarks that כַּצִּפּוֹר is for כַּכַּצִּפּוֹר; but see GES.-KAUTZSCH, *Heb. Gramm.*, 118r.

²⁾ So H. GUNKEL, *Schöpfung u. Chaos*, p. 50, n. 2. G. BEER (*Der Text des Buches Hiob*, p. 249), points out that σποῦθιον never renders תוֹר, and that of nine passages in the LXX in which σποῦθιον occurs, in seven of them it translates צִפּוֹר. The Greek rendering here could then be a second representation of צִפּוֹר.

³⁾ So, e.g., G. BEER, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*; *contra*, K. BUDDE, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 247.

⁴⁾ The last two are offered as alternatives by C. J. BALL, *The Book of Job*, p. 446.

⁵⁾ Cf. S. R. DRIVER and G. B. GRAY, *The Book of Job* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 333 (of philological notes).

SHORT NOTES

115

indeed believe that נַעֲרוֹתֶיךָ here has this meaning—'thy daughters, children' ¹). Such a meaning for נַעֲרָה is, however, more than doubtful. for in no other passage does it have this meaning ²). The Pesh. translates לַנְּעָרוֹתֶיךָ by لَمَّةٌ حَلْمَحَةٌ 'for the days of thy youth' (i.e. לַיָּמֵי נַעֲרוֹתֶיךָ) ³), while the LXX renders by παῖδες (i.e. לְנַעַר 'for a boy').

It seems then first that in the second half of the verse a parallel to כַּצְפּוֹר is required, and secondly that לַנְּעָרוֹתֶיךָ is not free from suspicion ⁴). The suggestion I have to make is that this suspect word itself conceals the parallel word required. In Arabic نَعْرٌ, fem. نَعْرَةٌ, means 'a species of sparrows, young sparrows' ⁵), and this is the meaning which, it may be supposed, belongs to נַעֲרוֹתֶיךָ. If we may postulate a Hebrew word נַעֲרָה/נַעֲרָה ⁶) // 'sparrow' צְפּוֹר, which, like the Arabic عَصْفُور, can mean 'sparrow', how is לַנְּעָרוֹתֶיךָ of M.T. to be explained? First, it may be suggested that the letters נַעֲרָה are dittography of יֶכָרִי in verse 30; and secondly, that the original reading here was כַּנְעָר (יֶה, יֶה), כַּנְעָר, and that, when the true meaning of נַעֲרָה 'sparrow' was lost, the preposition כַּ was changed to לַ in an attempt to give some kind of sense where no other seemed plain, perhaps with Prov. xxvii 27 in mind. The LXX's παῖδες = לְנַעַר has been regarded as due to a misunderstanding of an abbreviation

¹) So, e.g., G. BICKELL, *Das Buch Job*, p. 65; F. J. KISSANE, *The Book of Job*, p. 288; N. PETERS, *Das Buch Job*, p. 473.

²) Cf. BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *Hebr. and Eng. Lex.*, p. 655, F. WUTZ's לַנְּעָרוֹתֶיךָ 'as one who is content with thy cords' (Arab. *lyn pacificus fuit* and 'arwa 'cord, chain') is something of a curiosity (*Das Buch Job*, p. 144; cf. p. 189).

³) So also the Arabic version (لَا يَأْمُ شَيْبَتَكَ). Both versions render תִּקְשְׁרֵנוּ by verbs meaning 'guard' (حَفِظَ حِفْظًا), reading תִּשְׁמְרֵנוּ?

⁴) TORCZYNER, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*, holds that verse 29b can hardly be the original continuation of 29a.

⁵) F. W. LANE, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.* 2817. LANE cites يَا أَبَا عَمْرٍَا مَا فَعَلَ النُّغَارُ 'O Aboo-Omeyr, what did the little nughar?', said by Muhammad to a little child who had a bird, or birds, of this name, which died. In Hebrew נַעַר 'shake' = נַעַר 'boiled, was in violent commotion' (BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, p. 654.). Cf. further KAZIMIRSKI, *Diet. arabe-français*, II, p. 1301.

⁶) For the forms, cf. C. BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss d. vergl. Gramm. d. sem. Sprachen*, I, p. 336; J. BARTH, *Die Nominalbild. in d. Sem. Sprachen*, p. 167.

(לנער for לנער''), but it may in fact provide a hint of נער = נער, whose meaning the LXX translators did not recognise.

The verse will then have originally read:

הַתְּשִׁיחַ-בּוֹ בַּצִּפּוֹר וְתִקְשְׁרֵנּוּ בְנֵעַר (-ה, -ות)

“Canst thou play with him as with a bird (sparrow)?”²⁾

Or canst thou tie him with a string like a young sparrow (young sparrows)?”³⁾

Cambridge

D. WINTON THOMAS

¹⁾ So BALL, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

²⁾ While צפור is a general name for any small bird of the passerine kind, when it is parallel or contrasted with another specific bird, the sparrow is probably meant; see G. R. DRIVER, *P.E.Q.*, 1955, pp. 130 f. and H. B. TRISTRAM, *The Natural History of the Bible*, pp. 201 f.

³⁾ Several biblical passages refer to birds as tamed, e.g., Isa. lx 8 refers to domesticated doves; Baruch iii 17 mentions those who ‘had their pastime with the fowls of the air’; Ecclus. xxvii 19 refers to a pet bird let loose out of the hand and not recaptured (cf. Ahikar in A. COWLEY, *Aram. Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, p. 223, line 98); and birds are among the things that are tamed in James iii 7. Cf. further PAULY’s *Real-Encyclopädie der class. Altertumswiss.*, 2 Reihe, III 2, 1777, and the oft-quoted poem of Catullus (*C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*, ed. R. A. B. MYNORS, pp. 1 f.).

THE INTERPRETATION OF בָּסוֹד IN JOB 29 4

D. WINTON THOMAS

ST. CATHARINE'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE (ENGLAND)

A HEBREW root סָדַד, from which סָד "stocks" (only Job 13 27 and 33 11) is to be derived, is already to be found entered in some dictionaries,¹ and Fürst² and others³ equate it with the Arabic سَد "closed, stopped up."⁴ While Barth's reading יִתְסַד (Ettaphal)⁵ for Sachau's יִתְסַר⁶ has been noted⁷— and to this should be added a mention of the Aramaic phrase סָדַת כָּבֵא "the pain is stopped"⁸— no occurrence of סָדַד = سَد in Hebrew has so far found its way into the dictionaries. The aim of this article is to draw attention to a possible example of this root in Job 29 4b.

This half-verse runs in Hebrew בָּסוֹד אֶלֹהֶה עָלַי אֶהְלִי, and

¹ See, e.g., J. Fürst, *Hebr. u. Chald. Handwörterb.*, Part ii, 71; E. König, *Heb. u. Aram. Wörterb.*, 296; Gesenius-Buhl, *Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterb.*, (16th ed.), 536. Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Heb. and Engl. Lex.*, 690, regard סָד as a loan-word from the Aram. סָדַד, סָדַד.

² *Op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

³ E.g., Levy, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.*, iii, 478; M. Jastrow, *Dict. of the Targ.*, 956. Cp. A. Schultens, *Liber Jobi*, i, 340, and Payne Smith *Thes. Syr.* 2527 sub סָדַד.

⁴ Lane, *Arab. Eng. Lex.*, 1328.

⁵ *Oriental. Literaturzeitung* 15 (1912), p. 11.

⁶ *Aram. Papyrus u. Ostraka aus einer jüd. Militär-Kolonie zu Elephantine*, p. 160 (55, line 2).

⁷ Ges.-Buhl, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

⁸ S. A. Cook, *A Glossary of the Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 84, where reference is made to سَد and to the Hebrew סָד.

is translated in the Revised Version "when the secret of God was upon my tent." Similar renderings to this, which sees in סוד the meaning "council, secret counsel, intimacy," which this noun frequently bears in Hebrew, are found in some of the earlier commentators.⁹ Others, however, have recognized that in place of a noun סוד — which in any case must stand for בְּהִיּוֹת סוד¹⁰ — an infinitive construct is to be expected,¹¹ with the result that בְּסוֹד is commonly emended to בְּסוֹךְ (√סכך "screened, sheltered"),¹² which, it is said, was read by the LXX, Symm. and Pesh.¹³ If, however, סוד be regarded as original — and the possibility that assonance may be intended (בְּסוֹד and בְּעוֹר — v. 5) is one which ought not lightly to be passed over¹⁴ — it may

⁹ See, e.g., the commentaries of F. Hölscher (1839), p. 40; J. G. Stickel (1842), p. 78; H. A. Hahn (1850), p. 227; F. Delitzsch (1876), p. 375 f.; G. Bickell (1894), p. 45. The Versions render as follows:— LXX *ἐπισκοπή ἐποιεῖτο*; Symm. *περιέφρασεν*; Pesh. *בִּסְכֵּךְ בִּסְכֵּךְ*; Targ. *בִּסְכֵּךְ בִּסְכֵּךְ*; Vulg. *quando secreto Deus erat*. In the Arabic version in Le Jay's *Bibl. Hebr. Samar.*, etc. (Paris, 1645), and in Walton's *Polyglott*, בְּסוֹד is rendered *حين كان خفي*; in the Rome edition of 1671 (*Bibl. Sacra Arab.*) the verb used is *خفي* while in Lagarde's *Psalterium Job Proverbia Arabice* the version given on the right hand page (٢٧٨) renders by *يُفْتَقِد*. For the Ethiopic Version see F. M. Esteves Pereira, *Le Livre de Job, Version Éthiopienne* (*Patrol. Orient.* ii, 1907), p. 644; cf. Dillmann *Lex. Ling. Aeth.* 119.

¹⁰ See K. Budde, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 164; S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *The Book of Job*, p. 199 (philological section).

¹¹ Note the infinitive constructs in verses 3, 6, 7. There is no difficulty, of course, in the use of the noun in Job 15 8.

¹² See, e.g., the commentaries of C. Siegfried (1893), p. 44; K. Budde (1896), p. 164; J. Hontheim (1904), p. 222, and more recently those of N. Peters (1928), p. 313; G. Hölscher (1937), p. 68; E. J. Kissane (1939), p. 185. Cp. G. Beer in Kittel *Bibl. Hebr.* (1937) *ad loc.* Torczyner (1920) appears to be alone in emending to בְּסוֹר "als Gott einkehrte" — with על for אל (*Das Buch Hiob*, p. 203).

¹³ For the renderings of these Versions see footn. 9 above. Cp. the LXX's rendering of סכך in Lam 3 43, 44.

¹⁴ Cp. Hitzig, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 211. Peters, *op. cit.*, p. 314, and Hontheim, *op. cit. loc. cit.*, believe that the reading בְּסוֹד has arisen wrongly under the influence of בְּעוֹר in v. 5.

be satisfactorily explained as an infinitive construct of סֹדֶר = سد.¹⁵ So far as I am aware, the only commentator who has attempted to explain סֹדֶר in this verse in Job along these lines is J. J. Reiske, who, writing in 1791, says¹⁶—“quum Deus adhuc farciret mea vice meum tentorium; quum Deus tentorii mei rimas, si quas ageret, obturaret.” These words are followed immediately, without note or comment, by the Arabic words بسد الله على خلل خلتي which we may translate “when God closed upon me the gaps of my tent.” When it is remembered that *sadd* and *sudd*, derived from *sadda*, are used synonymously with ظل in the sense of “shade, shadow, cover, protection,”¹⁷ a somewhat different interpretation from Reiske's, but with the same general sense, becomes possible—“when God overshadowed (covered, protected) my tent.” This is in fact just the meaning which is provided by the proposed emendation בְּסוֹדֶר, and the LXX's rendering could thus as well represent בְּסוֹדֶר as בְּסוֹדֶר.¹⁸ Emendation becomes unnecessary, therefore, if, as we may believe, סֹדֶר in this passage is to be referred to סֹדֶר = سد.

¹⁵ F. Wutz, *Das Buch Job*, p. 101 f., 184, would retain סֹדֶר as original, with the sense “als Gott noch um meine Sicherung sorgte”, but refers it curiously to ذاد (II V) *tutor fuit*. The word סֹדֶר in Job 13 27 and 33 11 he vocalises סֹדֶר, which he refers to سد with the meaning *bene directus, reclus fuit* (p. 54, 118, 184).

¹⁶ *Coniecturae in Jobum et Proverbia Salomonis*, p. 108.

¹⁷ Lane, *op. cit.*, 1329. I am tempted to suggest that the name בְּסוֹדֶרֶה (Neh 3 6) may mean, not “in the secret of Yah” (so Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, 126; cp. Noth, *Die israel. Personennamen, etc.*, p. 152), but “in the shadow (protection) of Yah”, a name which would then be parallel, both in form and meaning, with בְּצִלָּהּ. The name סֹדֶר (Num 13 10) could be similarly explained, and צִלָּח (I Chr 8 20, 12 21), if it stands for צִלָּחֶה (see Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, 853), might be compared with it.

¹⁸ The primary meaning of סֹכֵךְ is very probably, like that of סֹדֶר = سد, “closed, stopped up”. See F. Delitzsch, *Proleg. eines neuen Hebr.-Aram. Wörterb.*, 195 f., and Ges.-Buhl, *op. cit.*, 543.

In conclusion it should be added that the Semitic root *sdd* can be traced as far back as the sixth century B.C. at least, for in Neo-Babylonian texts it is found in the sense of "penning in" (of sheep), and of "care" (of orchards, grain, etc.)¹⁹

¹⁹ See J. Augapfel, *Babylonische Rechtsurkunden aus der Regierungszeit Artaxerxes I und Darius II*, p. 112 of Glossary. I am indebted to Mr. C. P. T. Winckworth for this reference. Cp. further San Nicolò and Ungnad *Neubabyl. Rechts- u. Verwaltungsurkunden*, Vol. I, no. 384 (p. 357) and no. 515 (p. 454). I am indebted for these references to Professor G. R. Driver, who has also drawn my attention to the fact that in the Behistun inscription the word *suddid* "protect" is translated סבִּל "sustain (with food)" in A. Cowley, *Aram. Pap. of the Fifth Century B.C.*, p. 254 (line 63) and 257 (line 63).

HEBREW עָנִי 'CAPTIVITY'

THE Hebrew text of Ps. cvii. 10 runs as follows:

יֹשְׁבֵי חֹשֶׁךְ וְצִלְמוֹת אֲסִירֵי עָנִי וּבְרִיחַ:

and is translated in the R.V.:

Such as sat in darkness and in the shadow of death,
Being bound in affliction and iron.

Commentators in general are content with the meaning 'affliction' for עָנִי.¹ It may be noted, however, that Buhl² proposes to emend עָנִי וּבְרִיחַ to עָנִי בְּרִיחַ 'fettters of iron' (for בְּרִיחַ, cf. Ps. cv. 18, cxlix. 8). The phrase 'bound in affliction' is indeed a strange one, and in a recent publication³ I made a passing reference to the Arabic عَنِ 'became a captive', to which עָנִי in this verse is, I suggest, best referred. The Arabic verb is well known in this meaning as are also several derivatives from it. In the second and fourth forms it means 'imprisoned, made some-one continue in captivity', while عَنَوَ means 'state of captivity', عَنَاءَ means 'imprisonment', and عَانَ is used of women 'in a state of captivity'.⁴ The second half of this verse may therefore be translated—'Being bound in captivity and in irons'.⁵

The meaning 'captivity, imprisonment' for עָנִי may be seen also in Job xxxvi. 8. The Hebrew text runs as follows:

וְאִם-אֲסוּרִים בְּזִמָּה יִלְכְּדוּן בְּחַבְלֵי-עָנִי:

and is translated in the R.V.:

And if they be bound in fetters,
And be taken in the cords of affliction.⁶

So far as I am aware, F. Wutz⁷ is the only commentator who does not treat עָנִי in this passage as if it means 'affliction'. He in fact emends עָנִי to עָנִי 'fetter, chain' (Arabic عَكَ *compegit in ferrum*),⁸ a word otherwise unknown in Hebrew. If, however, עָנִי is given the meaning

¹ So Targ. (סִיגוּף); LXX, Vulg., Pesh. 'poverty' (πτωχεῖα, mendicitate, مَحْصَدَة).

² See BH³ ad loc.

³ *The Text of the Revised Psalter*, p. 45.

⁴ Lane, *Arab. Eng. Lex.* 2178f.

⁵ Cf. the translation in *The Revised Psalter*, p. 152.

⁶ LXX, Vulg., Pesh. again 'poverty' (πενίαι, paupertatis, مَحْصَدَة). Targ. as at Ps. cvii. 10 (above).

⁷ *Das Buch Job*, pp. 128, 186.

⁸ Freytag, *Lex. Arab.-Lat.*, iii. 203.

NOTES AND STUDIES

445

'captivity', emendation is unnecessary, and the phrase then means literally 'ropes of captivity', that is, ropes with which captives are tied, a suitable enough parallel to *אִקִּים* 'fetters'.

The verb *עָנָה* = *עָנִי* probably occurs in Ps. cv. 18, which has already been compared with Ps. cvii. 10 (above). Here the Hebrew text runs:

עָנָה בַּכָּבֶל רַגְלָיו בַּרְזֵל בָּאָה נַפְשׁוֹ :

and is translated in the R.V.:

His feet they hurt with fetters;

He was laid in chains of iron (Marg. 'His soul entered into the iron').

Again commentators are generally satisfied with the meaning 'afflict' for *עָנָה*, but it hardly provides a suitable meaning with 'feet' as object. Much more suitable is the meaning 'imprison'—'they imprisoned his feet' in fetters'.²

D. WINTON THOMAS

The Word רִבֵּעַ in Numbers xliii. 10.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for August 1934, p. 524, the Chief Rabbi draws attention to the translation of רִבֵּעַ in this verse. The parallelism demands for it the meaning 'ashes, dust,' and for this meaning the Chief Rabbi finds evidence in the Samaritan Targum on Gn 18²⁷. May I supplement this evidence? According to Freytag (*Lex. Arab.-Lat.* ii. p. 115), *rab'* (dotted 'ayin) means *pulvis tenuissimus*. If רִבֵּעַ be equated with this Arabic word—and there seems to be no reason why it should not be—the Chief Rabbi's translation of it in this verse is rendered the more probable. The Septuagint, in translating by δῆμους (the Pesh. on the contrary by *rūb'ā*), clearly did not connect it in any way with רִבֵּעַ or רִבְעָה, 'fourth part'—rather did they guess at the meaning of a very rare word.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Durham.

TEXTUAL AND PHILOLOGICAL NOTES ON SOME
PASSAGES IN THE BOOK OF PROVERBS *)

BY

D. WINTON THOMAS

Cambridge

I 4: לִנְעָר דַּעַת וּמוֹמָה

Parallelism with לִפְתָּאִים in the first half of the verse might lead us to expect לִנְעָרִים. The plural has indeed the support of the Tg. and Pesh. (לְנַעְרִי, טלא), and is read by some scholars¹⁾. Possibly לִנְעָר here is an abbreviation (לִנְעָר for לִנְעָרִים). In cases where the masculine plural is abbreviated in the M.T., only the final *mēm* as a rule disappears, while the *yōdh* remains²⁾. The disappearance of both consonants is, however, not unknown³⁾.

I 11: נֹאֲרָבָה לְדָם נִצְפֹנָה לִנְקִי חָנָם

The emendation of חָנָם into חָרָם "net"⁴⁾ is unnecessary. The verb נִצְפֹנָה is parallel in meaning to נֹאֲרָבָה —both mean "lurk"⁵⁾—and חָנָם is used here, as elsewhere⁶⁾, of groundless hostility or attack. The adoption of חָם "perfect"⁷⁾ for דָּם also seems difficult to justify, since the phrase חָם אֲרָב [ל] occurs elsewhere in Proverbs (e.g., i 18, xii 6), and moreover דָּם has the support of the ancient versions.

*) The following abbreviations are used throughout: BEER = G. BEER in KITTEL, *Bibl. Hebr.*; BDB = BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *A Heb. and Engl. Lex. of the O.T.*; EHRL. = A. B. EHRLICH, *Randglossen z. d. Hebr. Bibel*, vol. VI; FRANK. = W. FRANKENBERG, *Die Sprüche*; GEMS. = B. GEMSER, *Sprüche Salomos*; TOY = C. H. TOY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* (Intern. Crit. Comm.); WILD. = G. WILDEBOER, *Die Sprüche*.

¹⁾ E.g., N. SCHLOEGL, *Rev. Bibl.* ix (1900), p. 520.

²⁾ For examples see F. PERLES, *Anal. zur Textkritik der A.T.*, 1895, p. 29; R. GORDIS, *The Song of Songs*, p. 94 f.

³⁾ See PERLES, *op. cit.*, p. 28 f.

⁴⁾ So BEER, *ad loc.* FRANK., p. 21, supplies רֶשֶׁת "net" as object of נִצְפֹנָה.

LXX (ἀδίστατος), Tg. (מִנֵּן), Vulg. (*frustra*) support the M.T.

⁵⁾ For the intransitive meaning of נִצְפֵן, see BDB, p. 860.

⁶⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 336.

⁷⁾ E.g., by TOY, p. 19; WILD., p. 3; GEMS., p. 14.

SOME PASSAGES IN THE BOOK OF PROVERBS

281

The text seems to express the mounting glee of the blood-seekers (חטאים) as they contemplate, in a crescendo of delight, their groundless attack on those who have done nothing to deserve it. The sense may be brought out thus —

“Let us lie in wait for blood!
Let us lurk—for the innocent!!
Though we have no cause against them!!!”¹⁾

I 17: כִּי-חֲנֹם מִזֶּרֶה הָרֶשֶׁת

The word מִזֶּרֶה has been explained in several different ways—as ptcp. Pu. of זָרָה “scatter”²⁾; as ptcp. pass. Qal of מָזַר “spread out” (read as מְזֹרֶה)³⁾; and as ptcp. Pu. of זָרַר “draw tight”⁴⁾. The proverb is sometimes taken to mean that it is to no purpose that a net is spread out in the sight of a bird, for the fowler will gain nothing, since the bird will take fright and avoid the net⁵⁾. EHRlich⁶⁾, however, following Rashi, argues, with much probability, that מִזֶּרֶה here refers to the sprinkling of a net with grain as bait. Rashi's comment is as follows—הַרְשֵׁת עַל הָרֶשֶׁת מִזֶּרֶה מִזֶּרֶה עַל הָרֶשֶׁת

חֲנֹם הוּא בְּעֵינֵיהֶם שֶׁאֵינָם מֵכִירִים עַל מַה הִיא גֹרֶת וְיֹרֵדִין בָּהּ וְאִיכְלִין
“When the birds see wheat and small grain strewn upon the net, to no purpose is it in their eyes, because they do not realize why it is strewn with grain, and so they alight upon it and eat.” The birds, that is to say, are lured on by the bait and caught in the net, even though the net was baited in full sight of them—they see the bait prepared, but it is to no purpose, for they do not see the danger, and so meet their death⁷⁾. Neither Rashi nor EHRlich, however, indicate how the meaning “strewn with grain” for מִזֶּרֶה is obtained. This

¹⁾ For the use of חֲנֹם in connection with blood shed without good cause, see especially 1 Sam. xxv 31, 1 Reg. ii 31. Pesh. here has חֲבֹל “deceitfully”.

²⁾ So, e.g., BDB, p. 280.

³⁾ So BEER *ad loc.*; L. KÖHLER and W. BAUMGARTNER, *Lex. in Vet. Test. Libros*, p. 266, 510; GES.-BUHL, *Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterb.*, 16th ed., p. 206, 412.

⁴⁾ G. R. DRIVER, *Biblica* 32 (1951), p. 173, who thinks the root מָזַר is also possible. FRANK., p. 22, reads פְּרוּשָׁה “spread”; cf. TOY, p. 20. The versions render as follows—LXX ἐκτείνεταί; Tg. פְּרִיסָא; Pesh. פִּרְסָע; Vulg. jacitur; Pal. Syr. ܡܙܪܬܐ “spread” (*A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary*, ed. A. S. LEWIS, p. 104).

⁵⁾ So, e.g., FRANK., p. 22.

⁶⁾ P. 13.

⁷⁾ Similarly Ibn Ezra—יֵרָאֵה הָרֶשֶׁת וְלֹא יִכְחַד מִמֶּנָּה עַד שִׁנּוּת בָּהּ יֵרָאֵה—“the bird does not see the net and is not afraid of it, until it alights on it; it sees the bait which is on it, but not the net”. Cf. further GEMS., p. 14; TOY, p. 17; WILD., p. 4.

meaning can be obtained, however, if זרה is given the meaning which نرى has in Arabic. This Arabic root, which means "winnow", also means "throw, scatter, like as one throws grain for sowing" (نرى "he sowed the land, scattering the seed")¹, and نيرة means "corn"²). So the net is not "spread", a meaning which זרה seems not to have elsewhere, but "strewn" (with seed). As birds do not see the danger before them, so the wicked, lured on by seeming advantage, do not realise that they "lie in wait for their own blood, lurk for their own lives" (verse 18)³).

III 35: וכסילים מרים קלח

The word מרים in this passage has been much emended. J. REIDER, after listing four emendations, proposes yet another, viz., מְרִים, ptcpl. plur. Qal from מור = Arabic مار, in the sense "procure"⁴). This attempt to explain מרים as a participle in the plural, agreeing with (כסילים)⁵, loses sight, however, of the fact that מרים occurs again in an analogous passage, viz., xiv 29, with a singular subject—וקצר-רוח מרים אולה. In this last passage מרים אולה stands as a parallel to רב-תבונה מרים, and מרים should accordingly have a meaning similar to רב "great". The meaning "enhance, increase" (German "steigern") for מרים here has already been suggested⁶), but seems to have found little support. Yet it provides good sense, and may be compared with the English "heighten" in the sense of "intensify, augment". The Tg.'s מסו "increases" (cf. LXX's ἰσχυρύνει) has led some commen-

¹) LANE, *Arab. Eng. Lex.*, p. 964.

²) HAVA, *Arab.-Engl. Dict.*, p. 228; KAZIMIRSKI, *Dict. arabe-français*, I, p. 772.

³) EHRL., *loc. cit.*, thinks that verse 18 refers to the birds mentioned in verse 17. This verse (18) seems clearly to link up, however, with verse 11—the machinations of the sinners recoil upon themselves. Cf. TOY, p. 17; FRANK., p. 22; GEMS., p. 14. BEER's emendation לנפשתם for לנפשתם is accordingly unnecessary.

⁴) VT II (1952), p. 124. In this proposal he has been anticipated by B. HALPER, ZAW 31 (1911), p. 263 ff. For earlier suggestions, by G. BEER and H. TORCZYNER, see GES.-BUHL, p. 751. G. R. DRIVER has recently withdrawn his earlier suggestion to read וּמְרִים כְּסִילִים קֶלַח "and the desire of fools is shame(ful)" (JTS

XXXVIII (1937), p. 403) in favour of מְדָם "their garment", the verb נחלו in the first half of the verse being emended to נחלו "they are adorned" (חלה = Arabic ḥalā "adorned with fine clothes, jewels"); see *Biblica* 32 (1951), p. 177.

⁵) Similarly MELVILLE SCOTT, *Textual Discoveries in Proverbs, Psalms and Isaiah*, p. 30, who proposes פְּרִים "propagate" (root פרה).

⁶) E.g., by C. SIEGFRIED and B. STADE, *Hebr. Wörterb.*, p. 711, and F. HIRTZIG, *Die Sprüche*, p. 143.

tators to emend מרים to מַרְבֶּה ¹⁾, but the sense of "increase" can be obtained without difficulty from מרים (ptcp. Hiph. רום "be high") as it stands ²⁾. The meaning of מרים in iii 35 must, it is suggested, be similar—wise men obtain honour from their fellow men, but fools go on increasing dishonour ³⁾ for themselves. It is thus only necessary to alter מרים into מְרִימִים (cf. LXX's ὑψωσάμενοι ⁴⁾), unless indeed the singular מרים can be justified ⁵⁾.

VI 26: ואשת איש נפש יקרה תצוד

G. R. DRIVER's suggestion ⁶⁾ that בעד in this verse is a noun meaning "change, exchange, price" helps considerably the proper understanding of כי בעד־אשה וזנה עד־ככר לחם—"although the price of a harlot (mounts) up to a loaf of bread". His explanation of יקרה נפש as "costly abundance" seems, however, to depend on the meaning "abundance" given to נפש in Jes. lviii 10 ⁷⁾, and this is not altogether certain ⁸⁾. May not נפש יקרה here simply mean "a weighty person"? The married woman, who is contrasted with the harlot, makes a person of substance her quarry, since he can keep her in comfort ⁹⁾. It would seem at first sight natural perhaps to regard יקרה as an adjective in agreement with נפש. The phrases נפש־בִּרְכָה "one who blesses" (xi 25), and נפש־רְמִיָה "one who is idle" (xix 15) suggest, however, the possibility that נפש יקרה may likewise be a case of a construct and a noun in the genitive—"a person of weight". According to some authorities, יקרה in Jes. xxviii 16 is the construct of a noun יקרה ¹⁰⁾, and this word could be read here. It would,

¹⁾ So BEER, *ad loc.*; EHRL., p. 81; cf. TOY, p. 302.

²⁾ Vulg.'s *exaltat* supports the consonants of the M.T.

³⁾ יקרה is accusative, and not, as BDB, p. 927, subject. The parallelism shows that כסילים is subject.

⁴⁾ Cf. TG. and Pesh. (נפחלם, נקבלון). Vulg.'s *exaltatio* suggests that מרים was taken as a substantive.

⁵⁾ See GESENIUS, *Hebr. Gramm.* (KAUTZSCH-COWLEY), 2nd. ed., p. 145 L.

⁶⁾ VT IV (1954), p. 244.

⁷⁾ G. R. DRIVER, *ZAW* 52 (1934), p. 53 f.

⁸⁾ See W. VON SODEN, *ibid.*, 53 (1935), p. 291, and DRIVER's reply, 55 (1937), p. 68 f.

⁹⁾ For יקר with נפש as expressing a person's value or importance, cf. 1 Sam. xxvi 21, 2 Reg. i 13 f. For a like use in Akkadian, see W. MUSS-ARNOLT, *A Concise Dict. of the Assy. Lang.*, p. 90, and F. DELITZSCH, *Assyr. Handwörterb.*, p. 240.

¹⁰⁾ So J. FÜRST, *Hebr. u. Chald. Handwörterb.*, I, p. 541; cf. GESENIUS, *Hebr. Gramm.*, p. 422, n. 4.

however, be better to keep the present vocalisation and to compare יקרה with the Aramaic יקרה "honour, cost" ¹⁾.

With תצוד "hunt" in this passage may be compared the use in Arabic of صَبَّوْ, used of a woman "who takes, captures, ensnares, something from her husband" ²⁾. The heart of the woman whom Koheleth found "more bitter than death" (Eccles. vii 26) is "snares and nets" (מְצוּדִים וְחֶרְמִים), and the "snares" (מְצוּדוֹת) of the woman who plays the harlot are referred to in Sir. ix. 3. The Tg. ³⁾ renders Prov. xxiii 28b by וצאידא בניה שכרי "and she (i.e. the harlot) ensnares foolish sons".

VII 21: הטו ברב לקחה

In two passages in Proverbs (xvi 21, 23) לקח is commonly taken to mean "persuasiveness, power of persuasion", in a good sense. In this passage the same meaning is generally given to it, but—only here—in a bad sense ⁴⁾. It may be wondered, however, whether לקח here may not express more than mere verbal persuasion ⁵⁾. Possibly alluring gestures too are included ⁶⁾. May לקחה be the equivalent of the English phrase "her *taking*, attractive, ways"? An example of the verb לקח in the sense of "allure, attract", by seductive play of the eyes, is found in Prov. vi. 25—"let her (viz., the evil woman) not allure thee (אל-תִּקְחֶהּ) with her eyelids". ⁷⁾.

X 32: שפתי צדיק ידעון רצון

The word ידעון here is sometimes explained as meaning "pay

¹⁾ G. H. DALMAN, *Aram.-Neuhebr. Wörterb.*, p. 177; J. LEVY, *Chald. Wörterb. über die Targ.* I, p. 343.

²⁾ LANE, p. 753. The occurrence of *ṣwd* "hunt" in South Arabic has not been noted in the dictionaries; see K. CONTI ROSSINI, *Chrest. arab. meridionalis epigraphica*, p. 223.

³⁾ P. DE LAGARDE, *Hagiog. Chald.*, p. 137.

⁴⁾ BDB, p. 544. LXX δμῶν; Tg. Pesh. מילהא, מילהא; Vulg. sermonibus.

⁵⁾ TOR, p. 155 "with much fair speech".

⁶⁾ Cf. B. BOOTHROYD, *Bibl. Hebr.* (1810-16), p. 187.

⁷⁾ Tg. for שפתי צדיק עפעפיו has גביתתהא "her eyebrows"; Vulg. has in mind other signs of invitation—"her nods" (*nutibus illius*). J. REIDER's "overpower thee" in the sense of "seize forcibly", the verb לקח being almost synonymous with אָחַז (*Journ. of Jewish Stud.* III [1952], p. 79) gives to תִּקְחֶהּ here a sense of physical compulsion which is out of place in the context. With this verse in Proverbs, cf. Sir. xxvi 9 (LXX).

attention to, care for", a meaning which ידע frequently has ¹⁾. The use of ידע in this sense with lips as subject is, however, as TOY ²⁾ remarks, strange—צדיק would rather be expected as subject—and he accordingly emends to יביען "utter", which is thought to have the support of the LXX (ἀποστάζει). Since, however, the LXX translates ובע in xv. 2,28 by ἀναγγέλλει; ἀποκρίνεται, it is not immediately evident that the Greek translators had יביען before them in this passage. Moreover, the LXX uses ἀποστάζειν to translate also ינוב in the previous verse. No great reliance can, therefore, be attached to the Greek rendering of ידען here ³⁾. If the consonants of the M.T., which have the support of Aq., Theod. and Quinta (γνώσονται) ⁴⁾, are retained, two possible explanations suggest themselves. In the first place, ידען "declare" might be read ⁵⁾. The second possibility is that the root in question here is not ידע "know", but דעה, cognate with the Arabic ساء "sought, desired, asked, demanded". This root has already been detected in Prov. xxiv 14—possibly also in Hos. vi 3—while the derivative דעת "claim, suit" has been found in Prov. xxix. 7 ⁶⁾. If this equation be accepted here, ידען must be read for ידען, and the translation will run—

"The lips of the righteous seek goodwill" (i.e., seek by words uttered to spread goodwill)

But the mouth of the wicked (seeks) perverse utterances".

That the idea of lips "seeking, desiring" is not alien to Hebrew thought is shown by the phrase אַרְשֶׁת שִׁפְתָיו "the desire, request of his lips" (Ps. xxi 3). It is perhaps worth while to ask whether ירעה in Prov. xv 14, which is parallel to יבקש, should not be read ידעה ⁷⁾ "and the mouth of fools seeks (desires) folly".

XIV 8: ואולת כסילים מרמה

The LXX's ἐν πλάνῃ has induced some scholars to emend מרמה

¹⁾ See, e.g., TOY, p. 219; FRANK., p. 71; WILD., p. 33.

²⁾ P. 219. MELVILLE SCOTT, *op. cit.*, p. 38, emends to יעון "pour out" (root ערה).

³⁾ Cf. HITZIG, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

⁴⁾ F. FIELD, *Origenis Hexapl.*, II, p. 331.

⁵⁾ In Prov. i 23 אודיעה is parallel to אביעה.

⁶⁾ THOMAS in *JTS* XXXVIII (1937), p. 401 f.

⁷⁾ Cf. LXX γνώσεται = ידע.

to a participle—to *מִתְעֵה*¹⁾ or *מִתְעָה*²⁾ “leads astray”³⁾. It seems preferable, however, to read *מִרְמָה* (ptcp. Pi. רמה “mislead”), which involves only a change in the vocalisation. In verse 25, *מִרְמָה* should in all probability be vocalised *מִרְמָה* (with the versions)⁴⁾.

XIV 17: ראש מזמות יִשְׁנָא

As it stands, *יִשְׁנָא* appears to mean “is hated”⁵⁾. Toy⁶⁾, however, following the LXX’s *ποσοφεί*, reads *יִשָּׂא*—“a man of thought endures”, i.e., “bears much without getting angry”. Nearer to the M.T. would be *יִשְׁנָא*⁷⁾ = *יִשְׁנָה*, from *שנה* = Arabic *سنى* “become high, exalted in rank”, a root which has been discovered in several passages in the O.T.⁸⁾. The meaning of the proverb would then be that the quick-tempered man acts foolishly and thereby loses the respect of his fellow men, whereas the wise man attains high rank, honour, dignity, in the eyes of his fellows.

XV 30: מאור-עינים ישמח-לב

“Light of the eyes” *מאור-עינים* is sometimes explained as light which beams from the eyes of him who brings good news, and is thought to be equivalent to “good news”⁹⁾. This would seem,

¹⁾ So BEER, *ad loc.*

²⁾ So TOY, p. 286; cf. FRANK., p. 86.

³⁾ Vulg. *errans*. Tg. Pesh. render by substantives (רמיותא, *رحملا*).

⁴⁾ LXX *δολιος*; Tg. רמייא; Pesh. *ܠܡܝܐ*; Vulg. *versipellis*. See PERLES, *op. cit.*, p. 66, and BEER, *ad loc.*

⁵⁾ So English Versions and Vulg.; cf. FRANK., p. 88.

⁶⁾ P. 292; BEER, *ad loc.*, reads *יִשְׁנָן*. Cf. GEMS., p. 50; WILD., p. 43 proposes *יִשְׁנָן*. The versions, except Theod. and Vulg., understand *מזמות* in a good sense.

⁷⁾ For the spelling with *aleph*, cf. *יִשְׁנָא* (Thren. iv 1), *יִשְׁנָא* (Eccles. viii 1), and generally GESENIUS, *Hebr. Gramm.*, 75 rr. EHRL., p. 79, emends to *יִשְׁנָא* = *יִשְׁנָה* “commit an error”.

⁸⁾ THOMAS, *ZAW* N.F. 11 (1934), p. 236 ff., 14 (1937), p. 174 ff.; further J. A. MONTGOMERY, 12 (1935), p. 207 f. J. REIDER reads *שנים* for *שנים* in Hab. iii 2, and translates “exalted ones” (*VT* IV [1954], p. 284). In Prov. v 9 *שְׁנֵתָה*, which probably means “dignity” (*ZAW* 14 [1937], p. 174) is translated by EHRL., p. 27, “dein Glanz”. It seems that he had *سنع* in mind—it can mean “shine, gleam”—though he does not mention it.

⁹⁾ WILD., p. 47; TOY, p. 316; FRANK., p. 95, “good fortune”; GEMS., p. 53, “bright eyes are a sign of reviving after weariness”.

however, to read too much into the Hebrew phrase. The LXX's rendering of מאור-עינים by θεωρῶν ὀφθαλμοῦ καλὰ, suggesting the reading מְרֹאָה-עֵינִים¹, may point the way to a correct understanding of this Hebrew phrase. As is well known, ראה often has the meaning "look at with enjoyment"²). Seeing and enjoyment are both implied in the phrase מְרֹאָה עֵינִים³ (Eccles. vi 9; cf. xi 9), and in Yoma 74b we find מראה עינים באשה "the pleasure of looking at one's wife"⁴). The meaning required in this verse, if a satisfactory parallel to שמועה טובה "good tidings" is to be obtained, is not, however, the pleasure of looking at something and enjoying it, but something which is seen and enjoyed. Such a meaning can be obtained if we read מְרֹאָה (ptcp. Hoph. construct ראה) "what is seen (and enjoyed) by the eyes". The whole verse may accordingly be translated:—

"A fine sight cheers the mind
As good tidings make the bones fat",⁵)

XIX 17: מִלֵּנָה יִהְיֶה חוֹן דָּל וְגַמְלוּ יִשְׁלֹם-לּוֹ

"He lends to Yahweh who has pity on the poor, and (Yahweh) will repay him his (good) deed", i.e., whoever treats the poor kindly lays up with Yahweh a treasury of good works; Yahweh becomes his debtor, and will in his own time repay what he borrowed⁶). An interesting parallel to the thought of this proverb occurs in the Babylonian work known as "A Pessimistic Dialogue between Master and Servant". The relevant passage is as follows:—

"Servant, obey me". Yes, my lord, yes. "Bring me at once water for my hands, and give it to me. I will offer a sacrifice to my god".

¹) Cf. HIRZIG, *op. cit.*, p. 154. Tg., Pesh., Vulg., as M.T.

²) BDB, p. 908. Similarly *re'ya* in Ethiopic; see A. DILLMANN, *Lex. Ling. Aeth.*, p. 297.

³) BDB, p. 909.

⁴) M. JASTROW, *A Dict. of the Targ., etc.*, II, p. 834; cf. LEVY, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb. über die Talm. u. Midr.*, III, p. 235.

⁵) For the parallelism between שִׂמְחָה and דֶּשֶׁן עֵצִים, cf. Sir. xxvi 13 (LXX). With שמועה טובה here and in xxv 25, cf. שִׂמְעַת טֹב in Ostrakon IV, line 2, and שִׂמְעַת שְׁלֹם in Ostr. II, lines 2 f., and III, line 3, from Lachish; see D. DIRINGER, in O. TUFTNELL, *Lachish III (Tell ed-Duweir) The Iron Age*, p. 332 f. Pesh here has לֵב חָפֵּז "a cheerful heart" for שמועה טובה.

⁶) See FRANK, p. 112; TOY, p. 375; WILD., p. 57. Cf. Matth. xxv 40.

Offer, my lord, offer. A man offering sacrifice to his god is happy, *loan upon loan he makes*¹⁾.

XIX 18: וְאַל-הִמִּיתוּ אֶל-תַּשָּׂא נַפְשְׁךָ

Toy²⁾, who translates "set not thy heart on his destruction", is surely right when he says that "in the family life contemplated by Pr. it is highly improbable that a father would ever think of carrying chastisement to the point of killing his son". But when he thinks of the son, if uncontrolled, as finally suffering "death as the natural (legal or other) consequence of his ill-doing", he fails to see the true force of הִמִּיתוּ, which is to be taken in a figurative, and not a literal, sense. I have recently suggested that the noun מָוֶת "death" sometimes has a superlative force in Hebrew, like our "deadly dull", "sick to death", and so on³⁾, and in this passage the verb הִמִּית may be used similarly, possibly as a colloquialism, with a superlative force. When it is said—"Chasten thy son while there is still hope, but have no mind to kill him", הִמִּיתוּ, literally "to kill him", may accordingly mean no more than "to chastise him excessively"⁴⁾. In English the threat "I will thrash you to death" usually means only "I will give you a very severe thrashing"; and a joke or situation is sometimes described colloquially as "killing" when it creates an unusual degree of amusement. In Prov. xxiii 13 the phrase לֹא יָמוּת may also be used figuratively⁵⁾, with a superlative force—"Withhold not chastisement from thy child, for if thou beat him with the rod,

¹⁾ R. H. PFEIFFER's translation in J. B. PRITCHARD, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, p. 438b. The Babylonian original of the phrase "loan upon loan he makes" is *kip-tu eli kip-tu ip-pu-us* (S. LANGDON, *Babylonian Wisdom*, p. 76). Mr. W. G. LAMBERT, who has kindly drawn my attention to this Babylonian parallel, informs me that in his opinion the translation "is happy" does not really bring out the sense here of *libba-su fâb*. He thinks that the phrase is used rather in the sense that it bears in business documents, where it is added when a bargain is agreed by both parties, who undertake not to make any claims against the agreement later. The sense is then rather like our phrase "have a square deal".

²⁾ P. 376.

³⁾ VT III (1953), p. 209 ff.

⁴⁾ Tg. Vulg. "to his death" (לְמִיתוּתָהּ, *ad interfectionem ejus*). LXX, however, εἰς ὑπερηφανίαν "to haughtiness", and Pesh. حُرْبَتِهِ "to his shame". GEMS., p. 60, reads תָּמוּת "anger", translating "do not allow yourself to give way to passion", though he thinks the meaning "kill" is not impossible.

⁵⁾ Toy, p. 433, again thinks of physical death. BOOTHROYD, *op. cit.*, p. 204, writes: "Here I think we have the figure Litotes, 'Withhold not correction from a child; But chastize him, that he may live'".

he will not die!" — **לֹא יָמוּת**, that is to say, means no more than "he will come to no very great harm" ¹⁾. In English we say that such and such a thing, for example, an unusually strenuous effort "will not kill you", when we mean nothing more than "it will do you no great harm" ²⁾.

XIX 26: **מִשְׁדָּר־אֵב יִבְרִיחַ אִם**

The meaning "assault, maltreat", which is usually given to **מִשְׁדָּר** here by lexicographers and commentators, has suggested to some scholars ³⁾ that the parallel **יִבְרִיחַ** bears the meaning which **نَجَح** has in Arabic, viz., "molest, annoy, hurt" ⁴⁾. H. GRÄTZ ⁵⁾, however, retaining the meaning "drives away" for **יִבְרִיחַ**, seeks to find a parallel to it by emending **מִשְׁדָּר** to **מְנַדֵּר** "ejects" ⁶⁾. If this is the required meaning, it can, however, be obtained from **מִשְׁדָּר** without alteration, for in Ethiopic *sadada* means "expel, eject" ⁷⁾.

XXII 4: **עֶקֶב עֲנָה**

The LXX's γενεά "offspring" for **עֶקֶב** goes back to the Arabic عَقَب "son, offspring" ⁸⁾, literally "that which follows, results, issues".

¹⁾ Cf. Ahīqar, line 82—**הֵן אִמְחֹאנֹךְ כְּרִי לֹא תָמוּת**—"If I smite thee my son, thou wilt not die" (A. COWLEY, *Aram. Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, p. 215).

²⁾ Cf. my remarks on the similar use of نَجَح in Arabic (*VT* III (1953), p. 222).

³⁾ E.g., C. F. HOUBIGANT, *Notae criticae in universos veteris testamenti libros*, 1777, II, p. 119; cf. EHRL., p. 113. Pesh. **صَحِف** "annoy, grieve". LXX (**ἀπαθούμενος**), Tg. (**מַעֲרִיק**) and Vulg. (*fugat*) give **ברח** its usual meaning.

⁴⁾ LANE, p. 181, and derivatives given there.

⁵⁾ Cited in TOY, p. 382.

⁶⁾ Cf. TOY, p. 380 f.—"maltreats is probably equivalent to *drives away*. The son here seems to be in possession of the property in his father's lifetime; the latter is presumably decrepit, the care of the property falls naturally to the son whose unfilial conduct, though it may be condemned by public opinion, does not come under the cognizance of the law".

⁷⁾ See DILLMANN, p. 396. For *saddada* "send", *asaddada* "send away, banish", in Amharic, see C. H. ARMBRUSTER, *Initia Amharica*, Pt. iii, *Amhar.-Engl. Vocab.*, I p. 752 f. For **מִשְׁדָּר**, LXX has ἀταμάζων; Tg. and Pesh. **حار, بی**.

⁸⁾ LANE, p. 2101; HAVA, p. 486. عَقِبَ has the same meaning, and عَقَبٌ means "left offspring". EHRL., p. 129, reads **عَقِب** (عَقِب II "auf etwas bedacht sein, darauf Fleiss verwenden").

XXX 16: עֶצֶר רָחֵם

I have for a long time wondered whether רָחֵם in the phrase עֶצֶר רָחֵם usually translated “the barren womb”—“the reference is to the desire of a childless wife for children”¹⁾—might not refer to the bird רָחֵם mentioned in Lev. xi 18, Deut. xiv 17. According to LANE²⁾,

رَحْمَة (*nomen unitatis* of رَحِم) is the *vultur percnopterus*, “called by some the white carrion-vulture of Egypt, and the neighbouring countries”, and is described as “vehemently voracious, and fond of alighting upon carcasses”³⁾. In a context whose subject is insatiable voracity, the رָחֵם may then not be considered out of place. It was

with great interest that I recently came across B. HODGSON’s translation of עֶצֶר רָחֵם by “the ravenous gier-eagle”⁴⁾. When applied to this bird, עֶצֶר, HODGSON thinks, must signify “voracious”, and he compares the Arabic عَصِر *prandium, coena*⁵⁾. It is possible to

think also of the Arabic عَظِرَ “feel disgust at a thing” (عَظَارَةٌ) “indigestion of drink”, عَظُرَ “indisposed through excess of drink”⁶⁾. This word has been suggested to me by Professor A. GUILLAUME, who tells me that he thinks that, though the usual meaning of عَظِرَ is “drink too much to one’s discomfort”, a wider meaning like “gorge” is necessary, seeing that the male locust is nicknamed (العَظَارِيُّ)⁷⁾. May we then think of a Hebrew word עֶצֶר meaning

“voracity”? That עֶצֶר רָחֵם here may mean “the voracity of the carrion-vulture” is a possibility only, for the traditional rendering of the phrase is not lightly to be discarded⁸⁾. It seems worth while, however, to recall an interpretation which was at one time current, and which today may be considered not altogether impossible.

¹⁾ Toy, p. 529.

²⁾ P. 1059.

³⁾ For an illustration of the bird and a further description of it, see H. B. TRISTRAM, *The Natural History of the Bible*, p. 179 f.

⁴⁾ *The Proverbs of Solomon*, 1788, *ad loc.* (the volume is not paginated). Reference is made to HODGSON’s interpretation by BOOTHROYD, *op. cit.*, II, p. 212.

⁵⁾ FREYTAG, III, p. 167, gives أَعَاصِيرَ *prandium, coena*.

⁶⁾ HAVA, p. 482.

⁷⁾ See the *Qamus* (sub عَظِرَ).

⁸⁾ See the references to Arabic and Indian proverbs in Toy, p. 529.

XXX 31: וּמֶלֶךְ אֱלֹקִים עִמּוֹ

So many and varied are the interpretations of this obscure phrase which have been offered that it may be useful, without any attempt at a solution, briefly to draw special attention to two points which have hitherto received less notice than they deserve. In the first place, the fact that the first three of the four things that are "stately in carriage, motion" (מִיטְבֵי לַכֶּתֶ, verse 29) are animals, makes it very probable that מֶלֶךְ in verse 31, if it is original (see below), refers not, as is generally thought¹⁾, to a human king, but to an animal²⁾. Secondly, it may be asked whether אוֹ-תֵשׁ may not be an explanatory gloss on מְתִנִּים וְרִירָה, whose meaning is most uncertain; for the simple conjunction וְ (וְתֵשׁ), and not אוֹ, would normally be expected. If it be a gloss, then two animals must be recovered from מֶלֶךְ אֱלֹקִים עִמּוֹ. If, however, we read וְתֵשׁ³⁾, the "he-goat" then being in fact a firm member of the quartette of animals, then only one animal is to be looked for in the last member of the verse, which then seems overcrowded. TOY⁴⁾ suggests that מֶלֶךְ may be a corruption of אֱלֹקִים, or *vice versa*, is it too bold to suggest that in מֶלֶךְ אֱלֹקִים is to be seen a dittograph⁵⁾ of מֶלֶךְ אֵין לְאַרְבָּה (verse 27), the last two words אֵין לְאַרְבָּה being here abbreviated to אֵל (thus אֱלֹקִים)? We should then be left with the letters עִמּוֹ from which the name of an animal has to be extracted.

XXXI 11: וְשָׁלַל לֹא יִחָסֵר

The word וְשָׁלַל in the description of the capable housewife has not been adequately explained hitherto. It is customarily translated "gain", a meaning which is given to it in this passage only; everywhere else it means "booty taken in war"⁶⁾. As TOY, for example, says—"the

¹⁾ Most recently G. R. DRIVER, *Biblica* 32 (1951), p. 194.

²⁾ Cf. TOY, p. 537—"the original text referred to the majestic mien and movement of some animal". MELVILLE SCOTT, *op. cit.*, p. 88, has suggested reading מֶלֶךְ אֵיל קוֹם פַּעֲמָיו "a king stag that raiseth high its steps". A "queen bee" is called in Latin *rex apium*.

³⁾ Cf. FRANK., p. 164; TOY, p. 538.

⁴⁾ *Ibid.*

⁵⁾ For examples of vertical dittography, see M. LAMBERT, *Traité de gramm. hébr.*, p. 102, 105, 113, 119; further, R.-J. TOURNAY, *Vivre et Penser*, III (1945), p. 232, n. 2.

⁶⁾ So LXX here (καλῶν αὐτῶν); cf. Tg. מִתְּבוּאָה, Vulg. *spoliis*, Pesh. has מִתְּבוּאָה

292 WINTON THOMAS, SOME PASSAGES IN THE BOOK OF PROVERBS

military term came to be employed in a peaceful sense”¹). Since, however, such a usage is without parallel in Hebrew, another explanation may be advanced. There is an Arabic proverb *لَا تَعْلَمُ صَدَقَ ثَلَّةٌ* “a clever woman is not without wool” (to spin or weave when she has nothing else to do)²). May not *שָׁלִל לֹא יַחְסֹר* be the Hebrew counterpart of this Arabic proverb? If so, the Hebrew phrase may be translated—“and wool (*שָׁלִל* = *ثَلَّةٌ*) is not lacking (to her)”³). In both the Arabic and Hebrew proverb the capable woman (*אִשְׁת־חַיִל*, verse 10) is thought of as never idle; she is always at her wool⁴). Mention may be made in this connection of a passage in Livy (I, lvii, 9), where it is related how Lucretia, taken by surprise, was found sitting busy at her wool (*deditam lanae*), and gained the prize for womanly virtues⁵). . . So, too, Jerome recommends that a young girl should have as her guardian one who is “not given to much wine, nor in the apostle’s words, idle and wordy, but sober, sedate, industrious in spinning wool”⁶). We may recall also the well known epitaph of the beautiful and virtuous Roman matron, Claudia, who “kept to her house, and spun wool” (*domum servavit, lanam fecit*)⁷).

“store, victuals”. F. ZORELL, *Lex. Hebr. et Aram. Vet. Test.*, p. 852, would seem to be in error in giving the meaning “gain” to *שָׁלִל* in Sir. xxxvii 6: see R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Translation, p. 63; Commentary, p. 328).

¹) P. 543; cf. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, *The Book of Proverbs*, p. 283—“that which is acquired by skilful management of the estate, and thus income”.

²) LANE, p. 346.

³) Inserting *לֹא* after *יַחְסֹר*, with LXX (*ἡ τοιαύτη*); cf. Pesh. The word is thus the subject of the verb, and not object, as BDB, p. 341, *et al.*

⁴) Cf. verse 13 of this chapter.

⁵) The passage runs in full as follows: “citatis equis avolant Romam. Quo cum primis se intendentibus tenebris pervenissent, pergunt inde Collatiam, ubi Lucretiam haudquaquam ut regias nurus, quas in convivio luxuque cum aequalibus viderant tempus terentes, sed nocte sera deditam lanae inter lucubrantibus ancillas in medio aedium sedentem inveniunt. Muliebris certaminis laus penes Lucretiam fuit” (*Livy Bks. I and II, Loeb Class. Library*, p. 198). I am indebted to Mr. H. ST. J. HART for this reference.

⁶) *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistolae* (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum LVI*) recensuit ISIDORUS HILBERG, Pt. iii, Letter cxxviii, p. 16, lines 19 ff. The passage runs: “sit ei magistra, comes, paedagoga, custos non multo vino dedita, non iuxta apostolum otiosa atque verbosa, sed sobria, gravis, lanifica et ea tantum loquens quae animum puellarem ad virtutem instituant”.

⁷) *Corp. Inscr. Lat.*, I. 2, 1211 (last line): cf. VI. 3, 15346.

NOTES ON SOME PASSAGES IN THE BOOK
OF PROVERBS

BY

D. WINTON THOMAS

Cambridge

i 9: תַּנְקִים לְהַרְבֵּתָהּ

The LXX's καὶ κλοιὸν χρύσεον 'and a golden chain' implies that תַּנְקִים, or some other word for 'gold', was read in apposition after תַּנְקִים, an attractive balance to לְהַרְבֵּתָהּ 'a garland of beauty' being thus obtained. The Arabic version (طَوَقُ ذَهَبِيَّ)¹ and the Palestinian Syriac Lectionary (ܡܚܡܬ ܕܗܒܬ)² similarly have 'gold'. The verse will then be 4+4, and not 3+3³.

viii 26: הַרְבֵּוֹת

The translation of הַרְבֵּוֹת, which is usually taken to mean 'fields'⁴, by 'rivers' in the Pesh (ܡܢܬܠܐ), Targ. (ܡܢܬܠܐ), and Vulg. (*flumina*), is remarkable, and is not easily explicable. H. PINKUSS⁵ records some remarks of NÖLDEKE to the effect that the Syriac translator substituted הַרְבֵּוֹת, which seemed to him superfluous side by side with אֲרָצִים, what appeared to him to be a suitable word; or again, that he took הַרְבֵּוֹת here as meaning 'highways', that is, natural caravan roads, such as wadies (ܡܢܬܠܐ) could be. NÖLDEKE regards this second suggestion as somewhat artificial. VOGEL⁶ believed that the Syriac translator in

¹ As given in WALTON's Polyglot.

² *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary* (Studia Sinaitica, No. VI), ed. A. S. LEWIS and M. D. GIBSON, p. 25; on p. 88 ܡܚܡܬ.

³ As GEMS. (= B. GEMSER, *Sprüche Salomos*, 2nd. rev. ed., 1963), p. 19. Other abbreviations used are — BEER = G. BEER, *Kittel Bibl. Hebr.* 3; BDB = BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *A Heb. and Engl. Lex. of the O.T.*; FRANK. = W. FRANKENBERG, *Die Sprüche*; HIRTZ. = F. HIRTZ, *Die Sprüche Salomo's*; LANE = E. W. LANE, *Arab. Eng. Lex.*; TOY = C. H. TOY, *The Book of Proverbs* (I.C.C.); WILD. = G. WILDEBOER, *Die Sprüche*.

⁴ A meaning the word has in several O.T. passages; see BDB, p. 300a.

⁵ 'Die syrische Übersetzung der Proverbien', *Z.A.W.* xiv, 1894, pp. 140 f.

⁶ According to J. BAUMGARTNER, *Étude critique sur l'état du texte du livre des Proverbes*, 1890, p. 90.

this passage read תוצאות¹⁾, which PINKUSS thinks would represent rather תוצאות²⁾. HIRTZIG, who translates תוצאות by 'Steppen' (LXX ἀουήτους), suggests that the renderings of the versions may rest upon Zeph. iii 6, but he offers no explanation in support of his suggestion, which remains puzzling³⁾.

It seems worth while to point out that in Arabic حَاض means 'collected (water), built a tank', X 'it (water) collected, became collected', while حَوْض means 'a place in which water collects, is collected'⁴⁾. Did there exist in Hebrew a root חוץ = حاض, and does this Hebrew root lie behind the translations of תוצאות in this passage which are found in Pesh., Targ., and Vulg.? If so, these translations need not represent a form of text different from M.T.⁵⁾

ix 17: מִים גְּנוּבִים יִמְתְּקוּ וְלֶחֶם סִתְּרִים יִנְעֶם

'Stolen waters are sweet'—'probably a current proverbial saying'⁶⁾. The Arabic proverb كل ممنوع حلو 'everything forbidden is sweet'⁷⁾ may be recalled. For 'water', cf. v. 15f.; and with the phrase לֶחֶם סִתְּרִים, cf. Sirach xxiii 17 (ἀνθρώπων πόρνω πας ἄρτος ἡδύς).

xix 24 (= xxvi 15): טָמֵן עֲצֵל יְדֹו בַצֵּלֶת

Most scholars translate the last word 'dish'⁸⁾, but the LXX (κόλπον⁹⁾, Pesh. (חֶסֶד), the Arabic version (حُضْن), some Jewish commentators¹⁰⁾, and A.V., render 'bosom', while 'arm-pit' is the translation of Aq. (μασχάλην), Symm. (μάλην), Targ. (שחתיקה) and Vulg. (ascella)¹¹⁾. The basic idea underlying these translations must be that of hollowness. In Syr. حِلْد means 'scooped out, clave'¹²⁾, and so טָמֵן may be regarded as something scooped out, or cut out,

¹⁾ Aq. and Symm. ἐξόδους.

²⁾ P. 141, n. 1.

³⁾ P. 78. It seems clear that תוצאותי חוץתי in Zeph. iii 6 means 'I have made their streets desolate'. Had HIRTZ. 'was dry, dried up' in mind?

⁴⁾ LANE, 670.

⁵⁾ As suggested by TOY, p. 175.

⁶⁾ TOY, p. 191.

⁷⁾ J. L. BURCKHARDT, *Arabic Proverbs*, p. 200, No. 557.

⁸⁾ E.g. TOY, p. 379; GEMS, p. 76; FRANK., p. 114; HIRTZ., p. 193. So R.V., R.S.V.

⁹⁾ TOY, p. 382, thinks the LXX's rendering may be a guess induced by טָמֵן.

¹⁰⁾ See Rashi *ad loc.*

¹¹⁾ Similarly Aq., Symm., Theod. μάλη in xxvi 15; LXX κόλπος.

¹²⁾ PAYNE SMITH, *Theor. Syr.* 3405.

namely, a dish; likewise צִלְחָה 'pot' and צִלְחִית 'jar'. Similarly from the root קער = Arabic نمر 'made deep(well)', II 'hollowed out, carved out', is derived קֶעֶרָה 'dish' ¹⁾; כְּפֹר 'bowl' may be referred to Sabaeen כפר 'dug' ²⁾; and the place name מוֹאֵב may be connected with Arabic مَوْبَ, 'capacious drinking bowl', مَوْبَة, 'depression hollowed out in the rock and holding water', and may itself mean 'bowl' ³⁾. In Greek κάλπος is used of any bosom-like hollow ⁴⁾, and the Hebrew קִיָּק 'bosom' is used of the hollow bottom of the altar ⁵⁾. Etymologically then it seems that צִלְחָה means basically 'what is hollowed out, hollow-like', and both 'dish' and 'bosom' are possible ⁶⁾. The former, however, is more pertinent in the context, for there seems no special reason why a man should take his hand from his bosom to bring it again to his mouth ⁷⁾. The meaning 'dish' recalls Sirach xxxiv 14 ⁸⁾ and Mark. xiv 20 ⁹⁾.

אל-יִקְנָה לִבְךָ בַּחֲשָׁאִים כִּי אַם-בִּירְאָת-יְהוָה כָּל-הַיּוֹמִים: xxxiii 17

This verse is commonly translated—'Let not thine heart be envious of sinners, but of the fear of Yahweh at all times' ¹⁰⁾. According to this translation, ב in בִּירְאָת follows, like ב in בַּחֲשָׁאִים, upon יִקְנָה, but the phrase יִקְנָה בִּירְאָת is strange ¹¹⁾. Toy ¹²⁾ seeks to remove the difficulty by emending בִּירְאָת to יְרֵאָת 'fear thou (Yahweh)'. It is of some interest that, while Pesh. and Targ. support the reading of the M.T., the LXX and Vulg. meet the difficulty by inserting the

¹⁾ Cf. BDB, p. 891.

²⁾ In Sabaeen and Nabataean כפר means 'cave'; *ibid.*, p. 499.

³⁾ See G. R. DRIVER, *J.T.S.*, N.S. xii, 1961, p. 65.

⁴⁾ LIDDELL and SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lex.*, p. 974.

⁵⁾ Ezek. xliii 13, 14, 17; cf. G. A. COOKE, *The Book of Ezekiel* (I.C.C.), p. 467.

⁶⁾ LAGARDE denies that צִלְחָה can mean 'bosom'. He compares Arab. لَحْظَة 'dish' (*Anmerk. z. griech. Übersetzung d. Proverbien*, p. 63); cf. F. ZORELL, *Lex. Hebr. et Aram. V.T.*, p. 692. J. FÜRST, *Hebr. u. Chald. Handwörterb.*, ii, p. 273, gives צִלְחָה the meaning 'dish' in 2 Kings xxi 13, but 'bosom' in Prov. xxvi 15.

⁷⁾ Cf. Toy, p. 382.

⁸⁾ The Hebrew text has בַּסֵּנָה 'in the basket', for which the LXX has ἐν τρυβλίῳ (xxxi 14) 'in a dish'. See R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*, *Hebr. u. Deutsch*, p. 25 (of Heb. text), p. 53 (of translation, where סֵנָה is translated 'Schüssel'), and his *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, p. 278.

⁹⁾ ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον.

¹⁰⁾ E.g., FRANK., p. 131; GEMS., p. 86.

¹¹⁾ Cf. FRANK., p. 131, who underlines the distinction between the use of יִקְנָה ב in *malam partem* (envy) and יִקְנָה ל in *bonam partem* (zeal).

¹²⁾ P. 438.

imperative of the verb 'to be' (יִהְיֶה; *esto*; cf. A. V., R. V. ¹) after יִהְיֶה. The Arabic version too inserts a verb, but a much stronger one, namely, اَسْلُكْ, that is, לֶךְ 'walk thou'. The insertion of לֶךְ or of any other word in *b* would, however, upset the rhythm of the verse which is 3+3, and it is probably best to see in יִרְאֵת יְהוָה here an example of a feminine abstract noun used as a collective term for a concrete subject, so that יִרְאֵת יְהוָה = יִרְאֵי יְהוָה 'fearers of Yahweh' ²), which provides an excellent parallel to תַּשְׁאִים.

xxiv 16: כִּי שֶׁבַע יָפֹל צַדִּיק נָקָם וְרָשָׁעִים יִכְשְׁלוּ בְרָעָה

'For seven times a righteous man falls and rises again, but the wicked stumble to ruin'. Cf. the Aramaic proverb-שֶׁבַע בִּירֵי לְשִׁלְמוֹנָא 'Seven pits for the righteous, but one for the evildoer', ³) that is, even if there be seven pits, the righteous do not stumble, but one is enough to engulf the evil-doer.

xxv 4: הֵן סִיָּים מִכֶּסֶף וַיֵּצֵא לְצִרְף כָּלִי

The correction to וַיֵּצֵא may be accepted, with LXX, Pesh., Targ., Vulg. ⁴) G. R. DRIVER ⁵) approves the reading לְצִרְף or לְצִרְף, 'for the smelting (of a vessel)', or 'for the smelter (of a vessel)', and, on the basis of the LXX and Akkadian *ašû*, he gives to וַיֵּצֵא here the meaning 'that it may be bright, clean, pure', that is, the silver must be fit for the use of the silversmith. A different approach to the text may, however, be suggested. The LXX renders the three Hebrew words αὐτὸ καθαρίσθησεται. καθαρὸν ἔσται, which leads BEER ⁶) to read וַיִּצְרֶף כָּלִי. The reading כָּלִי for the LXX's ἔσται is on the right lines, but perhaps כָּלִי may rather be read (the ל of לְצִרְף being transferred to כָּלִי). The verse may then be translated—'Remove dross from silver so that it (i.e., the silver) may come forth completely purified' (וַיֵּצֵא).

¹) R.S.V. 'continue' (imv.).

²) Cf. BEER, *ad loc.*; G. R. DRIVER, *Biblica*, 32, 1951, p. 196, where other examples are cited. The latter, in a private communication, has drawn my attention to קִנְאָת-בֵּיתְךָ (Ps. lxi 10)—'the jealous enemies of thine house'; cf.

Isa. xxvi 11 קִנְאָת עַם 'the jealous enemies of (thy) people' (Vulg. *zelantes populi*;

Targ. סִנְאֵי עַמְךָ).

³) See M. LEWIN *Aram. Sprichwörter u. Volkssprüche*, 1895, p. 73 and p. viii, n. 61.

⁴) Cf. BEER, *ad loc.*

⁵) *Biblica* 32, 1951, p. 190.

⁶) *Ad loc.*

NOTES ON PROVERBS

275

וְצָרָה קָלִיל). The LXX renders קָלִיל in Lev. vi 22(15) by ἄπαν; and an example of קָלִיל as an adverbial accusative may be seen in Isa. ii 18. xxvi 11: The LXX adds a couplet to this verse which runs as follows—

ἔστιν αἰσχύνῃ ἐπαγούσα ἀμαρτίαν,
καὶ ἔστιν αἰσχύνῃ δόξα καὶ χάρις,

which is identical with Sirach iv 21, which in Hebrew runs:

וְכִי יֵשׁ בִּשְׁת מִשָּׂא עֵץ וְיֵשׁ בִּשְׁת כְּבוֹד וְחַן

It is of interest to note how near to the original Hebrew HIRTZIG's retranslation of the Greek approximated nearly forty years before the discovery of the original Hebrew text of Sirach. His retranslation was as follows¹):

יֵשׁ בִּשְׁת מִשְׁכָּת עֵץ
יֵשׁ בִּשְׁת כְּבוֹד וְחַן

xxvii 7:

וְנֶפֶשׁ רָעָה קַל-מֶר קָחוּק

'To the hungry any bitter thing is sweet'. Allusion has frequently been made to Aḥikar 188—כֶּפֶן יִהְיֶה מֵרֹרָתָא 'hunger sweetens that which is bitter'²). Another Aramaic proverb expressing a similar thought is כלבא בכפויה גללי מבלע 'a dog in its hunger swallows even dung'³).

xxvii 9: וּמִתֶּק רָעָהוּ מִצֶּצֶת-נֶפֶשׁ

This clause is admittedly untranslatable as it stands, and many attempts have been made to render it meaningful⁴). Another suggestion may accordingly be allowed. I suggest reading נֶפֶשׁ מִמִּתֶּקָה נֶפֶשׁ 'and the counsel of a friend makes sweet the soul'⁵). This suggestion uses up all the consonants of the M.T., with the substitution of a *yodh* (מִמִּתֶּקָה) for *waw* (in רָעָהוּ), and is very near to the rendering of the Vulg.—*et bonis amici consiliis anima dulcoratur*, which, as Toy⁶) observes, yields an appropriate parallel.

¹) See R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, Hebr. u. Deutsch*, p. 3 (of Heb. text).

²) P. 277.

³) A. COWLEY, *Aram. Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, pp. 218, 247; GEMS, p. 96.

⁴) Cf. M. LEWIN, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

⁵) Cf. Toy, pp. 484 f. For more recent treatment, see G. R. DRIVER, *Z.A.W.* lii. 1934, pp. 51 ff.; liii, 1935, p. 291; lv, 1937, pp. 69 f.

⁶) Cf. the phrase נִמְתִּיק סוֹד of intimate friendship (Ps. lv 15). Aq.'s γλυκαίνει 'sweetens' implies a transitive verb.

⁷) P. 485.

xxx 27: הָלַךְ צֶהָרָה

LXX καὶ στρατεύει ἀφ' ἑνὸς κελεύσματος εὐτάκτως 'and march at one command in orderly fashion'. The LXX's στρατεύει has led some commentators to emend צֶהָרָה to צֶהָרָה 'and waged war' ¹⁾, unnecessarily, since צֶהָרָה has the sense 'go out to battle, march' in a number of O.T. passages (Jud. ii 15, 2 Kings xviii 7, Deut. xxviii 25) ²⁾. In Joel ii 5 ff. the march of the invading locusts is vividly described. They are 'a powerful people drawn up in battle array. . . like warriors they run, like soldiers they climb the wall; each one marches in his own rank, and they do not break their ranks; none pushes the other, each one goes in his own tracks'. W. M. THOMSON ³⁾ writes of locusts—'Nothing in their habits is more striking than the pertinacity with which they all pursue the same line of march, like a disciplined army'; and H. B. TRISTRAM ⁴⁾ refers to 'their straight onward march'.

The word צֶהָרָה is regarded by BEER as doubtful, and he proposes, comparing the LXX's εὐτάκτως, צֶהָרָה 'equipped' ⁵⁾. The Pesh., Targ., and Vulg., however, all suggest the idea of 'massing together' ⁶⁾, a meaning which can be obtained from צֶהָרָה = Arabic حَمَّ. This Arabic verb meaning 'cut, severed' (cf. Akkad. *ḥaṣaṣu*) has in the third and fourth forms the meaning 'divided with a person', 'gave a share to', and in the sixth form 'divided between each other', and حَصَّة means 'portion, share' ⁷⁾. The locusts go out in swarms, or in military terminology, 'divisions'. A massing of locusts in ordered divisions would be suitably described as εὐτάκτως (LXX). Perhaps the word

¹⁾ E.g., BEER, *ad loc.*

²⁾ Cf. C. F. BURNEY, *The Book of Judges*, p. 59. G. A. COOKE (*A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 76 f.) explains הָצִיאוּם in a Phoenician inscription from Idalion as 'those who came forth' (to battle), and he compares 1 Sam. viii 20, 2 Sam. xi 1. For a suggestion that כָּל-יִצְחָק שְׂעָרָה עִירָן (Gen. xxxiv 24) means 'those who represent the community in battle', see E. A. SPEISER, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 144, 1956, pp. 22 f.; G. EVANS, *ibid.*, No. 150, 1958, pp. 28 ff.

³⁾ *The Land and the Book*, p. 419.

⁴⁾ *The Natural History of the Bible*, p. 314.

⁵⁾ *Ad loc.*

⁶⁾ וּמִתְכַּנְשִׁין כְּלָהוֹן כְּהָדָא; וּמִתְכַּנְשִׁין כְּלָהוֹן; *et egreditur universa per turmas suas*. Similarly Ibn Ezra יֵצֵא מֵאוֹכֶף וּמִקִּיבֵן 'goes out gathered together and collected together' (comparing הִצְבֵּר Job xxi 21. Symm.'s ὡς ψηφίς πᾶσα represents הִצְבֵּר 'gravel', as in xx 17).

⁷⁾ LANE, 579 f.

should be vocalised קָצַף and be regarded as an adverbial accusative. The Hebrew word קָדוֹר 'band, troop', literally 'division, detachment', presents a similar usage of a noun derived from a root meaning 'cut' (קָדַד) ¹⁾

xxxix 8: פִּתַּח-פִּיךָ לְאֵלִים אֶל-דָּן כְּלִי-קִלּוֹף

G. R. DRIVER ²⁾, after mentioning several proposed explanations of this phrase, all unsatisfactory, translates 'adversaries, opponents', in a legal sense, comparing Aramaic קִלּוֹף and Arabic خَلَفَ — 'open thy mouth for (=on behalf of, in defence of) the dumb against the suit of all (his) adversaries'. What seems required, however, is some indication of disability parallel to 'dumb'. It may be pointed out that, among its many meanings, خَلَفَ can mean 'was stupid, foolish, had little or no intellect, understanding'. It is said of a slave اخلف 'he was, became, idiotic, deficient in or bereft of his intellect'. The noun خَلْفَةٌ means 'a vice, fault, imperfection, stupidity, want of intellect, understanding' ³⁾. Could then כְּלִי קִלּוֹף be a general phrase for those incapable, like the dumb, of defending themselves from attack in the courts, in other words, those who are too weak to plead?—'Open thy mouth in defence of the dumb, and maintain the cause ⁴⁾ of all who are without understanding'. The Arabic version lends support in an interesting way to this suggestion—وَأَحْكُمْ لِلْفَقِيرِ

وَالضَّعِيفِ 'and judge thou for the poor and the imbecile' ⁵⁾.

xxxix 11: וְשָׁלַל לֹא יִחְסֹר

I have earlier suggested that this phrase may be translated 'and wool (שָׁלַל = Arabic نَلَّة) is not lacking (to her)', that is, the capable woman is never idle, she is always occupied with spinning; and parallels indicating that spinning was a highly esteemed womanly

¹⁾ BDB, p. 151.

²⁾ *Biblica*, 32, 1951, pp. 195 f.

³⁾ LANE, 793b, 796c.

⁴⁾ Reading וְדָן for M.T.'s אֶל-דָּן, as in verse 9; cf. TOY, p. 541. The preposition אֶל could have arisen through dittography from the preceding אֵלִים

⁵⁾ ضَعْفٌ means 'littleness of intellect', مَضْعُوفٌ 'weak in intellect' (LANE, 1792).

virtue were cited from Livy, Jerome and Claudia's epitaph¹). Some further references which point to spinning as a female virtue in antiquity may now be added. First, there is an Aramaic proverb—'אין חכמה לאשה אלא בפלך' 'there is no wisdom for a woman other than spinning'²). Next, at Ras Shamrah the goddess Asherah 'takes hold of her spindle; she... the spindle; she occupies herself with wool' (*t'lt bsm(r...)*)³). Then in Tobit ii 11, Tobit says of his wife Anna, according to the R.V., that she 'did spin in the women's chambers.'. LXX^B runs—ἡριθεύετο ἐν τοῖς γυναικείοις 'worked for hire in the women's chambers'; LXX^N ἡριθεύετο ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς γυναικείοις 'worked for hire at womanly works'. Though spinning is not specifically mentioned in the Greek text, it may perhaps be presumed to have been included among womanly works (as R.V.). Again, we read in the Mishnah that among the works which a wife must perform for her husband is 'working in wool', for 'idleness leads to unchastity'⁴). And lastly, St. John Chrysostom refers to virgins spinning at home⁵).

xxx1 28: בְּעָלָהּ הִתְקַלָּה

The Arabic version has two verbs—سَبَّحَهَا وَاَمْدَحَهَا 'praises her and commends her', thus supplying an additional word which the

¹) See *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East* (Suppl. to *Vet. Test.* 111, ed. M. NOTH and D. WINTON THOMAS), pp. 291 f.

²) Cf. M. LEWIN, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

³) According to the reading of the text by A. VAN SELMS, *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature*, p. 55, who explains *t'lt* from *'ll* 'occupied oneself with', as in Mishn. Hebrew and Arabic. G. R. DRIVER, however, translates *t'lt* 'her high estate', and reads the following word as *hym* 'on the (first) day' (*Canaanite Myths and Legends*, pp. 92 f.). J. AISTLEITNER reads *q(?)lt bi(?)*, 'fell into the sea', and gives *plk* the meaning 'weites (Ober) gewand' (*Wörterb. d. ugarit. Sprache*, ed. O. EISSFELDT, pp. 276, 256).

⁴) See H. DANBY, *The Mishnah*, p. 252, para. 5.

⁵) ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις τῶν παρθένων ἱστουργεῖν, καὶ πρῶτος καὶ μέσος καὶ τελευταῖος ὁ Δαυὶδ. This is quoted by J. M. NEALE, *Commentary on the Psalms*, 1860, 1, and by W. O. E. OESTERLEY, *The Psalms*, 1, p. 107, and by J. A. LAMB, *The Psalms in Christian Worship*, p. 30; both the latter refer back to NEALE's English translation. Neither NEALE nor OESTERLEY indicates where in Chrysostom's writings the quotation is to be found. LAMB locates it in *De Poenitentia*, *Hom. VI*. The correct reference, however, is *De Poenitentia et in lectorem de Davide et de uxore Uriae* (MIGNE, *Patrologiae Graecae*, Tom. lxiv, p. 11b, lines 25 ff.; the Latin translation is on p. 13, lines 2 ff.). After a lengthy search for the quotation, the present writer was able to locate it with the help of I. AUFDER MAUR, *Mönchtum und Glaubensverkündigung in den Schriften Hl. Johannes Chrysostomus*, 1959, p. 67, n. 3.

NOTES ON PROVERBS

279

rhythm (3+3) seems to require ¹⁾. We can only guess at the Hebrew word which the Arabic version implies, perhaps *הָיָה* 'her husband lauds and praises her'.

¹⁾ Cf. WILD., p. 92, who thinks that the second half of the verse should be filled out by the insertion of *קָם* (as *קָם* in the first half). GEMS., p. 109, thinks the verse as it stands is 3 + 3.

MOUNT TABOR: THE MEANING OF THE NAME

The name *tābhōr* has been explained in a variety of ways. For example, WINCKLER regarded it as pre-Semitic in origin; but he suggested at the same time a connection with the Ethiopic *dabr* "mountain".¹⁾ The name has, again, been connected with a presumed Hebrew root *tbr*, which is said to mean "be high"²⁾ with another presumed Hebrew root *tbr=šbr*, which is said to mean "grieve"³⁾; with the place-name Debir, the primitive form of *tābhōr* being thought perhaps to be *dbwr*⁴⁾; and with Ῥαβύριον, a mountain in Rhodes.⁵⁾ To these explanations I venture now to add another.

¹⁾ *Altorient. Forsch.*, 1. p. 423.

²⁾ J. FÜRST, *Hebr. u. Chald. Handwörterb. über d. A.T.*, II, p. 514.

³⁾ *Ibid.*, *loc.cit.*

⁴⁾ G. A. COOKE, *Encycl. Bibl.*, 4885, comparing Josh. xi 21, xiii 26, Jud. i 11.

⁵⁾ *Ibid.*, 4881. See further H. LEWY, *Die sem. Fremdwörter im Griech.*, p. 194, n. 2; and F. STÄHELIN, *Festschr. J. Wackernagel*, p. 152. The LXX renders *tābhōr* by Ῥαβύριον in Hos. v 1 and Jer. xxvi (Heb. xli) 18.

I suggest that the Hebrew root from which *tābbōr* is to be derived is *nbr* = Arabic *nabara* "raised, elevated". This root has already been adduced by F. ZORELL in explanation of *nābhār* and *tittābhār* in 2 Sam. xxii 27. ¹⁾ Derivatives from the Arabic root are *nībr* "heaps", *nabrātun* "anything rising from a thing", and *minbar* "pulpit" (so called because of its height). ²⁾ The word *tābbōr*, if derived from *nbr* = *nabara*, would accordingly mean "raised ground, height, hill", ³⁾ an appropriate enough meaning. ⁴⁾ As to its earlier formation, it is difficult to feel any certainty. It may, however, be suggested that, as the place-name *tanpūah* (root *nph*) lost its original *nun* and became *tappūah*, ⁵⁾ so may an early form *tanbūr* ⁶⁾ likewise have lost its *nun* and become *tabbūr*.

Whether there is any connection between *tanbūr* < *tabbūr* < *tābbōr* and *ṭabbūr* ⁷⁾ (Jud. ix 37, Ezek. xxxviii 12), usually translated "highest part, centre, navel", should perhaps remain an open question for the moment, but there may well be. In this connection it is of interest to observe that the root *nbr* is probably to be seen again in the Ethiopic *benbert* (cp. Amharic *enbert*) "navel", ⁸⁾ which is used to translate ὀμφαλός, the word by which the LXX renders *ṭabbūr* in the two passages in which it occurs.

Cambridge

D. WINTON THOMAS

¹⁾ *Biblica*, IX, 1928, p. 224. G. R. DRIVER, however, adduces the root *bnr* "be boorish" (*Harv. Theol. Rev.*, XXIX, 1936, p. 172).

²⁾ LANE, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.*, 2757; cp. KAZIMIRSKI DE BIBERSTEIN, *Dict. Arab.-Franc.*, 1183. For Syr. *nabbar* in the sense *excitavit (terram)*, see C. BROCKELMANN, *Lex. Syr.*, 2nd. ed., p. 412; further, PAYNE SMITH, *Thes. Syr.*, 2273, and LEVY, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.*, III, p. 330.

³⁾ Though too much should not be made of it, it may be noted that in Hos. v 1 the Targ. renders *tābbōr* by *tūr rām* "high mountain".

⁴⁾ The name of mount Gilboa has recently been explained as meaning "hill"; see L. KOEHLER, *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.*, LIX, 1940, p. 35.

⁵⁾ See GES.-KAUTZSCH, *Hebr. Gramm.*, 2nd. ed., trans. by A. E. COWLEY, p. 238.

⁶⁾ Cp. the Arabic formation *tunbūr*; see J. BARTH, *Die Nominalbild. in d. sem. Sprachen*, p. 296.

⁷⁾ As, e.g., FÜRST, *op. cit.*, II, p. 512, 514.

⁸⁾ DILLMANN, *Lex. Ling. Aeth.*, 108.

The Meaning of the Name Mishal

By D. Winton Thomas

I RECENTLY suggested in this Journal¹ that in certain Hebrew place-names, for which no meaning had hitherto been offered, some reminiscence of a religious practice, in this case dancing, has been preserved. The place-name, Mishal (Joshua xix 26,² xxi. 30), in the territory of Asher, suggests that another kind of religious practice was carried on in this locality.

Two well-known facts point the way to what may well be the original significance of this name. First, there is the frequent use of מִשַׁל in the O.T. in the sense of "enquire, consult" a deity or oracle.³ Secondly, the early Semitic belief that the divine will could be consulted and oracles obtained at certain well-known spots, held to be sacred, needs no emphasising. These two facts combined suggest that the real meaning of מִשַׁל is "place of enquiry," and that the name points to the existence at some time in this neighbourhood of an oracle-sanctuary, to which men resorted to discover the will of the deity.

Attempts to derive מִשַׁל from מִשַׁל have been surprisingly rare⁴; in fact, I have been able to discover only one, viz., in the list of proper names given at the end of C. J. Ball's *Light from the East*; here Mishal is translated "request." There

1. See QUARTERLY STATEMENT, Oct. 1933, p. 205; July 1934, p. 147; April 1935, p. 89.

2. A. V. Misheal. The form of the name in I *Chronicles* vi. 59 (Eng. vi. 74) Mashal (מִשַׁל) is probably nothing more than a clerical error. See C. R. Conder in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 3, p. 397, and Siegfried and Stade, *Hebr. Wörterb.*, p. 387.

3. The instances can be found in Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebr. Engl. Lex.*, p. 982. The root is used similarly in Assyrian (Muss-Arnolt *Ass. Dict.* p. 996) and in Syriac (Payne-Smith, *Thes. Syr.*, II. 4004).

4. Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 602, recognise no connection between the two words.

is nothing, however, against such a derivation; and for the translation "place of enquiry" it is enough to compare words like מִדְּגָר "place of driving (cattle)," מִדְּרָךְ "place of treading," מִשְׁפָּט which, besides its usual meaning "judgment, decision," can also mean "place of judgment."¹ (Cp. in Arabic nouns which indicate the place at which the act as expressed in the verb is performed, e.g., *muzallan*, "place of prayer,"² *masgid*, "place in which one performs the act of *sujud*."³) Finally, it may be remarked that the Ethiopic מִסְאַל is said to mean *locus ubi aliquid peti solet, ut in Templis*.⁴

It may not, then, appear too hazardous if we see in the name Mishal an indication that it at one time enjoyed a local reputation as a sacred spot, where, it was believed, oracles were to be obtained.⁵

1. Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 1048.

2. Lane, *Arab. Eng. Lex.*, 1721.

3. *Ibid.*, 1308.

4. Walton, *Polygl.*, VIII 3367.

5. Reference may be made to C. F. Burney's article in *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, XIII, 83, where it is suggested that the place-name אִשְׁתָּאוֹל means "place of consulting an oracle," just as אִשְׁתָּמוֹעַ means "place where prayer is heard." See further J. A. Montgomery, *Some Oracle Place Names*, *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.*, XIV., p. 61 (March 1935). May the place-name Shema (שִׁמְעָ) in Southern Judah (Josh. xv. 26) also point to an oracle site, where the deity "gave a hearing" to those who came with their requests? Imperative in form it may perhaps mean "Hear (O God)!"

EN-DOR : A SACRED SPRING ?

D. WINTON THOMAS.

SACRED dances in the form of encircling a sacred object had a definite place in the religious life of the Israelites.¹ Among the objects around which we may assume that the ritual encircling dance took place were holy trees and wells.² The existence of sacred trees, wells and springs among the Israelites and other Semitic peoples has, of course, been long recognised ; but in the Old Testament "there is no allusion to the dance around them ; but as we know from so many sources that wherever sacred trees and springs existed (which has been the world over), part of the ritual in connection with them consisted of the sacred dance, we need not gather from the silence of the Old Testament that it did not take place."³

The suggestion here made is that in the name En-dor there may be a reminiscence of the ritual encircling dance which at one time was performed at "the spring of Dor." This proper name occurs three times in the Old Testament, with variation of spelling (Josh. xvii, 11 עֵין דֹּר, 1 Sam. xxviii, 7 ע' דֹּר, Ps. lxxxiii, 11 ע' דֹּר)

Now the root דֹּר is cognate with the Arabic root دَار (dāra), whose primary meaning is "went, moved, turned in a circle."⁴ This root is used in the first and ninth forms of "encircling" the Ka'aba at Mecca, and دَوَّار (duwār^{un}) is the name of "a certain idol which the Arabs set up, and around it they made a space, round which they turned or circled,"⁵ and الدَّوَّار (al-duwwāru) and الدَّوَّار (al-dawwāru) also signify the Ka'aba,⁶ i.e. that which is encircled. The original meaning of דֹּר also is "to move in a circle, go about, surround."⁷ Is

¹ See W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Sacred Dance*, p. 37.

² *Ibid.*, p. 88.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

⁴ Lane, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.*, I, iii, p. 930.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 931.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 932. Cf. Wellhausen, *Reste Arabischen Heidenthums*, p. 106 (1887).

⁷ Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebr. Eng. Lex.*, p. 189. Cf. Payne-Smith, *Thes. Syr.*, I, 850, where דֹּר (dūr) = circumvīt ; further p. 851 ; דֹּר (dūrā) processio, pompa ecclesiastica.

it possible, then, that the name En-dor really means "spring of encircling," and that the spring was a sacred one, the name retaining a reminiscence of the ritual encircling dance which was once performed there ?

In the narrative in 1 Sam. xxviii. we are told that the "medium" whom Saul consulted was to be found at En-dor. Was it merely fortuitous that she should have taken up her abode at this spot ? May it not rather have been the case that she chose to practise her art at a spot which could claim ancient sacred associations, in the neighbourhood of a spring which tradition held to be sacred ? In verse 7 Saul commands his servants, "Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit," etc. His servants have no need to "seek"—the "medium" of En-dor is well-known to them. Was her reputation due, not so much to her known success as a "medium," as to the fact that she was to be found near this old sacred spring, around which at one time, we may believe, ritual dancing may have been performed ?

THE MEANING OF THE NAME HAMMOTH-DOR.

BY D. WINTON THOMAS.

IN a recent number of this Journal,¹ I suggested that the meaning of the name *Eu-dor* was "well of encircling," and that the name preserved a reminiscence of the ritual dance which may have been performed at one time round the well. It is possible that the place-name *Hammoth-dor* (חַמַּת דֹּר), occurring only in Josh. 21, 32, is to be explained similarly.

Assuming that דֹּר is to be translated "encircling,"² the first element of the compound חַמַּת דֹּר is capable of two interpretations, according to the root from which it may be supposed to be derived. The place-name *Hamath* on the Orontes is derived by Robertson Smith³ from a root חָמַי, which is unused in Biblical Hebrew,⁴ but which may be supposed to mean "to protect, guard," as a comparison with the Arabic حَمَى (*hamā*) shows⁵ (hence חוֹמָה "wall," as *protection*).⁶ From this root חָמַי "is derived *hima*, a sacred enclosure or *temenos*."⁷ If the first element in חַמַּת דֹּר be connected with this root, the name will mean "sacred enclosure of encircling," i.e., a sacred spot or sanctuary where ritual dancing or circumambulation was at one time performed.⁸

¹ October, 1933, pp. 205-6.

² *Ibid.*, where the philological argument for דֹּר "encircling" may be found.

³ *Religion of the Semites*, 3rd ed. (ed. S. A. Cook), p. 150, and footnote 2; see also Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebr. Lex.*, p. 333.

⁴ Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 327.

⁵ Lane, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.*, 651 حَمَى "prohibit, protect, defend, guard"; cf. Hava, *Arab.-Eng. Dict.*, p. 145—and derivatives *ad loc.* In Neo-Syriac ܡܫܬܐܡܝܢ means *custodivit*, see Payne Smith, *Thes. Syr.*, vol. 1, p. 1302, and derivatives *ad loc.*; cf. C. Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.* (2nd ed.), p. 239. In later Hebrew ִשְׁמַר, originally "to surround guard," means "to observe, see" (Jastrow, *Dict. of the Targ., etc.*, p. 476).

⁶ Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 327.

⁷ W. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

⁸ For the circuit round the sanctuary, see W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Sacred Dance*, p. 94f.

It is possible, however, that **הַמֶּת דָּאָר** is to be identified with the place-names **הַמֶּת** (only in Josh. 19, 35) and **הַמֶּזֶן** (1 Chron. 6, 61). Both these names may be derived from **חַמֵּם** "to be hot," and both perhaps mean "hot spring."* Should **הַמֶּת דָּאָר** be interpreted in the same way, the name will mean "hot springs of encircling." That hot springs are to this day in Palestine regarded as in some way sacred (their heat and curative powers being attributed to the activity of an indwelling spirit) is well known.¹⁰ It is not impossible then that the name perpetuates the custom of the sacred dance which may have been performed round the waters as part of the ritual done in honour of the spirit who was invoked to keep up the fire and heat the waters. Whichever derivation we may prefer for **הַמֶּת**, the connection between encircling and a sacred spot on the one hand, and with sacred waters on the other, constitutes perhaps sufficient ground for seeing in this place-name another relic of the sacred dance in ancient Israel.

* So Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 329. The Talmudic place-name **הַמֶּת דָּאָר** is said also to mean "hot springs" (Jastrow, *op. cit.*, p. 481; cf. Levy, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.*, II, p. 69f). The Arabic root **حَمَّ** (*hamma*) "become hot" (of water) is very common—in the fourth and tenth forms it means "to wash with hot water"; **حَمَّة** means a "hot spring" by means of which the diseased seek to cure themselves, and **حَمَّام** means "a hot bath" (Lane, *op. cit.*, p. 635f). In Syriac **ܠܚܡܐ** means *caluit*; **ܠܚܡܐܝܬܐ** "thermæ, aquæ calidæ, balneum," and **ܠܚܡܐܝܬܐ** is given as "*nom. loci prope Sebarcham sic dicti forte propter aquas calidas*" (Payne Smith, *op. cit.*, I, p. 1296f).

¹⁰ See S. I. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, p. 89, who refers to the hot springs of Callirhoe as to-day being "regarded as being under the control of a saint (*weli*) or spirit (*jinn*), who makes the fire and keeps it burning" (see notes *ad loc.*). Josephus calls the hot springs of Tiberias **Ἀμματοὺς** "which is perhaps Hammath (i.e., 'the Hot Spring')." A. Bertholet, *A History of Hebrew Civilization*, p. 18; Joseph. *B.J.* IV, 11, *Antiq.*, XVIII, 36, ed. Niese. Further on the hot springs of Tiberias, see G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 450f.

Naphath-Dor : A Hill Sanctuary ?

By D. Winton Thomas

IN two previous numbers of this Journal, I suggested that in the place-names En-dor and Hammoth-dor some reminiscence of ritual dancing which at one time took place in these localities is preserved.¹ It is possible that the place-name Naphath-dor may be explained along similar lines.

This name (נַפְתַּח דּוֹר) occurs in Josh. XII, 23, I. Kings IV, 11, (נֶגֶד דָּאָר), and in Josh. XI, 2, where the plural form נְפִיֹת דָּאָר occurs. In each case the R.V. renders by "the height(s) of Dor," while the A.V. translates variously: "the coast, region or borders of Dor." That the R.V. is correct in translating the first element in this place-name by "height(s)" is shown by a comparison with Arabic. The word نَفْثَة comes from نَفَثَ²

¹ See *Quarterly Statement*, Oct. 1933, p. 205; July 1934, p. 147. In the former the philological argument for נֶגֶד "to encircle (a sacred object)" is given.

² Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebr. Eng. Lex.*, p. 632.

which is cognate with the Arabic **نُوف** (*nūf*) "to overtop"¹; **نِيَاف** (*niyāf*) means *imminens pars montis*², and **مُنِيف** *munif* is used of a mountain or building in the sense of "high, lofty."³ Ben Yehuda⁴ explains **נָפֶה** in these passages by **רְמָה**, **גְּבָה**, while the sense of height is seen again in the later Hebrew word **נוף**, which means "bough, treetop."⁵

We may therefore translate Naphath-dor by "height of encircling," the name indicating some hill sanctuary where ritual dancing was performed either round the altar or some other sacred object which we may suppose to have been erected there.⁶ In this connection we recall the ritual dancing of the prophets of Baal who "leaped about the altar" on Mount Carmel—(I. Kings XVIII, 26.)⁷

The fact that in all three place-names compounded with **דֹּר** (**דָּאֵר**)—En-dor, Hammoth-dor, Naphath-dor—the first element indicates an object which was commonly associated in ancient Israel with religious ceremonies, viz., a spring, a sacred enclosure (or perhaps hot springs⁸), and a height would seem to lend support to the suggestion that **דֹּר** in these names indicates "ritual encircling" and to the belief that at these places the sacred dance formed an essential part of worship.

¹ Freytag, *Arab. Eng. Lex.*, iv, 353.

² *Ibid.*, 354.

³ Lane, *Arab. Eng. Lex.*, p. 3039; cf. Ps. xlviii, 3, where Mount Zion is described as **נָפֶה** **נָּה**: "beautiful in elevation."

⁴ *Thesaurus totius hebraicitatis*, p. 3716.

⁵ Levy, *Neuhebr. u. chald. Worterb.*, iii, 362; M. Jastrow, *Dict. of the Targumim, etc.*, p. 889.

⁶ For the ritual dance round a sacred object, see W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Sacred Dance*, p. 88f.

⁷ The worship of these prophets was of course Phoenician, but we may justifiably see in it a reflection of Israelite usage. See Oesterley, *op. cit.* p. 113; cf. also Elijah's use of the word **פָּסַח** in verse 21.

⁸ *Quarterly Statement*, loc. cit.

Proverbs XX 26

מִזְרָה וְשָׁעִים מְלִיךְ חָכָם וַיֵּשֶׁב עָלֵיהֶם אוֹפֶן :

THE phrase *וַיֵּשֶׁב עָלֵיהֶם אוֹפֶן* 'and bringeth the wheel over them' has been generally explained as a method of punishment¹, or as the bringing back of the wheel of fortune against the wicked², again with the suggestion of punishment. If, however, as is very likely, the wheel is that of the threshing-cart³, the *עֲגֻלָּה*, whose rollers were fitted with sharp iron wheels (cf. *אוֹפֶן עֲגֻלָּה*, which stands in parallelism with *תִּרְוֹץ* in Isa. xxviii. 27), then another explanation becomes possible, namely, that the phrase refers to the process of threshing, which is then parallel to the process of winnowing in *a*. The meaning seems to be that, just as in *a* a wise king winnows the wicked, that is, separates bad men from good men, as a countryman separates the grain from the chaff, so in *b* does he turn the threshing-wheel over them, that is, he separates bad men from good men, as a countryman separates the grain from the straw. The king is thus portrayed in *b*, not as a castigator, who uses an instrument of punishment but as a shrewd scrutineer, who can discriminate between good and evil men⁴ (cf. xx. 8). The proposed emendation of *אוֹפֶן* to *אוֹזֶם* 'their strength'⁵ is accordingly unnecessary, and, moreover, it robs *b* of its parallelism with *a*.

The Syriac *ʾūphānā* 'wheel'⁶ seems not yet to have found its way into the Hebrew dictionaries. If for *אוֹפֶן* a root *אפן* is to be postulated, perhaps *פָּנָה* 'turned', and *אֶפֶן* 'wheel' (Jer. xviii. 3) may be linked together, and the basic meaning of *אפן* may have been 'turned'⁷. The Arabic version in *b* has *wa-sabbaba lahum*

¹ So C. H. TOY, *The Book of Proverbs* (I.C.C.), p. 395; B. GEMSER, *Sprüche Salomos*, 2nd ed., 1963, p. 79; BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *A Heb. and Eng. Lex.*, p. 66. Similarly Rashi.

² G. R. DRIVER, *Biblica*, xxxii, 1951, p. 184 ('turn the tables upon them').

³ So TOY, *loc. cit.*; B-D-B, *loc. cit.*, Ibn Ezra, *R.V.* For descriptions and illustrations, see W. NOWACK, *Lehrb. d. hebr. Arch.*, p. 233, and I. BENZINGER, *Hebr. Arch.*, 3rd ed., 1927, p. 145.

⁴ W. FRANKENBERG, *Die Sprüche*, p. 119, rightly equates *וַיִּרְוֹץ* in this passage with *וַיִּקְרֹץ* 'search, examine.' The phrase in *b* is not so very different in meaning from *וַיִּקְרֹץ*.

⁵ So, e.g., G. BEER in KITTEL, *Bibl. Hebr.* 3 *ad loc.*; GEMSER, *loc. cit.* (following GRÄTZ); cf. *Ps.* xciv. 23. The M.T. is supported by Sept., Targ. and Pesh.

⁶ PAYNE SMITH, *Thes. Syr.*, 346; C. BROCKELMANN, *Lex. Syr.*, 2nd ed., p. 41.

⁷ Cf. B-D-B, *loc. cit.* H. TORCZYNER suggests a connection with *אָפֶן* (*Z.D.M.G.* lxx, 1916, p. 556).

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

jardan 'and caused for them exile', אִזְקֶן being evidently connected with Arabic *faniya* 'passed, vanished, away'⁸. The Vulgate's *et incurvat super eos fornecem* gives to אִזְקֶן the meaning 'arch, vault'. The word *fornix* is found elsewhere in the Vulgate only in 1 Sam. xv. 12⁹, where נָד is translated *fornicem triumphalem*. It would seem that in this passage in Proverbs, the Vulgate's *fornix* is based upon אִזְקֶן as if it were derived from a verb meaning 'turned' (זָאָן זָפָנָה). The English word 'vault' is derived from the Latin *volvere* 'to turn'.

D. WINTON THOMAS

⁸ In the fourth form *'afnāhu* 'he caused him to vanish away'; LANE, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.* 2451.

⁹ According to F. P. DUTRIPON, *Concord. Bibl. Sacr. Vulg. Editionis*, 1844, p. 534.

KELEBH 'DOG': ITS ORIGIN AND SOME USAGES
OF IT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT ¹⁾

by

D. WINTON THOMAS

Cambridge

This paper, as its title indicates, consists of two parts. In the first — the shorter — part I shall consider the origin of the Hebrew word כָּלֵב 'dog', and I shall indicate where I believe its most likely origin is to be found. And in the second part of the paper I shall discuss some usages of כָּלֵב in the Old Testament which are, I think, of considerable interest when they are studied in the light of available comparative material.

To begin with, two preliminary remarks about the word כָּלֵב. First, it occurs also in Akkadian, Phoenician, Ugaritic, Arabic, Aramaic and Syriac, and Ethiopic ²⁾. It is thus *gemeinsemitisch*, very probably *ursemitisch* ³⁾. And secondly, classical Hebrew has no feminine form כָּלֵבָה, though Akkadian, Ugaritic, Arabic, Aramaic and Syriac, and post-biblical Hebrew possess it ⁴⁾, and Egyptian has the word *kmb-t*, which is said to be the equivalent of *klb-t* ⁵⁾. The absence of the feminine form from the vocabulary of ancient Hebrew is doubtless purely accidental, unless we care to think that, in the case of כָּלֵב, as in the case of some other names of animals, like גָּמֶל 'camel',

¹⁾ A paper delivered to the Society for Old Testament Study, on 21 July 1959, in Glasgow.

²⁾ See the Hebrew dictionaries. For Ugaritic, see G. R. DRIVER, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, p. 145b.

³⁾ Cp. G. BERGSTRÄSSER, *Einführung in die semit. Sprachen*, p. 183.

⁴⁾ W. MUSS-ARNOLT, *A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language*, p. 384; G. R. DRIVER, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*; LANE, *Arab.-Engl. Lex.*, 2625; G. H. DALMAN, *Aram.-Neuhebr. Wörterb.*, p. 188; PAYNE SMITH, *Thes. Syr.*, 1742; J. LEVY, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.*, ii, p. 329. For masc. and fem. forms as proper names in South Arabic, see G. RYCKMANS, *Les noms propres sud-sémitiques*, i, p. 114.

⁵⁾ A. EMBER, in *Oriental studies published in commemoration of the 40th. anniversary (1883-1923) of Paul Haupt as Director of the Oriental Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University*, Baltimore (ed. C. ADLER and A. EMBER), 1926, p. 311. Cp. M. COHEN, *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*, 1947, p. 115.

the two genders were expressed by the same word in the masculine form ¹⁾).

According to CHEYNE ²⁾ and BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS ³⁾, the origin of the word כֶּלֶב is unknown. Attempts have to be sure been made from time to time to explain its origin. I may mention first the French Protestant pastor Samuel BOCHART (1599-1667), who, in his *Hierozoicon* ⁴⁾, devotes several columns to the word כֶּלֶב. Some, he says, without specifying who, explain the word as meaning *quasi cor* (i.e. faithful), i.e., כֶּלֶב; others explain as *totum cor*, i.e., כָּל לֵב, while others again explain as *sicut leo*, i.e., כֶּלֶבִּיא. All these explanations he rightly dismisses, as being not so much the origins of the word as what he calls *frigidae allusiones* to it. His own explanation is hardly more acceptable. It is that כֶּלֶב may have been so called from the strength of its teeth, which hold so firmly in biting that they could seem like hooks or forceps, or iron fetters, and he compares the Arabic كَلْبَان or كَلَابَات ⁵⁾. He adds, however, 'unless you prefer forceps and hooks and fetters as named from a dog'. We may reply — we do so prefer. כֶּלֶב was not, we may believe, derived from a word meaning forceps and the like. The reverse is the case — these latter received their names from כֶּלֶב (كَلَب).

BOCHART, as I have just mentioned, refers to some who think that כֶּלֶב is to be explained as כָּלֶב, the *kaph* being the *kaph* of comparison. C. J. BALL, in the *Hilprecht Anniversary Volume* ⁶⁾, offers an explanation along similar lines. His suggestion is that the origin of כֶּלֶב is a biliteral כֶּב and a root-formative *kaph*, which is identical with the *kaph* of comparison. According to him, the element כֶּב is the equivalent of

¹⁾ Cp. C. BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss d. vergleich. Gramm. d. semit. Sprachen*, i, p. 418. But, unlike כָּלֶב, the word כֶּלֶב, where it is construed with a verb, always takes the masc. form of the verb. In Greek κύων is used as masc. and fem. in Homer, though the masculine form predominates (see LIDDELL and SCOTT, rev. H. STUART JONES, *A Greek-Engl. Lex.*, p. 1015).

²⁾ *Encycl. Biblica*, i, 1124.

³⁾ *Heb. and Engl. Lex. of the O.T.*, p. 476.

⁴⁾ The full title is *Hierozoicon sive bipertitum opus de animalibus sacrae scripturae, Pars prior*, London, 1663. The reference is to Col. 662 (in the edition of 1793 the reference is to vol. i, p. 759).

⁵⁾ See LANE, *op. cit.*, 2627.

⁶⁾ 1909, pp. 41-56

of the Sumerian *luba* 'fox', so that כ־לֹב means 'fox (jackal)-like', and he compares the Assyrian *še-libu*, *še-labu* 'fox' ¹⁾. In BALL's article, which is valuable for the study of biliteral roots in Hebrew ²⁾, פֶּלֶב is but one of fourteen words which are explained as compounds of a biliteral root and *kaph*. We may admit that the list of words, taken together, is indeed impressive. We may admit further the possibility of a root-formative *kaph* ³⁾. On the other hand, the identification of this *kaph* with the *kaph* of comparison remains an open question. And the introduction of a Sumerian word in part explanation of פֶּלֶב is an unnecessary complication, for, as will appear later, the most probable origin of פֶּלֶב is independent of Sumerian. BALL himself indeed does not regard his explanation of פֶּלֶב as the only possible one. For he mentions also as possible the meaning 'lion-like', i.e., פֶּלֶב־יָא, an explanation which, as I mentioned earlier, BOCHART notes and rejects.

I turn now to the lexicons of GESENIUS-BUHL ⁴⁾ and KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER ⁵⁾. Both refer פֶּלֶב to an Arabic root كَلَبَ, which is said to mean 'seized'. The dog, that is, is a rapacious, attacking animal. It is, however, not very clear how the meaning 'seized' for كَلَبَ is obtained. KAZIMIRSKI ⁶⁾ gives as the first meaning of كَلَبَ 'stitched' (e.g., a leather purse); then comes the meaning 'spurred on' (a horse), and then 'barked'. The dictionaries of FREYTAG ⁷⁾ and HAVA ⁸⁾ are in general agreement with the meanings attributed by KAZIMIRSKI to the Arabic verb. Arabic lexicography is notoriously difficult, and one hazards opinions in this field in full consciousness of the peril involved. But it may be suggested that كَلَبَ in all the three meanings given to it by KAZIMIRSKI is a denominative from كَلَب 'dog'. The meaning 'stitched' is suggestive of the dog-stitch —

¹⁾ P. 53.

²⁾ Cp. G. R. DRIVER, *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System*, pp. 4f.; C. F. BURNLEY, *The Book of Judges*, pp. xiii, xvi.

³⁾ With Akkadian *tāru* 'return' and Hebrew *tūr* 'go round', the Hebrew *kittār* 'surrounded' may be compared (see DRIVER, *op. cit.*, p. 5; BURNLEY, *op. cit.*, p. 69). BALL, *op. cit.*, p. 54, explains כ־תָר as 'bind-like' (Sumerian *dar* 'bind').

⁴⁾ P. 346.

⁵⁾ P. 436.

⁶⁾ *Dict. arabe-français*, ii, p. 920.

⁷⁾ *Lex. arab-lat.*, iv, p. 51.

⁸⁾ *Arab.-Engl. Dict.*, p. 662.

in late Hebrew **קָלַב** in the Pi. and Hiph. means 'made stitches resembling dog-bites'¹⁾; a spur is suggestive of dog's teeth; and 'barked' is to make the noise a dog makes. If this suggestion is correct, we should hesitate before we accept the correctness of referring **קָלַב** to the Arabic root **كَلَبَ**. The form **كَلِبَ** also occurs in Arabic. LANE²⁾ gives it the meaning 'was seized with madness' — the madness itself is called **كَلَب** — and it is used of dogs and men. It can also mean 'was angry', and in the first and tenth forms 'barked'. Here again the Arabic root seems to be a denominative from **كَلَب** 'dog', and is not the root from which **كَلَب** 'dog' is to be derived. The corresponding form in Syriac, **ܟܠܒܐ** 'behaved like a dog, was rabid', is rightly regarded by PAYNE SMITH³⁾ as a denominative from **ܟܠܒܐ** 'dog'.

I mentioned earlier that, according to BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, the origin of the word **קָלַב** is unknown. The remark is, however, added, that according to the *Thesaurus*, it is onomatopoeic. When we turn to the *Thesaurus*⁴⁾, we find that GESENIUS postulates an unused root **קָלַב**, which is onomatopoeic, imitating the sound of striking (*pulsandi*) or rattling (*crepandi*), the sort of sound which is suggested by the word 'clap'. In this connection GESENIUS mentions another unused Hebrew root, namely, **קָלַח** 'strike', to which he refers the word **קִלְפוֹת** 'axe' in Ps. lxxiv 6. He further compares the German *klappen* 'strike together, clap, rattle', and *kläffen* 'bark', as well as the use in German of *anschlagen* 'strike upon' as it is applied to a dog barking. The French *clapir* 'squeak' and *clabauder* 'bay' (of a hound), and the Swedish *glaffa* 'bark' too are mentioned. The word **קָלַב** 'dog' is thus, according to GESENIUS, onomatopoeic in origin, and this is, I believe, its most likely origin⁵⁾. GESENIUS incidentally confirms what was said earlier, namely, that the Arabic **كَلَبَ** and the Syriac **ܟܠܒܐ** are secondary. In other languages too the word for 'dog' goes back in

¹⁾ M. JASTROW, *A Dict. of the Targ., etc.*, i, p. 639.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, 2624 f. Cp. KAZIMIRSKI and HAVA, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

³⁾ *A Compendious Syriac Dict.*, p. 215.

⁴⁾ P. 684.

⁵⁾ Cp. F. J. V. D. MAURER, *Comment. gramm. histor. crit. in V.T.*, 1838, iii, p. 49. *Contra* J. FÜRST, *Hebr. u. Chald. Handwörterb.*, i, p. 593.

origin to onomatopoeia. In Egyptian, for example, one word for 'dog' is *iw*, which is perhaps the etymological equivalent of the Hebrew *יא* 'jackal' ¹⁾, literally 'howler', itself probably onomatopoeic ²⁾. In English too the word 'dog' is of dubious origin ³⁾, but it has been suggested that it is onomatopoeic in origin ⁴⁾. As we use the word 'bark' to describe, onomatopoeically, the noise a dog makes, so Hebrew used the word *נִבַּח* ⁵⁾, just as did Akkadian, Arabic, Aramaic and Syriac, and Ethiopic.

I come now to the second part of my paper, to some usages of *פֶּלֶב* in the Old Testament. The use of *עֶבֶד* 'servant' in addressing others, whether they be equals or superiors, is too familiar to call for illustration ⁶⁾. In one passage, however, namely, 2 Kings viii 13, *עֶבֶד* is followed by *הַפֶּלֶב*. The speaker is Hazael, and in expressing doubts to Elisha on the great acts he would perform according to the prophet's utterance, he says — 'What is thy servant who is but a dog, that he should do this great thing?' When he uses the phrase 'What is thy servant who is but a dog?', *מָה עֶבְדִּי הַפֶּלֶב*, Hazael compares himself, in self-depreciation, with the vile and contemptible animal, the dog, the scavenger *par excellence*. Two and a half centuries after Hazael, the same phrase is found in the Lachish ostraca, certainly in three cases ⁷⁾, except that the writer, who is writing to his superior officer, the governor of Lachish, uses *מי* instead of *מָה* and *פֶּלֶב* instead of *הַפֶּלֶב*. Some five hundred years before Hazael we find in the Amarna letters the combination *ardu kalbu* 'the slave, the dog', or *kalbu* 'dog' alone, applied both to the writer himself as an expression of deference ⁸⁾, and to others as a term of invective ⁹⁾ (like *אָטֹאן* ¹⁰⁾

¹⁾ See E. KÖNIG, *Hebr. u. Aram. Wörterb.*, p. 14; A. ERMAN and H. GRAPOW, *Wörterb. d. aegypt. Sprache*, i, p. 48.

²⁾ Cp. J. FÜRST, *op. cit.*, i, p. 65.

³⁾ So W. W. SKEAT, *An Etymol. Dict. of the Engl. Language*, p. 178, and *The Oxford Engl. Dict.*, iii, p. 577.

⁴⁾ Cp. E. PARTRIDGE, *Origins*, p. 162.

⁵⁾ According to GESENIUS, *Thesaurus*, p. 842, the primary syllable is *בַּח* with the meaning *pulsandi*.

⁶⁾ For examples, see BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, p. 714b.

⁷⁾ In II. 3f., V. 3f., VI. 2f. See H. TORCZYNER, *The Lachish Letters*, *ad loc.* The occurrences in VII. 2 and IX. 2f. are doubtful.

⁸⁾ J. A. KNUDZON, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, No. 60, 6f., 61. 2f. See further Index, iii, p. 1432.

⁹⁾ E. g. No. 71. 17f., 75. 41f., 85.64.

¹⁰⁾ See LIDDELL and SCOTT, *op. cit.*, p. 1015.

and *canis* ¹⁾). The expression is but one of many which the writers of the letters employ to indicate their inferior standing *vis-a-vis* the Pharaoh whom they are addressing. For example, they refer to themselves as 'the dust of thy feet' ²⁾, 'the dirt upon which thou treadest' ³⁾, 'thy stable groom' ⁴⁾, and so on. Even earlier than the Amarna period, we find *kalbu* as a term of abuse at Mari ⁵⁾. Later, in the seventh century B.C., Adad-šum-ušur employs similar language in writing to Esarhaddon ⁶⁾. Such terminology, stretching from c. 2000 B.C. at Mari to c. 590 B.C. at Lachish, is thus characteristic of ancient Near Eastern epistolary style. The sole occurrence of it in the Old Testament, and in speech, not in a letter, is not without its special interest. If the word כְּלִבִּיָּא at Elephantine means 'dog-like', and is a term of abuse applied to Waidrang ⁷⁾, it too will belong here. The Aramaic text is, however, obscure, and no completely satisfactory explanation of it has yet been proposed.

In comparatively modern times, and from another part of the world, there comes an interesting parallel to the application of 'dog' to oneself by a person of inferior station. In Robert Knox's *An Historical Relation of Ceylon*, first published in 1681 ⁸⁾, the author says that, when the inhabitants "speak to the king concerning themselves, they do not speak in the first person, and say I did so or so, but Baulagot the limb of a Dog did it or will do it. And when they speak of their Children unto the King, they call them Puppies. As if he asks them how many Children they have, they say so many Puppy-dogs, and so many Puppy-bitches. By which by the way, we may conjecture at the height of the King and the slavery of the People under him". ⁹⁾. I need hardly add that I am not claiming any relationship between ancient Near Eastern and Ceylonese practice. The parallel shows us

¹⁾ See *Thes. Ling. Lat.*, iii, p. 258.

²⁾ E.g. No. 60.3, 136.3.

³⁾ E.g., No. 213.5, 255.5.

⁴⁾ E.g., No. 299.6, 303.6.

⁵⁾ G. DOSSIN, *Archives royales de Mari*, I, No. 27, l. 28.

⁶⁾ E. DHORME, *Rev. de l'Hist. des Rel.*, cxiii (1936), pp. 127ff.

⁷⁾ See J. BARTH, *ZA* xxi (1908), p. 190; E. SACHAU, *Aram. Papyri. u. Ostraka*, p. 16; A. COWLEY, *Aram. Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, p. 116.

⁸⁾ I quote from the edition published as Vol. vi, July 1956 to April 1957, Nos. 1-4, of *The Ceylon Historical Journal*.

⁹⁾ *Ibid*, p. 169; cp. p. 61. Their low view of the dog is illustrated by their avoidance of being called by names which they had in infancy when they are grown up "which they say is to be like unto Dogs" (p. 151), and by their blackening their teeth by eating betel leaves, "for they abhor white Teeth, saying, That is like a Dog" (p. 160).

no more than the appearance of common thought forms among different peoples in different places at different times.

While the use of עֲבָדִי 'thy servant' by itself expresses self-abasement, real or polite¹⁾, the phrase עֲבָדִי הַכֶּלֶב, we may suppose, heightens the force of that expression. A further progressive heightening is to be seen in the phrase מֵת כֶּלֶב 'dead dog', which is found three times in the Old Testament. In 1 Sam. xxiv 15 David, in order to impress Saul with his importance and with the senselessness of Saul's persecution of him, asks, 'After whom dost thou pursue? after a dead dog (מֵת כֶּלֶב), after a flea?' (In parenthesis I would ask — is there current proverbial speech behind this question, as there is elsewhere in the Old Testament where 'dog' is mentioned? ²⁾). Again, in 2 Sam. ix 8 Mephibosheth, wishing to show how unworthy he felt of the great gifts of the king, asks of David — 'What is thy servant, that thou shouldest look upon a dead dog (הַכֶּלֶב הַמֵּת) such as I?'. And in 2 Sam. xvi 9 the reference this time is not to the speaker, but to another person. Shimei has been cursing David, and Abishai is moved to ask David — 'Why should this dead dog (הַכֶּלֶב הַמֵּת הַזֶּה) curse my lord the king?' To these three passages in the Hebrew Bible a fourth would have to be added if we follow LXX^L in 2 Kings viii 13, the passage to which I referred earlier. In the Hebrew text we have מָה עֲבָדִי הַכֶּלֶב. In LXX^L we find ὁ κύων ὁ τεθνηκώς³⁾, i.e., הַכֶּלֶב הַמֵּת⁴⁾.

CHEYNE⁵⁾, commenting on הַכֶּלֶב הַמֵּת הַזֶּה 'this dead dog' in 2 Sam. xvi 9, cites LXX^L which has ὁ κύων ὁ ἐπικατάρατος 'this cursed dog'⁶⁾, and he goes on to say that 'this dead dog', which "has hitherto been plausibly taken as an Oriental exaggeration", cannot be right. He

¹⁾ For some useful remarks on the formula of self-abasement, see I. LANDE, *Formelhafte Wendungen der Umgangssprache im A.T.*, pp. 74 ff.; further, E. KÖNIG, *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik, etc.*, p. 72, and generally C. LINDHAGEN, *The Servant Motif in the O. T.*, pp. 11ff.

²⁾ As in Koh. ix 4b. The proverb is found among the Arabs كلب حتى خير (see MAURER, *op. cit.*, iv, 352). Also in Exod. xi 7.

³⁾ P. DE LAGARDE, *Librorum veteris testamenti canonicorum, Pars prior, ad loc.*

⁴⁾ This reading is adopted by some commentators; see C. F. BURNES, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, p. 294.

⁵⁾ *Op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

⁶⁾ I. AGARDE, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.* So also Theodotion, in FIELD, *Orig. Hexapl.*, *ad loc.*

accordingly wishes to emend מֵת in this passage, and in 1 Sam. xxiv 15 and 2 Sam. ix 8, to טִמְאָה 'unclean, despised, pariah dog'. Two arguments, however, tell against CHEYNE's contention. In the first place, the 'cursed' of LXX^L in 2 Sam. xvi 9 does not necessarily imply a different reading from the Massoretic text. It need be no more than a paraphrase — a dead body is an unclean thing. And secondly, it is pertinent to recall that in 2 Kings viii 13, as I have already mentioned, LXX^L presupposes הֵמָּה after הַכָּלָב where the Hebrew text has not got it. It would seem accordingly that the evidence of LXX^L cannot be utilised to cast doubt upon the possibility of a phrase מֵת כָּלָב. In any case, all doubt is removed since the phrase *kalbu mitu*, the exact equivalent of מֵת כָּלָב, appears in a number of Akkadian texts, several of them from correspondents, named or unnamed, to Ashurbanipal. For example, Bel-ibni writes to the king — 'I who was but a dead dog, the son of a nobody' ¹). Again, Belibki and the Gambulians write to him — 'We were dead dogs (but) the king our lord has restored us to life' ²). An unnamed writer writes — 'the man Labnu, the son of Labni, has been a dead dog' ³), and another — 'Nabuaddan is a dead dog' ⁴). Lastly, an anonymous writer writes to an anonymous addressee — 'I who was a dead dog have been restored to life by the king my lord' ⁵). The expression 'dead dog' is stronger than merely 'dog'. A dog is a vile, contemptible, animal. A dead dog is more vile and more contemptible, and, like all dead bodies, unclean into the bargain. It is very strong language of self-abasement or invective.

A most interesting Hebrew phrase occurs in 2 Sam. iii 8. The situation is briefly this. Abner had gone into Saul's concubine, Rizpah, which was "an act of *lèse majesté*, as the harem of a king was the property of his successor" ⁶) (cp. xii 8, xvi 22), and Abner's act was conceived accordingly as tantamount to a claim to the throne. When Ishbosheth takes Abner to task for his action — 'Wherefore hast thou gone in unto my father's concubine?' (verse 7) — Abner, angrily and indignantly, and profoundly contemptuous, replies — הֲרֹאשׁ כָּלָב

¹) L. WATERMAN, *Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire*, No. 521, Obv. 1.6.

²) *Ibid.*, No. 771, Obv. II. 5f.

³) *Ibid.*, No. 1285, Obv. I. 13.

⁴) *Ibid.*, No. 1289, Rev. 1.4.

⁵) *Ibid.*, No. 831, Obv. II. 5f.

⁶) W. H. BENNETT, in PEAKE's *Commentary on the Bible*, p. 287.

אֹזֶנִי 'Am I a dog's head?' These words are followed in the Massoretic text by לְיְהוּדָה אֲשֶׁר 'belonging to Judah', and this phrase is thought by many scholars to be a gloss¹⁾. The phrase is not found in the LXX, and is thought to have been occasioned by the interpretation of רֹאשׁ כָּלֵב as רֹאשׁ כָּלֵב 'a chief of Caleb', the intention of the gloss being to make clear to what tribe the Calebites belonged. The interpretation of כָּלֵב as כָּלֵב has indeed been maintained by some modern scholars, for example, H. WINCKLER²⁾, but has met with adverse criticism³⁾, and we need not consider it further here. Other scholars, keeping the translation 'a dog's head', regard the phrase as an expression of the most worthless part of an animal held in general contempt⁴⁾. Another explanation of the phrase is to see in רֹאשׁ the equivalent of the Arabic رَأْس 'head' in the sense of 'a head of cattle' (*rēṣu* in Akkadian and راس in Syriac are used similarly)⁵⁾. The phrase רֹאשׁ כָּלֵב then means 'a single dog'. This is the explanation of C. F. SEYBOLD⁶⁾, who compares 2 Kings vi 25, where, he thinks, רֹאשׁ חֲמֹר does not mean 'an ass's head', but 'a single ass'⁷⁾. With regard to 1 Sam. xxiv 15 — 'After whom dost thou pursue? after a dead dog, after a flea?' — SEYBOLD argues that רֹאשׁ is omitted with כָּלֵב because it is further determined by מֵת, whereas with פֶּרֶעַשׁ the use of רֹאשׁ would be unsuitable, and so אֶחָד is used. This seems a strange argument. It would appear quite gratuitous to suppose that in this passage the word רֹאשׁ was ever in the mind of the Hebrew writer, and the importing of it into the passage by SEYBOLD would appear to owe its origin to his proposed explanation of רֹאשׁ כָּלֵב in 2. Sam iii 8 and his desire to find support for it elsewhere. The phrases מֵת כָּלֵב and פֶּרֶעַשׁ אֶחָד, where אֶחָד probably has the meaning 'a single (flea)', can

¹⁾ See, e.g., W. NOWACK, *Richter, Ruth u. Bücher Samuelis*, p. 161; H. P. SMITH, *The Books of Samuel* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 276. S. R. DRIVER, however, thinks the supposition of a gloss is doubtful (*Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, p. 247).

²⁾ *Geschichte Israels*, i. p. 25.

³⁾ E.g., from E. MEYER, *Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*, p. 408, n. 2, and E. KÖNIG, *Stilistik, etc.*, p. 71.

⁴⁾ E.g. E. KÖNIG, *ibid.*, loc. cit.

⁵⁾ Cp. Lat. *caput*.

⁶⁾ *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag* (2 März 1906) gewidmet. . . ., ii, pp. 759f.

⁷⁾ So also F. ZORELL, *Lex. Hebr. et Aram. V.T.*, p. 749b.

surely stand quite satisfactorily as parallels in worthlessness. We may have some doubts too as to the application of ראש in the sense of a single unit to dogs. In Arabic رأس is generally applied to sheep, goats, and horses ¹⁾ (cp. Lat. *capita boum*), that is, to domesticated animals. The dog in ancient Israel was hardly a domesticated animal, and the use of ראש to denote a single dog seems improbable. As for SEYBOLD's view that ראש חמור, which, according to 2 Kings vi 25, sold during the famine in Samaria for eighty pieces of silver, means 'a single ass', it may be recalled that Plutarch ²⁾ relates that the troops of Artaxerxes, in their campaign against the Cadusians, could find no provisions, and were forced to kill their beasts of burden and eat them. The beasts, so the text runs, became so scarce that an ass's head was sold for sixty drachmas. The phrase ראש חמור means, we may believe, an ass's head, which fetched a high price in time of scarcity of food in Samaria, and for ראש כלב we must seek a different explanation from that offered by SEYBOLD.

Let us look now at the renderings of ראש כלב in the ancient versions. The Vulgate (*caput canis*) and Targum (רישא דכלבא) ³⁾ are unremarkable. The Peshitta, however, has ריש חלקא, which can be read either as ריש חלקא 'head, leader of dog pack' ⁴⁾, or as ריש חלקא 'head of those who look after dogs, chief huntsman' ⁵⁾. The LXX has κεφαλὴ κυνός, a literal rendering, to which I shall return a little later. Most interesting is the translation of Symmachus ⁶⁾, who renders by κυνοκέφαλος 'dog-headed, dog-faced baboon'. The genus *Cynocephalus*, found in Africa and Arabia, includes one species, *Cyno-hamadryas*, the Arabian baboon, which was the sacred baboon of Egypt. Two other species are *C. thoth* and *C. anubis*, both names reminiscent of ancient

¹⁾ LANE, *op. cit.*, 995, and KAZIMIRSKI, *op. cit.*, i, p. 794.

²⁾ *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae* (Cl. LINDSKOG and K. ZIEGLER, ed. Teubner), iii. Fasc. 1, ch. 24 (p. 395).

³⁾ So WALTON *Polygl.*, *ad loc.* In LAGARDE's edition (*Prophetæ Chaldaicæ*), p. 112, רישא stands alone, without דכלבא.

⁴⁾ So KIMCHI. This would require כלבים; cp. Arab. رئيس الكلاب (LANE, *op. cit.*, 996).

⁵⁾ RASHI שומר הכלבים כראש. That the Hebrew vocabulary knew a noun כלב (= Syr. חלקא 'huntsman') is shown by the translation by Aquila and Symmachus of כלבים in Ps. xxii 17 by θηρατά (see FIELD, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*).

⁶⁾ FIELD, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*

Egypt¹). Queen Hatshepsut (c. 1500 B.C.) obtained such animals from the land of Punt, and tributaries of Punt, walking in procession to the temple of Amen and leading apes of the two species indigenous to Punt²), the *C. hamadryas* and the *C. babuinus*, may be seen portrayed in A. B. EDWARDS, *Pharaohs, Fellahs and Explorers*³). Monkeys and baboons appear also on a wall painting in a tomb at El Bersheh⁴).

In view of their contacts with Egypt and Arabia, there is no reason why the Hebrews should not have been acquainted with the *C. hamadryas*⁵). It may be noted that a bronze figure of a baboon has been found at Gebal, and another figure of this animal has been discovered at Beth-shemesh, both figures testifying to Egyptian influence⁶). G. MARGOLIOUTH⁷), it seems, was the first in recent times to suggest the meaning 'dog-headed, dog-faced baboon' for רֹאשׁ כְּלָב.

His suggestion appears not to have been taken up, yet it is very well worth consideration. According to him, 'the dog-headed baboon of Judah'⁸) is Joab, David's kinsman and chief captain, between whom and Abner there had been a feud since the death of Asahel at Abner's hand (2 Sam. ii 23). Suspecting that Ishbosheth was attempting to turn his nominal authority over him into real supremacy, Abner turns on him, and in effect says — do I occupy the same position as that dog-headed baboon of Judah? Am I, who helped Saul's house, to be treated as Joab is rightly treated by his master, David? The Egyptians, MARGOLIOUTH goes on to say, believed that the dog-headed baboon habitually saluted the rising and setting sun, and he argues that Joab, so highly placed in David's house, could be regarded as a second deity, as it were, moving about the person of his lord, just

¹) See S. F. HARMER and A. E. SHIPLEY (ed.), *The Cambridge Natural History*, x(1902), p. 566.

²) See E. NAVILLE, *The Temple of Deir el Babari*, 12th. Memoir of the Egypt. Explor. Fund, 1894, p. 21 (cp. p. 25). For the location of Punt (Africa? Arabia?), see W. F. ALBRIGHT, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 1953, p. 212, n. 14.

³) P. 292.

⁴) See *El Bersheh*, Archaeol. Survey of Egypt. Pt. II, by F. L. GRIFFITH, P. E. NEWBERRY and G. WILLOUGHBY FRASER [1895], Tomb No. 4, Wall paintings Fragment No. 5, p. 29, and Pl. xi.

⁵) Cp H. B. TRISTRAM, *The Natural History of the Bible*, pp. 37f., who writes that the African baboons are perhaps spoken of under the term Satyrs in Is. xiii 21, xxxiv 14; cp. p. 132.

⁶) See A. T. OLMSTEAD, *History of Palestine and Syria*, pp. 69, 94, 269; cp. D. MACKENZIE, *Excavations at Ain Shems* (Palest. Explor. Fund Annual 1912-13), p. 60, and Pl. xxviii, No. 31.

⁷) *The Expositor*, Eighth Series, x(1915), pp. 155-162.

⁸) He retains the words אֲשֶׁר לַיהוּדָה (p. 157).

as Thoth and Anubis moved about in a pantheon in which Ra, Osiris, or some other god, held supreme place. This interpretation is altogether too fanciful for acceptance. A much simpler explanation suggests itself. Abner is in fact saying — 'Am I, to whom the house of Saul owes so much, a dog-faced baboon, am I but a shadow of a man, that you can treat me like one, and charge me with a fault concerning a woman? I will show you I am no apology for a man, you cannot treat me as you would a baboon, I will show you who is master'. Abner is not denying the action with which Ishbosheth charges him. Here is no self-abasement, only fiercely aggressive justification of his standing as a person of importance, couched in contemptuous language, combined with a threat of secession to David. We are reminded of Goliath's words to David — 'Am I a dog, that thou comest to me with staves?' There is here the same menacing attitude — the Philistine giant continues, 'I will give thy flesh unto the fowls of the air, and to the beasts of the field' (1 Sam. xvii 43f.).

I mentioned earlier that the LXX omits the words אֲשֶׁר לִיהוּדָה which follow רֹאשׁ כֶּלֶב in the Hebrew text. MARGOLIOUTH makes the suggestion that these words may have been omitted by the Greek translators so as to avoid giving the Egyptian reader cause for derision against the Jews. Another suggestion he makes is that the translators may have deliberately used κεφαλή κυνός, and not κυνο-κέφαλος, so as not to give offence to a people which associated the cynocephalus with the idea of divinity. Both these suggestions are interesting and relevant to the present discussion.

The dog-faced baboon was then known in Egypt, Arabia, Syria and Palestine. It was known also to the Assyrians, for the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III depicts several kinds of monkey, among them the baboon ¹). It was well known further to Greek writers of antiquity. Plato refers to it. In the *Theaetetus*, Socrates remarks to Theodorus that as a rule he is delighted with the way in which Protagoras expresses the view that what appears to each man is real. "But I am surprised", he goes on, "that he did not in the very preface of his work on Truth announce that a pig or dog-faced baboon is the measure of all things, or any other more fantastic creature that has perception" ²). Aristotle says of the baboons that they have the same

¹) Cp. A. H. LAYARD, *Nineveh and its Remains*, p. 245 (illustration there and on p. 247).

²) S. W. DYDE, *The Theaetetus of Plato*, 161 c (pp. 105 f.). Cp. 166 c (p. 112).

form as apes, but they are larger and stronger, and their faces are like dogs' faces; they are by nature fierce, and they have teeth like dogs' teeth, yet stronger ¹⁾. Josephus ²⁾, Origen ³⁾, Diodorus ⁴⁾, Galen ⁵⁾, Pliny ⁶⁾, and others all knew of the baboon. There is no time, of course, to go further into these sources now. I should, however, like to quote from two of them. The first I quote for the rather charming picture it affords of how on occasion the baboon was treated in ancient Egypt and how it behaved. The passage is taken from Aelian ⁷⁾. The writer relates that in the time of the Ptolemies, the Egyptians taught dog-faced baboons their letters, and how to dance and play the flute and harp ⁸⁾. The baboons received rewards for their performances which they put into a bag which they carried attached to them, just like clever beggars ⁹⁾. The second passage I quote because in it the speaker, like Abner, applies the term baboon to himself. The passage comes from Aristophanes' *Equites*. The Offal-monger says to Paphlagon (the demagogue Cleon)—

"With such a training can't I beat him? Certainly I'm able;
So big I've grown, just fed on crumbs and leavings from the table".

To which Cleon replies—

"On table-leavings like a dog? How then, for all your prattle,
You fool, can you expect to face the Dog-Baboon in battle?" ¹⁰⁾

¹⁾ *De Animalibus Historia*, ed. L. DITTMAYER (ed. Teubner) 502 a 19-22 (p. 45).

²⁾ *Flavii Iosephi Opera Omnia*, ed. S. A. NABER (ed. Teubner), vi, p. 229, 28.

³⁾ *Contra Celsum: Translated, with an Introduction and Notes*, by H. CHADWICK, V, 51, p. 304.

⁴⁾ *Diodori Bibliotheca Historica*, ed. F. VOGEL (ed. Teubner), I, 33, p. 54.

⁵⁾ *De Usu Partium Libri XVII*, ed. G. HELMREICH (ed. Teubner), ii, pp. 43, 114f.

⁶⁾ *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae Libri XXXVII*, ed. C. MAYHOFF, Vol. ii (ed. Teubner), 8.54 (p. 109); cp. 9.40 (pp. 436f.).

⁷⁾ *Claudii Aeliani De Natura Animalium Libri XVII*, ed. R. HERCHER (ed. Teubner), VI, 10. For other references, see Index, *sub κυνοκέφαλος*, p. 442.

⁸⁾ A monkey playing the flute is depicted on a seal from Ur and on a Neo-Babylonian seal. Little clay figurines of apes playing musical instruments were common in the Neo-Babylonian period. See E. DOUGLAS VAN BUREN, *Archiv. f. Orientforsch.*, xi (1936-37), pp. 19 f. According to the Mishnah, apes were trained to act as servants; see *The Jewish Encycl.*, i, 662.

⁹⁾ The Greek phrase ὡς οἱ τῶν ἀγχειρόνων δεινοί is not free from difficulty, but 'clever beggars' or 'professional beggars' seems the sense intended. See LIDDELL and SCOTT, *op. cit.*, p. 8, *sub ἀγείρω*, 11.2; further D. RUHNKEN, *Timaei Sophistae Lexicon Vocum Platoniarum*, 3rd. ed., 1824, p. 15. I am indebted to Mr. A. F. SCHOLFIELD, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, for this second reference and for other help kindly given in connection with the Greek phrase.

¹⁰⁾ *The Knights*, translated by Gilbert MURRAY, p. 50.

In referring to himself as 'the Dog-Baboon', Cleon, like Abner, wants to show himself fierce and menacing.

If we turn to Arabic literature, we find that the word قرد 'ape, monkey, baboon'¹⁾, is applied, in an ancient poem, to a man in contempt of him. The poet Busheir ibn Ubayy is inveighing against a man of the people of Ḥidhjam, and he challenges his adversary with the words —

"Do you lash the tail against the nobles, O you monkey of Ḥidhjam?
And is the monkey well equipped for tail wagging? jam?
The shortness of your tails prevents you from wagging them.
And the nature of the Banū Qird is everywhere mean.
Fat are your camels, O people of Ḥidhjam,
Yet is your dignity in the tribe slender"²⁾.

The people of Ḥidhjam, it seems, was called, wholly or in part, Banū Qird, and the poet here is playing upon the word قرد 'monkey'³⁾, which is applied contemptuously, not to the speaker himself, as in the case of Abner and Cleon, but to another person in derision of him.

The baboon was then well known to peoples of antiquity, Semitic and non-Semitic, and among the Greeks and the Arabs at least a person could refer to himself or another as a baboon. I will only add here that in Greek πιθήκος 'ape' is also used in a derogatory sense, as a nickname for a trickster, a jackanapes⁴⁾, and that in Latin *simius* is used contemptuously of a person⁵⁾. In view of all that has been said, MARGOLIOUTH's suggestion that ראש כלב in 2 Sam. iii 8, applied by Abner to himself, means 'baboon', gains in plausibility.

The last passage I wish to consider is Deut. xxiii 18, where we

¹⁾ LANE, *op. cit.*, 2512.

²⁾ For the Arabic text, see G. G. FREYTAG, *Hamasa Carmina*, 1828, p. 633. A German translation may be found in F. RÜCKERT, *Hamāsa oder die ältesten arabischen Volkslieder*, 1846, ii, p. 169.

³⁾ Cp. Th. NOELDEKE, *Delectus veterum carminum arabicorum* (Porta Ling. Orient.), 1933, p. 53 (where the Arabic text may also be found).

⁴⁾ Several times in the plays of Aristophanes. See LIDDELL and SCOTT, *op. cit.*, p. 1403.

⁵⁾ See, e.g., Horace *Satires*, Bk. I, X. l. 18, where it is probably applied to Demetrius, who is mentioned in l. 90, on account of his small size and ugliness, or as an unintelligent imitator (see E. C. WICKHAM, *Horace, Vol. II, The Satires*, etc., 1903, p. 79). Further, L. C. PURSER, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae*, I, viii, 12, ll. 26ff.

read — ‘thou shalt not bring the hire of a harlot (אֶתְנָן זֹנָה) or the price of a dog (מְחִיר כָּלֵב) into the house of the Lord thy God for any vow’. We must begin our study of this passage by looking again at the use of *kalbu* ‘dog’ in Akkadian letters. Side by side with the use of *kalbu* indicating self-abasement or invective, another idea is present, namely, the idea of one who is a faithful watch-dog, who looks after the interests of his superior. For example, when Abdi-Ašratu, in one of the Amarna letters ¹⁾, writes to the Pharaoh — ‘I am the servant of the king and the dog of his house’, he adds ‘the whole of Amurru-land I watch for the king, my lord’. The phrase *kalbu ša bītišu* ‘the dog of his house’ is used *in bonam partem* — Abdi-Ašratu is the Pharaoh’s faithful watch-dog. Again, the men of the city of Kisik write to Ashurbanipal — ‘We are the king’s dogs’ ²⁾ — they cannot be turned away through the word of an enemy.

This use of *kalbu* in the sense of faithful servant is transferred from the secular to the religious sphere in a hymn to Marduk. There the suppliant says — ‘Like a little dog, O Marduk, I run behind thee’ ³⁾. The Old Testament itself knows this use of ‘dog’ in man’s address to God, if we accept, as I think we should, TORCZYNER’s emendation of the Hebrew text in 2 Sam. vii 21 ⁴⁾. Here David addresses Yahweh with the words — בְּעִבּוֹר דְּבָרְךָ וּכְלָבָה עָשִׂיתָ אֶת כָּל־הַגְּדֹלָה הַזֹּאת ‘for thy word’s sake, and according to thy heart, hast thou done all this greatness’. However, in 1 Chr. xvii 19 we find, instead of the words בְּעִבּוֹר דְּבָרְךָ וּכְלָבָה, the words בְּעִבּוֹר עֲבָדֶךָ וּכְלָבָה, for which TORCZYNER would read בְּעִבּוֹר עֲבָדֶךָ וּכְלָבָה ‘for the sake of thy servant and thy dog’. The Massoretic vocalisation has the appearance of a deliberate toning down of an original כָּלֵב which was regarded as unseemly in the mouth of David in his address to God. David can thus refer to himself as Yahweh’s dog, as the suppliant to Marduk refers to himself as a little dog. The most ignoble and contemptible of animals is thus made the comparison of David’s sense of humility before, and fidelity to, Yahweh.

¹⁾ No. 60.6ff.

²⁾ WATERMAN, *op. cit.*, No. 210, Rev. l. 8. Cp. A. T. OLMSTEAD, *History of Assyria*, p. 458.

³⁾ J. HEHN, *Hymnen u. Gebete an Marduk* (Beitr. z. Assyriol. V, 1906), p. 359, l. 11.

⁴⁾ In *Vom Alten Testament Karl Marti zum siebenzigsten Geburtstage gewidmet...* (B.Z.A.W. 41, 1925), p. 275. Cp. TORCZYNER, *The Lachish Letters*, p. 39; further, MILLAR BURROWS, *What mean these stones?*, pp. 39f.

This use of 'dog' in the sense of devoted follower of a god may lead to a fuller understanding of the word כָּלֵב in the passage under discussion, Deut. xxiii 18. That כָּלֵב is equivalent to קֹדֶשׁ 'a sacred person, a male prostitute' is clear ¹⁾ (cp. 1 Kings xv 12, 2 Kings xxiii 7). Such persons are called κύνες 'dogs' in Rev. xxii 15, and possibly the same class of persons is referred to in Phil. iii 2 ²⁾. The word כָּלֵב in this Deuteronomic passage is sometimes explained from the sexual promiscuity which is characteristic of dogs ³⁾. This may be doubted. For there is evidence that suggests that כָּלֵב is here better taken in the sense of devoted follower, just as κύων in Greek can mean 'servant, agent, watchman' of the gods. ⁴⁾ It has long been known that at the temple of Astarte at Kition in Cyprus there were cultic persons, temple servants, who were called כלבם ⁵⁾. With them are mentioned גֵּרָם 'clients', guests who were attached to the temple and supported from its funds. Attempts have been made to take כלבם here literally as 'dogs', and גֵּרָם, read as גִּרָּים, as 'whelps' ⁶⁾. But the context, which consists of a list of persons who are recipients of payments of one kind and another, is against such an interpretation ⁷⁾. In Phoenician the name כלבאלם 'dog of the gods' corresponds to עבדאלם 'servant of the gods' ⁸⁾. In Neo-Babylonian names compounded of *kalbu* 'dog' and a divine name, *kalbu* means 'priest, servant' ⁹⁾. Theophoric names of this type are fairly common — to mention only *Kalbi-Sin*, *Kalbi-Šamaš*, *Kalbi-Marduk* ¹⁰⁾. At a very early date, c. 4300 B.C., Ur-nina declares that he built the temple of Nina, renewed her image, and caused her servants to build for her two high places. The

¹⁾ The word כָּלֵב here has sometimes been taken literally. Against such a view, see W. ROBERTSON SMITH, *The Religion of the Semites*, 3rd. ed., p. 292, n. 2, and W. NOWACK, *Lehrb. d. hebr. Archäologie*, ii, p. 264, n. 2.

²⁾ Cp. PAYNE SMITH, *Thes. Syr.*, 1742.

³⁾ See, e.g., MAURER, *op. cit.*, i, p. 83, and *The Jewish Encycl.*, loc. cit.

⁴⁾ See LIDDELL and SCOTT, *op. cit.*, p. 1015.

⁵⁾ *CIS* I, No. 86 B 10.

⁶⁾ See G. A. COOKE, *A Text-book of North-Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 67 ff. W. ROBERTSON SMITH recalls that men named 'dog' and 'whelp' are connected with the story of a shrine at Ma'lul, near Nazareth (*Rel. of the Semites*, 3rd. ed., p. 541).

⁷⁾ Cp. M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Études sur les religions sémitiques*, p. 220.

⁸⁾ *CIS* I, No. 49; see also 11. No. 702, ll. 3f. Cp. V. ZAPLETAL, *Der Totemismus*, p. 70, n.1. The Phoenician name כלבא is thought by LIDZBARSKI to be a hypocoristicon of the longer name (*Handb. d. nordsemit. Epigraphik*, p. 296). For the Safaitic name כלבאל (?), see G. RYCKMANS, *op. cit.*, i, p. 233.

⁹⁾ Cp. W. ROBERTSON SMITH, *The Rel. of the Semites*, 3rd. ed., p. 596.

¹⁰⁾ See K. TALLQVIST, *Neubab. Namenbuch*, p. 87; cp. p. 319 sub *kalbu*.

word for 'servants' is expressed by the ideogram for 'dog', "the Semitic term for sacred prostitute"¹). The Ishtar cult knew pederastic priests (*assinnu*, *kurgarû*), "whose manhood Ishtar has changed into womanhood"²). The term **פָּלֶב**, we may think, carried with it no sense of dishonour. The **פָּלֶב** was after all **קֹדֶשׁ**, and it would seem very improbable that a person with recognized cultic status would have been called **פָּלֶב** in any derisory or pejorative way³). Among certain Muslims the expression 'dog of god' is said still to be a title of honour⁴). Our conclusion then is that **פָּלֶב**, when it refers to temple servants, while it has the normal meaning 'dog', has attained the idea of the faithful dog of god, his humble slave and devotee. The term **פָּלֶב** was the ordinary term to describe such a servant, and was not a term deliberately aimed at him in contempt⁵). And so he could be officially listed at Kition in company with other persons with honourable functions to perform. Once again we see how a term which in the secular world signifies a contemptible animal has been raised into the sphere where God and man are in near relationship to each other, in the cultus. What was respectable elsewhere in the Semitic world did not pass muster with the Deuteronomist, and the **פָּלֶב** (**קֹדֶשׁ**) and the **קֹדֶשֶׁת** were banned, together with other features of pagan worship.

In this paper I have been able to draw attention only to a few of the many problems that arise when the word **פָּלֶב** and its usages in the Old Testament are investigated. There are other passages which are worthy of fresh examination. In conclusion, I may perhaps add a few general observations. Our Society rightly emphasizes the importance of the *vox dei* as it may be heard in the Old Testament, and of Israel as a worshipping community. We perhaps need to be reminded from time to time that in ancient Israel the community was not always at worship, any more than communities elsewhere. It was composed of men and women who met one another in the course of everyday life, talked about matters of mutual interest, and expressed

¹) G. A. BARTON, *A Sketch of Semitic Origins*, p. 188.

²) W. G. LAMBERT, *JEOL*, No. 15, p. 195. Cp. B. MEISSNER, *Babylonien u. Assyrien*, ii, p. 67, and S. A. PALLIS, *The Babylonian Akêtu Festival*, p. 145.

³) C. - F. JEAN, *Le Milieu Biblique avant Jésus-Christ*, iii, p. 556.

⁴) E. RENAN, *Hist. du peuple d'Israël*, i, p. 106.

⁵) Cp. CHEYNE, *op. cit.*, 1125, and G. A. BARTON, *op. cit.*, p. 251 n.

their thoughts in the idiom of the time, sometimes in elevated style, sometimes in colloquial, sometimes proverbial, speech. There is in the Old Testament a *vox populi* as well as a *vox dei*, and if we are today to try to understand the Israelite mind, we must try our best to discover this *vox populi*, the living and lively language of the people. The undertaking is in a sense a kind of archaeological operation which involves digging deep into the layers of speech used throughout countless generations. Because we possess so little of the literature of Israel, we must be ready to extend our enquiry beyond the pages of the Old Testament to include other literatures, both Semitic and non-Semitic. Their modes of expression can often help us to understand more clearly the way in which the Hebrews expressed themselves. It is a difficult undertaking, but it is well worth the attempt. And this must be the justification for my attempt to discover something of what may be learnt from a brief study of כָּלֵב, that lowly animal, the dog, despised and generally wretched, yet, as we have just seen, in religious circles, in prayer and worship, not without honour.

The root אָהַב 'love' in Hebrew¹.

By Prof. D. Winton Thomas in Cambridge.

(4, Cranmer Road, Cambridge, England.)

In two respects especially the current lexica are inadequate in their treatment of the root אָהַב. First, they contain but little information concerning occurrences of it in extra-biblical material; and again they hardly enter into the question of its etymology. BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS², for example, is silent on both these points; while the information as given in GESENIUS-BUHL³ and BEN YEHUDA⁴ is meagre enough. The aim of this article is to supplement this deficiency. In the first place the occurrences of אָהַב outside the OT which ought to be cited in a Hebrew dictionary will be brought together (here it should be remarked that, as far as Rabbinical Hebrew is concerned, where אָהַב is used with much the same frequency as in the OT, only those forms of it which are unknown to biblical Hebrew will be noted); and secondly, various etymologies of the root which have from time to time been proposed will be reviewed briefly, and a

¹ A paper read before the Society for OT Study at Oxford on Sept. 22, 1938.

² *Heb.-Eng. Lex.*, p. 12.

³ *Heb. u. Aram. Wörterb.*, 16th ed., p. 12.

⁴ *Thes. totius hebraicitatis*, I 78.

preference will be expressed for the etymology which was first put forward one hundred and ninety years ago by ALBERT SCHULTENS. In support of it certain biblical evidence will be adduced.

The word אָהַב is peculiar to Hebrew¹, the usual words for 'love' in the other Semitic languages being quite different. In the OT itself it is, as is well-known, very commonly used, being found as early as Jud 5 (v. 31) and as late as Eccl (e. g. 3 8 59).

1) The root and the derivative אָהַבָה (= אָהַבָה) are found in the 'hebraic' dialect of Ras Shamra².

2) Twice in the Elephantine papyri we find the proper name נְאֻהָבָה, once written without the *aleph* (נְאֻהָבָה)³. This same name (of Niph. participial form = *amabilis*; cp. the description of Saul and Jonathan in II Sam 1 23 as נְאֻהָבָה—the only occurrence incidentally of the Niph. in the OT)—occurs too, written with *aleph*, on a Hebrew seal inscription⁴.—It is perhaps worth remarking in passing that Hebrew does not seem to have formed proper names from אָהַב with the same readiness as it did from roots of allied meaning, e. g., רָחַם, יָדַד, יָדַע (in the sense of 'care for')⁵ and the like⁶. There is no case of such a name in the OT. The later Jewish name אָהַבָה⁷, borne by the son of R. Zera and father of R. Adda, appears to be the only other known example; it should, however, be noted that, while this is the spelling of the Babylonian Talmud, the Jerusalem Talmud preserves the name in a different form, viz., אָהֻבָה⁸.

3) There is a possible occurrence of אָהַב in another Aramaic papyrus of the fifth century B. C.⁹, where the reading of the CIS is

¹ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

² See, e. g., J. A. MONTGOMERY and Z. S. HARRIS, *The Ras Shamra Mythological Texts* (Memoirs of the Amer. Phil. Soc., vol. 4), 1935, p. 86; and C. VIROLLEAUD in *Syria*, XIII p. 138, XVI p. 266, XVIII p. 259.

³ See A. E. COWLEY, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.*, 1923, I line 4 (p. 1f.), XXII line 107 (p. 70). The papyri are dated 495 and 419 respectively.

⁴ See M. A. LEVY, *Siegel u. Gemmen*, 1869, no. 18 (Hebrew), p. 46. Cp. M. NOTH, *Die israelitischen Personennamen*, 1928, p. 251. The reading לְנְאֻהָבָה is preferable to that of RÖDIGER לְן אָהַבָה 'for thee, Ahabath'), *ZDMG*, III (1849), p. 347. Cp. M. LIDZBARSKI, *Altsem. Texte I (Kanaanäische Inschr.)*, 1907, p. 11. Further literature is cited in D. DIRINGER, *Le iscrizioni antiche-ebraiche palestinesi*, 1934, p. 217.

⁵ See D. W. THOMAS, *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, XXXV 300f.

⁶ See BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, sub *voc.*, and NOTH, *op. cit.*, index.

⁷ Adduced as a parallel to נְאֻהָבָה on the seal referred to by S. A. COOK, *Proc. of the Soc. of Bibl. Archaeol.*, XXVI (1904), p. 166. Cp. G. H. DALMAN, *Aram.-Neuhebr. Handwörterb.*, 1922, p. 8.

⁸ See M. JASTROW, *A Dict. of the Targumim, etc.*, (1926), p. 19. Cp. J. LEVY, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.*, (1876) I 34, 54. In Palestine today אָהֻבָה is commonly used as a proper name.

⁹ See COWLEY, *op. cit.*, p. XIV.

אהבתה *dilexisti eum*¹. This must, however, remain a doubtful case, as not all scholars are agreed that this is the correct reading².

4) In Ben Sira 7 30³ the imperative אָהַב for the normal אָהַב — a form found also in Pirke Aboth I, 11⁴—is interesting to the grammarian, as is the occurrence in 47 of a Hiph., in the phrase הִאָּהַב נַפְשׁוֹ 'make oneself beloved'⁵. The use of the Hiph. is unknown in the OT, where only the Qal, Niph., and Pi. are employed. Rabbinical Hebrew, however, knows it, as well as a Pu. and a Hithp.⁶.

5) Next may be mentioned the use of *aab* 'love' in Samaritan. J. H. PETERMANN⁷ cites imperfect forms (1st pers. plur.) *na-eba* or *na-eba*, and with suffix of the second person *na-ebak*. The infinitive form is given as *la-eba*.

6) Lastly may be noted אָהַב (אהבה in the construct state) in the Targum of the Song of Songs 8 6⁸. LEVY⁹ cites no other example of the occurrence of the Hebrew word in Targumic literature.

These then are the occurrences of אָהַב in extra-biblical material which deserve citation in a Hebrew dictionary. They range over a very long period of time, and are to be found often, as has been shown, in an Aramaic milieu.

We may now turn to the question of the etymology of אָהַב. Several different ones have from time to time been proposed. Three of them may be passed over with a mention only, as they do not

¹ CIS, Pt. ii. Tom. i (1889), No. 150 line 3 (p. 171). Cp. LIDZBARSKI, *Handbuch d. nordsem. Epigraphik*, 1898, I 209. On p. 172 of the *Corpus* it is remarked "אהבתה a radice hebraica אָהַב 'amavi', Aramaeis inusitata derivandum; non enim יִרְבֶּתָּה legere fas est."

² See J. EUTING, *Epigraph. Miscell.*, in *Sitzungsb. d. königl. preuß. Akad. d. Wiss.* zu Berlin, 1887, p. 408; S. A. COOK, *Glossary of the Aramaic Inscriptions*, 1898, p. 14; COWLEY, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

³ See R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*, hebr. u. deutsch, 1906, p. 63 (of text); cp. his *Kommentar*, 1906, p. 71. On p. 7 of his text he gives אָהַב also in 7, 21 (cp. *Komm.*, p. 69). In other editions of the text, however, the reading חִבֵּב is found; so S. SCHECHTER and C. TAYLOR, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 1899, p. 6; I. LEVI, *L'Ecclésiastique ou la sagesse de Jésus, fils de Sira* (deuxième partie), 1901, p. 46; N. PETERS, *Hebr. Text d. Buches Ecclesiasticus*, 1902, p. 336.

⁴ See C. TAYLOR, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 1897, p. 3 (of text).

⁵ See SMEND, *op. cit.*, p. 63 (of text), and similarly the other editions cited above *ad loc.* With this Hiph. may be compared the Syr. אָהַב Aph. *amabilem reddidit* (PAYNE SMITH *Thes. Syr.*, 3881). BEN YEHUDA, *op. cit.*, I 79, regards הִאָּהַב in this passage as a Niph. In 20, 13 PETERS, *op. cit.*, p. 364, reads a Hiph. imperfect אִיִּיִּיִּי, which is, however, bracketed by SMEND, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

⁶ JASTROW, *op. cit.*, p. 19; LEVY, *op. cit.*, I 34; BEN YEHUDA, *op. cit.*, I 80.

⁷ *Brevis ling. Samar. Gramm.*, 1873, p. 3 (of Chrestomathy).

⁸ LAGARDE, *Hag. Chald.*, 1873, p. 162, line 1.

⁹ *Wörterb. über d. Targ.*, 1867, I 13 (where Job is an error for Song of Songs).

seem likely to lead very far towards a solution of the problem. First, אָהַב has been compared with the Egyptian 'i-h-bw 'love', the Egyptian word being attested apparently only once in a late text¹. Next, it has been compared with the Arabic وَهَب 'gave'²; though we are familiar with the identity of some פִּיא and פִּי verbs, especially in Arabic³, it must be confessed that it is not at all clear what the connection in meaning between אָהַב and وَهَب may be. And thirdly, אָהַב has been related to a root חב = Arabic ḥbb, which is said by J. DEÁK⁴, who proposes this etymology, to have the meaning of 'protective concealment'; with this root he connects both חב 'bosom' Hi 31 38 and חֲבִיץ 'hiding-place' (Hab 3 4, LXX ὀσφύς)—incorrectly, it seems, for both these words can be satisfactorily derived from other roots, the former from חָבַב⁵ and the latter from חָבַה⁶.

It is commonly recognized today that many, if not all, Semitic roots were at one time biliteral, and were later converted into triliterals. One way of achieving this end was by the addition of formative elements⁷. We may now pass to a consideration of views, other than the unlikely one proposed by DEÁK, which regard אָהַב as arising from a biliteral root. The first we may mention is that of LEVY⁸ who *sub* הִקְהֵב (Pilp. הִבֵּב) meaning 'roast, burn', suggests that הִבֵּב is synonymous with חָבַב 'burn with love', a well-known root in the Semitic languages⁹. From this biliteral חב there have arisen, LEVY thinks, by initial expansion, both אָהַב and לָהֵב¹⁰. This etymology brings אָהַב into that familiar category of Hebrew words in which the ideas of warmth and emotion are combined. Such words are common in Hebrew, e. g., חֵרָה of burning anger, יָרוּם of heat of cattle in breeding, כֶּמֶר of warmth and tenderness¹¹, and so on. Another

¹ A. ERMAN (quoting BRUGSCH), *ZDMG*, XLVI (1892), p. 108.

² J. PEDERSEN, *Israel; its life and culture*, I—II, 1926, p. 525.

³ See W. WRIGHT, *Compar. Gramm. of the Sem. Languages*, 1890, p. 47, 71; NÖLDEKE, *Neue Beitr. zur Sem. Sprachwiss.*, 1910, p. 179f.

⁴ *Die Gottesliebe bei d. alten sem. Religionen*, 1914, p. 86. I am indebted for this reference to J. ZIEGLER, *Die Liebe Gottes bei d. Propheten*, 1930, p. 13. The Arabic dictionaries which I have consulted give as the basic meaning of وَهَب, not that which is assigned to it by DEÁK, but 'was deceitful' (LANE, *Arab. Eng. Lex.*, p. 691, *et al.*)

⁵ BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

⁶ *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*

⁷ See G. R. DRIVER, *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System*, 1936, p. 3ff.

⁸ *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.*, I 447.

⁹ See BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, p. 285, to which should be added Acc. ḥabābu 'love' (ḥibabītu 'young woman, bride'); see C. BEZOLD, *Bab.-Ass. Glossar*, 1926, p. 118.

¹⁰ Only derivatives from the root לָהֵב are used in Hebrew. See BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, p. 529 (where see cognate languages).

¹¹ LEVY, *op. cit.*, IV 439, sees also in רָחַם the stem חָם 'be warm'.

view has recently been expressed by G. R. DRIVER, who suggests that underlying אָהַב is the biliteral אב 'inclined', which by initial expansion became אָהַב, 'inclined to (love)', by medial expansion אָהַב, and by final expansion אָהַב 'was willing'¹.

Quite different from these etymologies is that suggested first by ALBERT SCHULTENS in his Commentary on Proverbs, published in 1748, which appears to be more probable than those already mentioned. He too refers אָהַב to a biliteral root אה, but this time cognate with the Arabic هَبَّ. This Arabic root properly means, he says, *flavit*² 'blew'. This meaning is attested by the Arabic dictionaries³ — it is used of the wind blowing, of a sleeper breathing deeply on awaking, and of an animal being excited with lust. According to SCHULTENS — *thema* אהב *amare, diligere, vim istam secundariam induit a primaria spirandi, anhelandique; prout anhelare aliquid est vehementius petere, et adamare*⁴. The words אָהַב אֶהְיֶה אֵלֶיךָ (Prov 8 17) he translates first by 'ego amatores meos anhele, id est, maximo amore appeto et amplector', and again by *anhelatores meos anhele*⁵. One hundred and twenty years after SCHULTENS' Commentary was published, the connection between אָהַב and هَبَّ was put forward again, apparently quite independently, by A. WÜNSCHE⁶, אה being in his view an onomatopoeic word with the meaning 'breath, blowing' — אָהַב means 'breathed, blew, panted with eager desire'. Thirty years later we find F. SCHWALLY⁷ rejecting the idea of any relationship between אָהַב and אבה, and again finding a connection between אָהַב and هَبَّ, aptly comparing the relationship between the Arabic هَوَى 'loved' and هَوَا 'air' (هَوَى 'blew'). Coming to more modern times, we may note that SCHWALLY'S comparison with هَبَّ is referred to by GESENIUS-BUHL⁸, and BEN YEHUDA⁹, too, regards a connection between אָהַב and the Arabic root as possible.

If then we are to see in אָהַב the biliteral root אה = هَبَّ, we have a case, not of medial expansion by means of an infixed ה, as DRIVER has suggested, but a case of initial expansion by the addition of א; and the root אהב will not mean 'burn' (with love), as LEVY has proposed, but 'breathe heavily' (with desire). The forms אָהַב and אָהַב side

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 7, where examples of expansion may be found. For medial expansion by ה in particular, see n. 2. At Ras Shamra *bht* = *bt* 'house' (C. VIROLLEAUD, *Syria*, XIV, p. 139 n., XVIII p. 86). For the possibility of a root אָהַב (in Prov 13 1), an Aramaizing by-form of אָהַב, see G. R. DRIVER, *ZAW* 1932, p. 144.

² *Proverbia Salomonis* (1748), at end *Index hebraearum vocum sub* אָהַב.

³ E. g. LANE, *op. cit.*, p. 2873f. (where see derivatives); HAVA, *Arab. Eng. Dict.*, p. 811f., etc.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, on 1, 22 (p. 7).

⁵ *Ibid.*, on 8, 17 (p. 73f.).

⁶ *Der Prophet Hosea*, 1865, p. 55.

⁷ *ZDMG*, LIII (1899), p. 198.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

⁹ *Op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

by side will then be comparable with forms like מַלֵּל and אָמַל ($\sqrt{\text{מל}}$) 'was weak', אָשַׁם and שָׁמַם ($\sqrt{\text{שמ}}$) 'was made desolate, was appalled'¹. In passing it may be asked whether a final expansion by the addition of *lamedh* has not produced הָקַל 'breath'². The word אָהַב then belongs to that category of words in which the ideas of breathing and emotion, in this case desire, are combined. Such words, whose primary significance is 'breathe, pant', which mean also 'pant after, desire', are frequent in Hebrew and the cognate languages — to mention only שָׂאָה 'gasp' (of a woman in travail, Jes 42 14), 'gasp, pant with desire' in Ps 119 181 (cp. Hi 7 2 36 20): נָחַם, cognate with the Arabic نَحَّمَ 'breathed deeply', in Gen 27 42 'pant after'³; נָשַׁם 'pant' (of woman in travail, Jes 42 14), Syr. *flavit, spiravit*, Arabic نَسَّمَ 'blew gently' (of wind) — in the fifth form 'sought a thing by perseverance'; מָחַ 'breathe, blow' (Cant 2 17 4 6), Syr. *flavit*, Arabic فَاحَّ 'blew' (of wind), possibly 'pant for' in Ps 12 6; and נָפַשׁ 'breath, desire', Syr. *respiravit*, Arabic نَفَسَ in the third form 'desired a thing, aspired to it', in the fifth form 'breathed, sighed'⁴. We may perhaps see this meaning of aspire, i. e., breathe towards, in a passage like Am 5 15 — שְׁנֹאֲדָרַע וְאֶהְיֶה טוֹב 'eschew evil and aspire to good', where אֶהְיֶה is like דָּרַשׁ in v. 14 (in Ps 4 8 אָהַב stands as a parallel to בָּקַשׁ, and in Jes 1 23 to דָּרַח). With the Am passage just quoted may be compared Mi 3 2, where the LXX brings out this meaning of אָהַב by translating ζητοῦσιν (similarly the Arabic Version, which uses طلب).

For the existence of a biliteral root הַב cognate with the Arabic هَبَّ in the sense 'blow, breathe, desire', which we believe underlies the Hebrew אָהַב (cp. Horace's *spirabat amores*⁵, and the Greek phrase πνεῖν ἀδωκεῖ)⁶, we are not perhaps without some support from the OT itself. The evidence which is to be adduced in support of its existence is admittedly slight, but it is worth while at least to record it. The three passages to which reference will be made

¹ For שָׁמַם = אָשַׁם (= שָׁם) see G. R. DRIVER, *Occident and Orient*, ed. B. SCHINDLER and A. MARMORSTEIN, 1936, p. 75 ff. For other examples of the correspondence between ע"ע and פ"א roots, see SCHWALLY, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

² Cp. LEVY, *op. cit.*, I 448, where הָבַל is connected with הַב = חַב (*v. supra*) and given the meaning 'warm breath'. For final expansion by *lamedh* cp. גִּזַּל 'stole' (Ar. جَزَلَ 'cut off'); the biliteral לַ 'cut' is seen in such words as גִּזַּל and גִּזַּר. See G. R. DRIVER, *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System*, p. 4.

³ See D. W. THOMAS, *Expository Times*, XLIV, p. 151 f.

⁴ See D. W. THOMAS, *Zeitschr. für Semitistik*, 10, p. 311 ff.

⁵ *Thes. Ling. Latinae*, p. 1973.

⁶ LIDDELL and SCOTT, *Greek-English Lex.*, 8th ed., 1897, p. 1232. The new edition (ed. H. STUART JONES and R. MCKENZIE), Pt. 8, 1934, p. 1425, however, makes no reference to the phrase.

are well-known for their difficulty. It is not proposed here to enter into any full discussion of them, but merely to relate them to a possible root אהב = אהב. First, there is the enigmatic passage Prov 30 15 — לַחֲלֹקָהּ שְׁתֵּי בָנוֹת הֵב הָב — 'the horse-leach hath two daughters, crying, Give, give', taking הָב as the imperative of יָהַב 'gave', as do some other Versions and authorities¹. The rendering of the LXX here is interesting — it translates הָב by ἀγαπήσεις ἀγαπώμενα 'dearly beloved' (cp. Pesh. *محب*). Next, the difficult יְהִבְךָ in Ps 55 23, commonly translated 'thy burden'², or by others 'thy lot'³, is rendered by Aq., Symm., Quinta and Sexta by ἀγαπήσεις σε⁴ and by Jerome *caritatem tuam*⁵. Again, in Hos 8 13 the words וְקָדְשִׁי הַבְרִיכִי, which have been variously interpreted⁶, are rendered by the LXX Θυσιαστήρια τὰ ἡγαπημένα 'the beloved altars'⁷.

As has been remarked, this evidence from the OT is slight and must not be pressed unduly, but on the basis of it we may perhaps go so far as to ask whether a word אהב (= *هَبَّ*), a synonym of אהב, was recognized by the translators of the Versions alluded to above. In Prov 30 15 הָב, in Ps 55 23 יְהִיבְךָ, in Hos 8 13 הַבְרִיכִי are all given by them the meaning 'love'. It is possible, of course, to hold that in each case the translators connected the Hebrew word before them with אהב, even though the *aleph* may have been missing from their texts, as it is in ours⁸. This is the easier assumption. Whether or not they knew the root אהב as well as אהב must remain for the present

¹ So BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, p. 396. See FIELD, *Orig. Hexapl.*, 1875, II, 371.

² Though doubtfully by some, e. g., H. GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen*, 1926, p. 237. So also A. FISCHER, *ZDMG*, LVIII, p. 665f., in reply to E. NESTLE, *ibid.*, p. 664f., who thinks יְהִיב = אהב. See further JASTROW, *op. cit.*, p. 566; LEVY, *op. cit.*, II 223.

³ So BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, p. 396; C. A. BRIGGS, *The Book of Psalms* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), 1906-7, II 25.

⁴ FIELD, *op. cit.*, II 180. Some modern commentators follow them and emend to יְהִיבְךָ; so, e. g., H. HERKENNE, *Das Buch der Psalmen*, 1936, p. 198.

⁵ *Psalterium juxta Hebraeos Hieronymi*, ed. J. M. HARDEN, 1922, *ad loc.*, p. 66.

⁶ הַבְרִיכִי has been connected with יָהַב, so 'my offerings' (so, e. g., BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, p. 396; K. AHRENS, *ZDMG*, LXIV, p. 172f., the English Versions, *et al.*). LEVY, *op. cit.*, I 447, connects with הַבְרִיכִי 'roast', so 'my burnt-offerings'. Cp. S. POZNANSKI, *ZDMG*, LXX, p. 461, where הַבְרִיכִי, with which הַבְרִיכִי is there connected, is compared with *هَبَّيْ* 'cook'. The text is, of course, emended by most scholars; see, e. g., W. NOWACK, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 1922, p. 53; E. SELLIN, *Das Zwölfpropheten-Buch*, Erste Hälfte, 1929, p. 85; O. PROCKSCH in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, 1933, *ad loc.* NYBERG, *ZAW*, 1934, p. 252f. (cp. further his *Studien zum Hoseabuche*, 1935, p. 66f.) regards הַבְרִיכִי as a corruption of אהבה, a Pe'alal abstract form from אהב.

⁷ For the other Versions see FIELD, *op. cit.*, II 954.

⁸ In the case of Ps 55 23 was יְהִיבְךָ read? See BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, II p. 29.

an open question. The three passages cited above would seem to allow us at least to ask that question. That the translations of the Versions in these particular passages may be erroneous is of no consequence for our present purpose, for even from mistranslations lost roots can often be recovered¹.

We have recognized in אָהַב—and in רָחַם, if this root may be assumed to have existed—further examples (perhaps, with WÜNSCHE, onomatopoeic examples) of that category of words in which the ideas of breath and emotion, in this case 'desire, love', are combined². There is, however, no clear case in the OT where the meaning 'breathe' is demanded for אָהַב. The underlying meaning of the word must have been forgotten at a very early stage in the language, and the Hebrew used it to express 'love', as he did other words of similar origin, quite unconscious of its primitive meaning. In the OT אָהַב has, as has the word 'love' in most languages, many and various shades of meaning³. Not only to man, but to Yahweh also, conceived anthropomorphically, is applied this word which at bottom expresses the common physical accompaniment of manifestations of love, viz., breathing. The word thus joins company with those other expressions of emotion attributed to Him whose basic meaning is that of 'breathing'. For example, we have the phrase אָנַף (הִתְאַנַּף) יְהוָה 'Yahweh snorted', i. e. breathed heavily through His אָף 'nose' in anger; again הָאֱרִיר אֲפִים (cp. אָרַךְ אֲפִים), usually translated 'was longsuffering', evidently has reference to the long deep breathing associated with a state of calm, as opposed to the short, quick breath of impatience as expressed by the phrase הָצִיר אֲפִים (רִיחַ); again Yahweh is said to 'repent' — נָחַם means rather 'comforted himself' i. e. took a deep breath of relief⁴. To the theologian, who is concerned, shall we say, with the teaching about the love of Yahweh as it may be seen in the books of Hos and Dtn, the accurate determination of the basic meaning of אָהַב may be perhaps relatively unimportant. The philologist, however, must make it his concern; for him there is a problem, and he must, if he can, find a solution to it. Of the many solutions which have been proposed we are not without some justification, we think, if we are attracted most by that which was proposed first by ALBERT SCHULTENS.

[Completed August 23rd, 1938.]

¹ See G. R. DRIVER, *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.*, LV Pt. ii, 1936, p. 102f.

² See H. WHEELER ROBINSON in *The People and the Book*, ed. A. S. PEAKE, 1926, p. 353 ff.

³ These may be conveniently studied in ZIEGLER, *op. cit.*, p. 12ff.

⁴ See G. B. MICHELL, *Expository Times*, XLIV, p. 428.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE HEBREW ROOT חָדַל

BY

D. WINTON THOMAS

Cambridge

In the Hebrew lexicon of BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS the only philological information given about the Hebrew root חָדַל "cease" is that in Sabaeen the root means "be negligent" ¹⁾. GESENIUS-BUHL ²⁾ goes further, and in addition to mentioning the root in Sabaeen, compares the Arabic حَدَلَ ³⁾, with references to NÖLDEKE ⁴⁾, BROCKELMANN ⁵⁾ and RŮŽIČKA ⁶⁾. The first reference is a short note which is concerned with the equation of ח and ח in חָדַל = حَدَلَ and in other words; the second reference is restricted to a bare mention of this equation; while the third refers to an article on the equation חָדַל = حَدَرَ, with remarks also on حَدَلَ, حَدَلَ and other roots, the common basis of which is the biliteral 'd(d),bd(d), in the sense "be far from". ZORELL ⁷⁾ also compares the Arabic حَدَلَ, with a reference to an article by P. JOÜON ⁸⁾, to which I shall refer again in a moment; and KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER ⁹⁾ also mention حَدَلَ, with a reference to the use of the word in South Arabic and in post-Biblical Hebrew, and also to H. BAUER ¹⁰⁾, who is concerned, as are NÖLDEKE and RŮŽIČKA, with the equation of ח and ח.

To what we find in these authorities, some further information may be added. As is to be expected חָדַל is found in the Samaritan

¹⁾ P. 292. Cp. K. CONTI ROSSINI, *Chrestomathia Arabica meridionalis epigraphica*, p. 154, and S. D. F. GOITEIN, *Journ. of the Pal. Or. Soc.*, xiv (1934) p. 141.

²⁾ P. 214 f.

³⁾ The equation as between Sabaeen and Arabic is not, however, without difficulty, for in Sabaeen, which possesses the letter ח, the root is spelt with ח (So Dr. E. ULLENDORFF in a private communication).

⁴⁾ *ZDMG* xl (1886) p. 729.

⁵⁾ *Grundriss d. vergleich. Gramm. d. sem. Sprachen*, I, p. 237.

⁶⁾ *ZA*, xxvii (1912) pp. 317 ff.

⁷⁾ *Lex. Hebr. et Aram. Vet. Test.*, p. 223.

⁸⁾ *Mélanges de la Faculté orientale Université Saint-Joseph, Beyrouth (Syrie)*, V ii (1912) pp. 424f. There is a reference to this article also in GES.-BUHL, *sub* חָדַל (p. 215).

⁹⁾ *Lex. in Vet. Test. libror.*, p. 277.

¹⁰⁾ *OLZ* xxxvi (1933) p. 473.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE HEBREW ROOT חָדַל

9

Pentateuch wherever it occurs in the Massoretic text. In the Samaritan Pentateuch-Targum¹⁾ it is regularly translated by קָצַץ , to which CASTELL²⁾ gives the meaning *desiit, cessavit, defuit, destitit*. In Syriac and Ugaritic the root appears to be unknown. The comparison of חָדַל with the Ethiopic *guadala* "became less, defective" (= Arabic عَدَلَ "decreased, failed")³⁾, which has been made by H. GRIMME⁴⁾ appears dubious⁵⁾, as does the equation $\text{חָדַל} = \text{בָּטַל}$ ($k = b$) suggested by C. J. BALL⁶⁾. In Soqōṭri *ḥedol* means "turned aside, abandoned"⁷⁾. The Accadian word *ḥadilu*, the name of an animal, seems to be connected by MUSS-ARNOLT⁸⁾ with $\text{חָדַל} = \text{خَدَلَ}$, but in what sense is not clear.

The equation $\text{חָדַל} = \text{Arabic خَدَلَ}$ can be accepted without hesitation, and a consideration of the meanings of the Arabic root forms the best starting point for our observations on the root as it is found in the Hebrew Bible. Here JOÜON's two page article to which I have referred, written forty-four years ago, makes a valuable contribution. Starting from the primitive meanings given to خَدَلَ in LANE's Arabic lexicon, JOÜON finds traces of them in the Old Testament and in the ancient versions. According to LANE⁹⁾, the Arabic root means "abstained from, neglected, aiding; held back from (as a gazelle holds back from going with the herd); left, forsook, deserted". In Ex. xiv 12 JOÜON points out that the phrase חָדַל מִמֶּנּוּ is rendered in the Vulgate by *recede a nobis*, and similarly in the Targum by שְׁבוּק מִיֵּנּוּ . In Job vii 16 the imperative חָדַל is translated in the LXX by $\alpha\pi\acute{o}\sigma\tau\alpha$, and in 2 Chr. xxxv 21 the Peshitta renders חָדַל by פָּאַס "separate from, depart, abandon". In 2 Chr. xxv 16 the Vulgate renders חָדַל by *discedere*, and again the Peshitta uses פָּאַס ; while in Ex. xxiii 5 the LXX has $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\eta$ and the Vulgate

¹⁾ Gen. xi 8, xviii 11, xli 49; Ex. ix 29, 33, 34, xiv 12, xxiii 5; Num. ix 13; Deut. xv 11, xxiii 23; see H. PETERMANN, *Pentat. Samarit., ad loc.* This work is, unfortunately, far from reliable; see P. KAHLE, *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 37.

²⁾ *Lex. Heptaglott.*, col. 3411.

³⁾ Cp. RŮŽIČKA, *op. cit.*, p. 317.

⁴⁾ *ZDMG* lv (1901) p. 481.

⁵⁾ Cp. DILLMANN, *Lex. Ling. Aeth.*, col. 1201.

⁶⁾ *Hilprecht Anniversary Volume*, p. 41.

⁷⁾ Dr. E. ULLENDORFF has kindly drawn my attention to this. See W. LESLAU, *Lexique Soqōṭri*, p. 165.

⁸⁾ *A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language*, I, p. 307. Cp. H. HOLMA, *Die assyr.-babylon. Personennamen, etc.*, p. 53, n. 2.

⁹⁾ *Arab.-Engl. Lex.*, p. 713.

pertransibis. In four, possibly five, other passages ¹⁾ not mentioned by Joüon, the Targum translates חָדַל by שָׁבַק, and in Prov. xix. 27 by פָּרַשׁ "keep off, abstain, depart" ²⁾. So too in the Peshitta, ܦܪܫ is used in eight other passages not mentioned by Joüon ³⁾; ܡܚܝܬ is used in six passages ⁴⁾; ܚܠܝܬ "depart" is used in Gen. xviii 11; ܚܠܝܬ "depart" is used in Job. xiv 7, while in the Palestinian Syriac Lectionary we find in Zech. xi 12 the use of ܕܡܫܝܬ "be far, depart" ⁵⁾. Again, Joüon does not mention the Vulgate's *desero* in Jud. ix 9, 11, 13 (where הֲחַדְלֹתִי "shall I leave?" is to be read for M.T.'s הֲחַדְלֹתִי ⁶⁾), nor *derehquo* in Job xix 14. In the LXX again we find ἀπολείπω in five passages ⁷⁾, and ἀποτρέχω in Jer. xl 4.

For the meaning "hold oneself back, refrain from", Joüon instances the Targum's rendering of חָדַל in Gen. xi 8 and Num. ix 13 by מָנַע (Hithp.). This rendering, which is found in some twenty-seven other passages ⁸⁾, is by far the commonest rendering in the Targum of the Hebrew root. This meaning seems indeed to be the commonest meaning of the Hebrew root itself. At least half of the sixty or so occurrences of the root in the O.T. can be satisfactorily translated by "hold oneself back, refrain from", or the like. The meaning "cease", in the sense of "come to an end", is comparatively rare in the O.T., being found perhaps in eight passages only ⁹⁾. This sense does not appear to be borne by the Arabic root خَذَلَ.

Starting from the Arabic root we may see then how in the Hebrew חָדַל we have first the meaning "held back from, left, forsook" ¹⁰⁾; secondly, the meaning "held oneself back, refrained from"; and finally the meaning "ceased, came to an end". A similar development in meaning can be seen in some Arabic verbs. Thus عَدَلَ means "turned

¹⁾ Jud. ix 9, 11, 13; 1 Sam. ix 5 (possibly Am. vii 5).

²⁾ The Targum mostly renders by פָּסַק "cut, split, sever", then "be interrupted, cease". The Pesh. has ܦܫܬ in Jud. v 6, 7; Job xix 14.

³⁾ Ex. ix 29, 33, 34; 2 Chr. xvi 5, xxxv 21; Job vii 16, x 20; Prov. xxiii 4.

⁴⁾ Ex. xiv 12; Jud. ix 9, 11, 13; 1 Sam. ix 5; Jer. xli 8.

⁵⁾ *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary*, ed. A. S. LEWIS and M. D. GIBSON, p. 110.

⁶⁾ Cp. H. BAUER and P. LEANDER, *Histor. Gramm. d. hebr. Sprache*, p. 351.

⁷⁾ Jud. ix 9, 11, 13; 2 Chr. xvi 5; Prov. xix 27.

⁸⁾ Ex. ix 29, 33, 34, xxiii 5; Deut. xxiii 23; Jud. xv 7, xx 28; 1 Sam. xii 23, xxiii 13; 1 Kings xv 21, xxii 6, 15; 2 Chr. xviii 5, 14; Is. i 16, ii 22, xxiv 8; Jer. xl 4, xli 8, xlv 18, li 30; Ezek. ii 5, 7, iii 11, 27 (*bis*), Zech. xi 12.

⁹⁾ Gen. xviii 11; Ex. ix 29, 33, 34; Deut. xv 11; Is. xxiv 8; Job xiv 7; Prov. x 19.

¹⁰⁾ As in Jud. ix 9, 11, 13; Job iii 17, xix 14.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE HEBREW ROOT 11
חדל

aside" and also "ceased"¹⁾; חָלַ means both "departed" and "ceased"²⁾; and חָרַח means "went away" and "ceased"³⁾. In Latin too *absistere* and *desistere* show a like development in meaning, as does *cessare* "go away, cease". And in Hebrew we may recall that רָחַק means "be far, distant" in the sense of "abandon"⁴⁾, then "abstain from"⁵⁾, and finally "be absent, cease to exist"⁶⁾.

I now wish to consider briefly four passages in the O.T., all well known for their difficulty. The first passage, Is. liii 3, follows naturally upon what has been said about the basic meaning of חדל = חָדַל "held back, left, forsook"⁷⁾. The words used to describe the Servant of Yahweh—נִבְזָה וְנִדְחָל אֲנִישִׁים—are usually translated "despised and rejected of men", a translation which has become hallowed by tradition, and which is generally adopted by commentators and lexicographers. GESENIUS-BUHL⁸⁾, however, gives as a possible translation "renouncing men". Professor G. R. DRIVER⁹⁾ has explained נִדְחָל in this passage in similar fashion, comparing such passages as Is. ii 22—חָדְלוּ לָכֶם מִן־הָאָדָם "be far from men", i.e., "forsake ye men", and Job xix 14—חָדְלוּ קִרְבִּי "my relations have deserted me". The word נִדְחָל in Is. liii 3 has thus, Professor DRIVER argues, an active sense—the Servant of Yahweh forsakes the company of men. Professor DRIVER asks in a footnote whether the Arabic حَذَلَ is cognate with the Hebrew root. His question has already been answered in the affirmative. Since חדל means basically "hold back from, leave, forsake", נִדְחָל אֲנִישִׁים means "holding back from men, forsaking men", that is, keeping aloof from human kind¹⁰⁾. In Arabic, "deserted, forsaken" is expressed by the passive participle مَحْذُول. In the Koran (Sura xvii 23) we find the phrase مَذْمُومًا مَّحْذُولًا "despised, deserted", a state which results

¹⁾ KAZIMIRSKI, *Dict. arabe-française*, II, p. 191.

²⁾ LANE, *op. cit.*, p. 1270 f.

³⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 181. Cp. JOUBON, *op. cit.*, p. 424, n. 1.

⁴⁾ Pss. xxii 12, 20, xxxv 22, xxxviii 22, lxi 12; Prov. xix 7.

⁵⁾ Ex. xxiii 7; Eccl. iii 5.

⁶⁾ Is. xlix 19, lix 9, 11; Job xxi 16, xxii 18; Lam. i 16.

⁷⁾ BEN IEHUDA, *Tbes. totius hebraeatis*, III, p. 1451, compares חדל with حَذَلَ and explains it by נָטַשׁ, עָזַב.

⁸⁾ P. 215. Contra C. C. TORREY, *The Second Isaiah*, p. 417.

⁹⁾ JTS xxxviii (1937) pp. 48 f.

¹⁰⁾ The force of the *waw* in וְנִדְחָל is perhaps "and so".

from associating other gods with Allah. The active participle "for-saking" is expressed in Arabic by *خَانَلَ*. Perhaps then *חָדַל* in this passage might be vocalized *חָדַל*.

The next two passages may be taken together, namely, Is. xxxviii 11 and Ps. xxxix 5. The first runs in Hebrew as follows:—

אָמַרְתִּי לֹא-אֶרְאֶה יְהוָה בְּאֶרֶץ הַחַיִּים לֹא-אֶבִּיט אָדָם עוֹד עִם-יּוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָדָם:

This verse is translated in the R.V.—

"I said, I shall not see the LORD, even the LORD in the land of the living: I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world".

In BH3 it is indicated that the probable reading here is *חָדַל* "world", which has manuscript and ancient authority (Targum) to commend it. Commentators ¹⁾ generally, and some, but not all, lexicographers ²⁾, adopt this reading. Those scholars who retain *חָדַל* ³⁾ translate it "(land of) cessation" (i.e., cessation of life), and explain it as a reference to the underworld ⁴⁾ Such an expression for the realm of the dead is, however, as DUHM ⁵⁾ remarks, somewhat artificial. The rendering of *חָדַל* in the Peshitta by *سفل* "ditch, pit", has been taken as supporting the sense "underworld" for *חָדַל* ⁶⁾. It is, however, not at all certain that the Peshitta's rendering does in fact lend support to this meaning, for it could represent, not *חָדַל*, but *חָלַךְ*. For in Syriac *سفل* means "creep, burrow" ⁷⁾, and in New Hebrew *חָלַךְ* means "dig, hollow out" ⁸⁾. Certainly in Pss. xvii 14, lxxxix 48, and Job xi 17 *سفل* renders *חָלַךְ*. Parallelism of thought (*חָדַל* // *יּוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָדָם*), as well as the phrase *יּוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָדָם* in Ps. xlix 2, would seem to be in favour of the reading

¹⁾ See the commentaries of KÖNIG (p. 321), DUHM (1902, p. 248), MARTI (p. 262), FELDMANN (p. 451), KISSANE (I, p. 418).

²⁾ See BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS (p. 293), KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER (p. 278), ZORELL (p. 224), Cp. JOÜON, *op. cit.*, p. 425, n. 4. *Contra* SIEGFRIED-STADE (p. 186).

³⁾ DSIA has *חָדַל*.

⁴⁾ E.g., J. FÜRST, *Hebr. u. Chald. Handwörterb.*, I, p. 378, and RŮŽIČKA, *op. cit.*, p. 317.

⁵⁾ *Das Buch Jesaja* (1902), p. 248.

⁶⁾ E.g., by E. SCHEIDIUS, *Dissertatio philologico-exegetica ad Canticum Hiskia*, 1769, p. 57.

⁷⁾ See PAYNE SMITH, *Thes. Syr.*, I, col. 1276.

⁸⁾ M. JASTROW, *Dict. of the Targumim, etc.*, p. 464.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE HEBREW ROOT חָדַל 13

חָדַל¹⁾. It may, however, be unnecessary to assume that חָדַל must accordingly be emended to חָלַל. I have just mentioned that in Is. xxxviii 11 some manuscripts have חָלַל for M.T.'s חָדַל. In Ps. xlix 2 and Ps. lxxxix 48 too, one ms. in each case reads חָלַל for חָדַל²⁾. Perhaps the view current in Rabbinic circles³⁾ that the two words חָדַל and חָלַל were in use side by side, as were כָּבַשׁ and כָּשַׁב, שָׁמַל and שָׁלַח, may be not altogether fanciful. If this were the case, there would be no need to assume a scribal error in Is. xxxviii 11. Rather should we have a case of metathesis. The translation "world" could then be retained for חָדַל.

Is metathesis to be seen also in Ps. xxxix 5? The Hebrew text runs as follows:—

This verse is translated in the R.V.:—

"LORD, make me to know mine end,
And the measure of my days, what it is;
Let me know how frail I am".

The translation of חָדַל by "frail" is favoured by many commentators⁴⁾, who derive this meaning from the idea of "ceasing". Yet there is substance in BRIGGS'⁵⁾ contention that such a meaning for חָדַל has no linguistic authority. He accordingly emends חָדַל to חָלַל—which occurs in verse 6—and translates—"Let me know what my duration is"; and other scholars emend the text similarly⁶⁾. If the text is to be emended, perhaps the simplest and most satisfactory emendation is חָלַל, as JOÜON⁷⁾ has suggested—"Let me

¹⁾ Cp. LXX's ἐπὶ γῆς.

²⁾ See BH3 *ad loc.* Cp. further T.K. ABBOTT, *ZAW* xvi (1896) p. 293, who emends חָדַל in Ps. xlix 9 to חָלַל or יָחַל "that he should continue for ever". M. LAMBERT, *REJ* lxxx (1925) pp. 96 f. also emends in Pss. xxxix 5, xlix 9 to חָלַל, and in Job xiv 6 he emends וַיִּחַלֵּל to וַיִּחַל; cp. F. WUTZ, *Das Buch Job*, p. 55.

³⁾ See, e.g., L. FINKELSTEIN, *The Commentary of David Kimbi on Isaiah*, p. 227, lines 19f. He takes חָדַל in the sense of "this world" (הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה).

⁴⁾ See the commentaries of KÖNIG (p. 588), EERDMANS (p. 227), BAETHGEN (p. 113), KISSANE (I, p. 173), etc.

⁵⁾ *The Book of Psalms* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), I, p. 346.

⁶⁾ E.g., T. K. CHEYNE, *The Book of Psalms*, p. 382, emends מִן-חָדַל אֲנִי.

⁷⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 425; he regards חָדַל as a possibility. In Ps. lxxxix 48 the present text מִן-חָדַל אֲנִי may be read, not, as BH3, מִן-חָלַל אֲנִי, but מִן-חָדַל אֲנִי "remember how I endure" ("how short a time I have to live").

know how enduring I am", that is, how long I have to live. Perhaps, however, we have here once again חָדַל = חָלַה, in which case there will be no necessity for emendation, and the phrase as it stands will mean "how long I have to live".¹⁾

In the fourth, and last, passage which I wish to consider, we meet an altogether different root חָדַל. The first half of 1 Sam. ii 5 runs as follows in Hebrew: — שְׂבָעִים בְּלָחֶם וְשָׂקָרוּ וְרַעֲבִים חָדְלוּ עֵד-

Here חָדַל is not, we may believe, to be equated with חָדַל, but with חָדַל "became plump, fleshy in the limbs". If, with A.B. EHRLICH²⁾, we read עֵד for עֵד, and ignore the athnah at חָדְלוּ, we may translate—"they that were full have hired themselves out for bread, while the hungry have grown plump again". This explanation of חָדַל in this passage, which may be said to receive some support from the Peshitta (ܫܠܫܬ), the Vulgate (*saturati sunt*) and Symmachus (ἀνεπείρετο ἐγένοντο)³⁾, was suggested at least as early as SCHEIDIUS⁴⁾ in 1769, and it deserves to be brought back into currency. The Akkadian proper name, of a woman, *Hudultu*, has been plausibly explained by H. HOLMA⁵⁾ by reference to the Arabic حَدَل "became plump". In English a plump girl is sometimes affectionately known as "Fatty". And this is what *Hudultu* seems to mean. It should be added that HOLMA also thinks it possible that this name may have to be explained from the Arabic حَدَل "to have one shoulder higher than another"⁶⁾. He in fact leaves the decision open as between the two Arabic roots. According to him, however, *Hudultu* and the Hebrew name חָדְלִי (2 Chr. xxviii 12) seem to belong to the same root; and M. NOTH⁷⁾ has explained חָדְלִי as meaning "fat". If we may again assume metathesis as between חָדַל and

¹⁾ In Job x 20 יָמֵי יַחְדָּל should perhaps be emended, not to יָמֵי חָלָה, as proposed in BH3, but יָמֵי חָדְלִי (חָדְלִי = חָלָה) "the days of my life".

²⁾ *Randglossen z. d. hebr. Bibel*, iii, p. 170.

³⁾ See FIELD, *Orig. Hexapl.* I, 490. Cp. the Arabic version's شَبَعُوا (in WALTON's Polyglot).

⁴⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 55.

⁵⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

⁶⁾ HAVA, *Arab.-Eng. Dict.*, p. 115. See the names sub חָדַל in G. RYCKMANS, *Les noms propres sud-sémitiques*, I, p. 88 f.

⁷⁾ *Die israelit. Personennamen, etc.*, p. 226. Cp. KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER's lexicon, p. 278.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE HEBREW ROOT חָדַל 15

חָדַל, we may perhaps be permitted to wonder whether the Hebrew names חָדַל, חָלַי, חָלָה and חָלָה may be connected with חָדַל = חָדַל. Is it more than a coincidence, we may ask, that חָלַי (1 Chr. xxvii 15), which appears in xi 30 as חָלַי, occurs in the form חָלַב "fat" ¹⁾ in 2 Sam. xxiii 29?

To return to חָדַל = חָדַל. It may be observed that the identification of these two roots goes back as far as CASTELL ²⁾ in the seventeenth century, and in the eighteenth century ALBERT SCHULTENS ³⁾, G. J. LETTE ⁴⁾, and SCHEIDIUS ⁵⁾, perpetuated it. In the nineteenth century it is found in GESENIUS' *Thesaurus* ⁶⁾, and, as was remarked earlier, in most modern lexicons. Among these earlier scholars we meet the view that חָדַל = חָדַל means properly *flaccescere* "become faint, weak", and some passages in the O.T. were so interpreted by them. For example, SCHEIDIUS ⁷⁾ translates וַיִּנְקְחוּ לֹא תַחֲדִל (Job xiv 7) "and its tendril grows not weak"; וַיִּחְדְּלוּ לְבָנוֹת (Gen. xi 18) "they ceased to build through lack of strength"; and, as mentioned earlier, מָה-חָדַל אָנִי (Ps. xxxix 5) is translated—"how weak I am". SCHEIDIUS ⁸⁾ quotes the Arabic phrase *مخاللت رجلاه* "his feet became weak". It may, however, be asked, whether these older scholars may not have been misled by this phrase into believing that חָדַל meant "became faint, weak", a meaning which it would be difficult to justify from the evidence of Arabic ⁹⁾. It is true that LANE ¹⁰⁾ gives to the Arabic phrase just referred to the meaning "his legs became weak in consequence of some evil affection". But may not the phrase perhaps mean literally "his legs deserted, or left, him"? If this is in fact the meaning of the Arabic phrase, we

¹⁾ Cp. FÜRST, *op. cit.*, I, p. 400.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, 1137.

³⁾ See his *Comm. in librum Jobi*, 1773-4, p. 72.

⁴⁾ *Observationes philologico-criticae in augustissima Deborah et Moysi Cantica*, 1748, pp. 36 f.

⁵⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

⁶⁾ P. 447.

⁷⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 55 f. and *Specimen Observationum ad quaedam loca V.T.*, 1769, Index, p. i.

⁸⁾ *Dissertatio, etc.*, p. 54.

⁹⁾ See, however, R. DOZY, *Supplém. aux dict. arabes*, I, p. 356, where *خَلَل* in the third form is said to mean *tâcher d'affaiblir*, and in the seventh form *mollir, faiblir, fléchir*.

¹⁰⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 714.

16 THOMAS, SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE HEBREW ROOT **חָדַל**

are back at the point from which we set out, namely, **חָדַל** in the sense "left, deserted, forsook".

To sum up. I have tried to show, first, that some additions may be made to the etymological information concerning **חָדַל** which is found in current Hebrew dictionaries; secondly, that JOÜON's short, but important, article on the basic meaning of **חָדַל** = **חָדַל**, namely, "held back from, deserted, forsook", can be usefully supplemented by reference to further evidence supplied by the ancient versions; thirdly, that in Is. liii 3 the meaning of **חָדַל אֲנִישִׁים** is almost certainly "forsaking (the company of) men", not "forsaken by men"; fourthly, that we may have to allow for metathesis as between **חָדַל** and **חָלַד**, a point which I have illustrated from Is. xxxviii 11 and Ps. xxxix 5; fifthly, that in 1 Sam. ii 5 **חָדַל** is to be equated, not with **חָדַל**, but with **חָדַל** "grew plump", and that in addition to **חָדַל**, some other Hebrew proper names may, by metathesis, have to be referred to this root; and lastly, that some older scholars have, mistakenly perhaps, given to **חָדַל** the meaning "became weak, feeble"—a meaning which would not be without its interest for a study of **חָדַל** in the O.T. if it could be justified. On these points I have been able to do no more than offer a few observations, which, though brief, will yet, I hope, have suggested that the root **חָדַל** is worthy of our notice, and that more still remains to be discovered about it. In the course of this congress there will be papers on themes much wider and more weighty than the study of a Hebrew root. I can only hope that this paper may not appear an unworthy contribution to our common studies. If justification of it were needed, I would plead that textual criticism and Semitic philology are fundamental requirements for sound O.T. exegesis. And I would recall, to my comfort, some words of Samuel Taylor COLERIDGE, who wrote—"There are cases, in which more knowledge of more value may be conveyed by the history of a *word*, than by the history of a campaign" ¹).

¹) *Aids to Reflection, and the Confessions of an enquiring spirit*. (Bohn's Standard Library, 1884), p. 5, n. 1.

ḤDL-II in Hebrew

In *CBQ* 23 (1961) 451-460, Father P. J. Calderone discusses the Hebrew root *ḥdl-II* (= Arabic *ḥadula*) with the particular meaning "become plump," and the first OT passage with which he deals is 1 Sm 2,5. He mentions also M. Noth's explanation of the OT name *ḥadlay* as meaning "fat," and also a similar meaning proposed by H. Holma for the Akkadian *ḥuddultu*. All these matters may be found already discussed in a paper on the root *ḥdl* which I read at the meeting of the International Organization of Old Testament Scholars held in Strasbourg in 1956, and which was later published in *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 4 (1958) 8-16. Father Calderone cannot, I think, be aware of this paper, for he makes no reference to it. For the points which he makes in addition to my own I am grateful.

I take this opportunity of raising the question whether the Arabic name *Fatima*, which Arabic suggests might mean "weaning" (a child),¹ might not, like the names derived from a root *ḥdl* mentioned above, also mean "fat" (cf. Hebrew-Aramaic *ḥim*, "was fat").²

D. WINTON THOMAS
Cambridge University

¹ A. Kazimírski, *Dictionnaire arabe-français* (Paris, 1860) II, 612.

² J. Levy, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1889) IV, 26.

The Interpretation of Proverbs xxix. 5.

M.T. : נָבַר מַחְלִיק עַל־רֵעֵהוּ רֶשֶׁת פּוֹרֵשׁ עַל־פַּעֲמָיו :

A.V. 'A man that flattereth his neighbour
spreadeth a net for his feet' (R.V.
'steps').

LXX δὲ παρασκευάζεται ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ
φίλου δίκτυον, περιβάλλει αὐτὸ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ
ποσίν.

THE LXX rendering of this verse is noteworthy in two respects. In the first place, whereas the pronominal suffix in the word פַּעֲמָיו 'his feet' is generally taken by commentators on the Hebrew text to refer to רֵעֵהוּ in the LXX translation it is taken to refer to נָבַר. And secondly, in the LXX translation the word רֶשֶׁת is treated as the object of מַחְלִיק. These two features of the LXX rendering of this verse point the way, I believe, to the correct interpretation of it. I suggest, first, that we should follow the LXX and take the pronominal suffix in פַּעֲמָיו as referring to נָבַר; and next, that מַחְלִיק here should be explained, not by reference to חָלק 'was smooth,' Hiph. 'flattered,' but to an entirely different root חָלק, cognate with the Arabic حلق, which, Dozy notes (in *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, i. 316), can mean 'prendre, envelopper dans des rets, dans des filets.' The resulting translation will then be :

'A man who lays a snare for his neighbour
Spreadeth a net for his own feet.'

The word מַחְלִיק is thus seen to bear much the same meaning as the phrase רֶשֶׁת פּוֹרֵשׁ, and the point of the aphorism is that the man who lays a snare to catch some one else will find that his action will recoil upon himself.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Cambridge.

The Revised Psalter

As a member of the Archbishops' Commission to revise the Prayer Book Psalter, I am grateful to Professor Porter for the generally favourable judgment which he passes on the *Revised Psalter* in his

¹ Cf. e.g. C. H. Dodd, *Gospel and Law*, chap. 2; T. W. Manson, *Ethics and the Gospel*, chap. 5.

article in *THEOLOGY*, September 1963, pp. 359 ff. I should, however, like to comment on the criticisms he makes of the revised translation. Professor Porter's article well illustrates one of the main difficulties which face the translator of the Old Testament to-day, namely, the frequent necessity to choose between several possibilities all of which receive some support from scholars. The Commission have often felt this difficulty acutely, and when several possibilities presented themselves, they decided finally upon those renderings which seemed to them justifiable—in some cases, they would dare to hope, preferable—and which conveyed a sense suitable to the context. In this connexion it is not unfair to say that Professor Porter's frequent appeal to modern commentaries when they do not support the *Revised Psalter* is not in itself especially strong, for it is an unfortunate fact that many of the results of recent advances in comparative Semitic philology have not yet found their way into the commentaries, with the result that improbable renderings of Hebrew words and phrases continue to be perpetuated. In these circumstances a "minority opinion"—Professor Porter's phrase on p. 362—need not, when it is an informed opinion, necessarily be less strong than the majority opinion which Professor Porter seems always to prefer. It is very noticeable how he is inclined to refer only to those scholars whose opinions may be cited against the *Revised Psalter* and to omit any reference to those whose views support it, even when the latter include writers of standard commentaries, some of them quite recent.

In commenting on the passages referred to by Professor Porter I follow the order in which he takes them. In taking exception to the revised rendering in Ps. 45. 6, Professor Porter himself makes the point that the translation of the opening clause is debatable. The Commission had to make a choice, as they have had to throughout their work, between conflicting renderings, and they made it on the basis of what Professor Porter somewhat curiously calls "an alleged phenomenon of Hebrew syntax". Curiously, because the phenomenon to which he refers is recognized by E. König (*Hist. compar. Syntax der hebr. Sprache*, 319g) and by Professor G. R. Driver, who finds a similar phenomenon in Babylonian (*The People and the Book*, ed. A. S. Peake, pp. 115 f.). In Ps. 68. 8 "the Lord of Sinai" has the support of W. F. Albright (*Bull. of the Amer. Schools of Oriental Research*, 62, p. 30) and H. S. Nyberg (*Zeitschr. der deutsch. morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, N.F. xvii, p. 338), and rests upon what is at least a tenable explanation of the Hebrew word *ze* (=Arabic *dhu*) which otherwise is here obscure (cp. the attempt at emendation of it in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*; F. Zorell in his commentary mentions *ze=dhu* here as possible). For "sacrifices in their appointed seasons" (Pss. 4. 5; 51. 19), literally "right sacrifices", support may be found in the commentaries of C. A. Briggs, R. Kittel, and E. J. Kissane. "The right way" in Ps. 23. 3 in place of Coverdale's "the paths of righteousness" does not elicit any remark from Professor Porter, though *sedek* is used here in the same way as in Pss. 4. 5; 51. 19. In Ps. 95. 7 the addition of "ye shall know his power" rests on a partial emendation which is proposed in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.* "Power" represents the

Hebrew *yādhō* "his hand", and *de'ū* "know ye" could easily have fallen out before this word.

In Ps. 34. 10 "they who trust not in him" is not, as Professor Porter supposes, an emendation. The antithesis to "they who seek the Lord" requires some such sense as this, and it may be found in the Hebrew *kephirim* as it stands (singular *kāphīr*), which may be explained from the Arabic *kafara* "became an unbeliever" (cp. the proposed emendation *kōpherim* in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.* which is presumably to be taken in this sense and is the emendation to which Professor Porter seems to refer). In Ps. 58. 6 *kephirim* again has nothing to do with *kephīr* "lion", but is once more explicable from Arabic, and the translation "the ungodly" refers back to "the ungodly" in verse 3. In Pss. 57. 4 and 22. 21, where the *Revised Psalter* retains "lions", the Hebrew words are, as Professor Porter rightly points out, different, and accordingly do not enter into a discussion of the meaning of *kephirim* in these passages.

In Ps. 104. 31 "they are made strong" for Coverdale's "they shall be made" is based, not on the Hebrew verb *bārā* "created", as Professor Porter believes, but on another *bārā*, cognate with the Arabic *bari'a* "was healthy, recovered from disease". In Ps. 37. 27 the Septuagint gives a hint that *b* is too short. The insertion of "in the land" finds support in the commentaries of Kittel and W. O. E. Oesterley, and is moreover an aid to singers of the psalm, a consideration which the Commission have throughout borne in mind. In Ps. 24. 6 "portion" in place of Coverdale's "generation" is based upon the meaning of the cognate words in Accadian and Arabic, and makes much better sense, following upon the preceding verses, than does "generation". In Ps. 73. 1 "the upright" provides a more suitable parallel than "Israel" to "such as are of a clean heart", and finds support in Kittel, Oesterley, and Zorell. In Ps. 53. 6 the omission of Coverdale's "where no fear was" has at least the support of some Hebrew manuscripts. In Ps. 33. 7 "as in a water-skin" is supported by the Septuagint, Symmachus, Targum, Peshitta, Jerome and the Vulgate. As to the meaning of Ps. 110. 3, the Hebrew text is so obscure that its meaning is almost anyone's guess. In Ps. 55. 20 Professor Porter is right in thinking that the Commission have adopted Gunkel's "Ishmael", but he is wrong in supposing that they have paraphrased his "and Jaalam" by their rendering "the tribes of the desert", for this is a translation of the Massoretic text *weya'anēm* vocalized *wī'ēnīm*. Professor Porter writes of Gunkel's emendation—"it has not found favour with many recent scholars". Perhaps it would be fair to mention that it is adopted in its entirety in the commentary of H. Schmidt (1934), who incidentally attributes it to Ehrlich.

The Hebrew behind Ps. 22. 29 is, as Professor Porter rightly states, barely comprehensible. A remedy must accordingly be found. The *Revised Psalter's* "that sleep in the earth" rests upon an emendation proposed by G. Beer in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, and is adopted by Kittel himself and by Oesterley and Kissane; while "how" is based upon a mere vowel change (*'ēykh* for *'akh*). The translation "the sacrifice"

for *hāgh* in Ps. 118. 27—a well-known crux—is said by Professor Porter to be dependent on the view that this Hebrew word can mean “sacrificial victim”, an opinion, he goes on to say, which “enjoys virtually no support at the present day [and] is abandoned in all modern lexicons”. This statement is not easy to follow, since the lexicons of Brown-Driver-Briggs—if this can be regarded as a “modern lexicon”—and of Zorell lend support to the meaning “sacrificial victim”, while in the lexicon of Gesenius-Buhl the meaning is said to be *unklar*. It may be added that König in his commentary translates *hāgh* here by *Festopfer*.

In offering these comments my main aim has been to show, in the briefest possible terms, that the changes which the Commission have made in these passages have not been made without reason. The reasons may seem good to some scholars, to others less good. As has been said, and it cannot be too often repeated, there is room for wide divergence of opinion in the solution of the many problems with which the translator of the Psalms has to deal, more particularly perhaps in the case of emendations, and the Commission have never supposed that their revision will command universal assent in all respects. Professor Porter's remark that “one would not wish to suggest that the *Revised Psalter* is wrong in any of the cases that have been quoted” is gratifying and generous, and will encourage the Commission to believe that in carrying out the task for which they were appointed they have not gone fatally astray.

Students of the Hebrew text of the Psalms who wish to have full information concerning the changes which have been made in the *Revised Psalter* may care to be referred to *The Text of the Revised Psalter*, by myself, which was recently published by S.P.C.K., who have published also a general introduction, *A Companion to the Revised Psalter*, by Bishop G. A. Chase.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

THE ROOT מִכַּר IN HEBREW.

THERE are four occurrences in the O.T. of the Hithpa'el of מִכַּר, viz., Deut. xxviii 68, 1 Kings xxi 20, 25, and 2 Kings xvii 17.¹ In the first passage there is no reason to doubt that the root bears its usual meaning of 'sell' (in this case into slavery)², but in the other three passages, where the Hithp. is said to be used figuratively³ (followed in each case by the phrase *לעשות הרע בעיני יהוה*) it would appear questionable whether 'sell' is the true meaning of the root.

In 1 Kings xxi 20, in answer to Ahab's question, 'Hast thou found me, O mine enemy?', Elijah replies, 'I have found thee, because thou hast sold thyself (*יען התמכרך*) to do that which is evil in the sight of the Lord'. If, as has been generally held, the Hithp. here is used figuratively, it will have some such meaning as to 'surrender oneself without a will to evil, so that sin exercises the uncontrolled power of a master over man as his slave'.⁴ The LXX (*διότι μάτην πέπρασαι*) and Vulg. (*eo quod venundatus sis*) support the rendering of the English Versions in this passage, but the renderings of the Pesh. (*לְאַסֵּפְדָּה*)⁵ 'because thou hast magnified thyself'⁶ and the Targ.⁶ (*חֵלְךָ דְּחִשְׁבַּתָּהּ*) 'because thou hast planned' suggest that the translators saw in *התמכרך* here something different from the ordinary root מִכַּר 'sell'. I suggest therefore that underlying *התמכרך* is not מִכַּר 'sell', but a distinct מִכַּר which must be compared with the Arabic مَكَّر 'practised deceit, guile'; مَآكِر is 'deceitful, crafty',⁷ and مَكْرَة and مَكْر mean 'craft, stratagem'.⁸ What Elijah says to Ahab therefore is not 'because thou hast sold thyself', but 'because thou hast shewn thyself deceitful by doing that which is evil'—a fitting enough description of the king's conduct in respect of Naboth. In v. 25 of the same chapter *התמכר*, again with

¹ See Brown-Driver-Briggs *Heb. Lex.* 569.

² S. R. Driver *Deuteronomy (Intern. Crit. Comm.)* p. 319.

³ Brown-Driver-Briggs *op. cit. loc. cit.*

⁴ K. F. Keil *Books of Kings* p. 315, and similarly other older commentators. Elieser b. Yehuda. *Thes. totius hebraicitatis*, 2998, gives for the Hithp. here and in the other two passages in Kings the meaning 'devote oneself'. Burney's only comment on the words is to the effect that *לְאַסֵּפְדָּה* 'to no purpose' (cp. LXX *μάτην*) should be added after *התמכרך* (*Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* p. 249).

⁵ Payne Smith *Thes. Syr.* II 3783 gives for the Ethp. of *כַּד* the meaning *magnificatus est, magnificavit se, insolenter se gessit*.

⁶ Walton *Polygl. ad loc.*

⁷ Lane *Arab. Eng. Lex.* 2728.

⁸ Hava *Arab. Eng. Dict.* 730; Freytag *Lex. Arab. Lat.* iv 199-200 adds مَكْرُور and مَكْرُور, *deceptor*, and مَكْرَائِم *res excogitatae, machinationes*.

NOTES AND STUDIES

389

Ahab as subject, is once more taken by the LXX (*ἐπαθή*) and Vulg. (*venundatus est*) in the sense of 'sell', but on this occasion the Pesh. renders by *לסבב* 'cogitavit, in mente habuit, consilium iniit',¹ and the Targ. as before by *חשיב*.² So here too we may believe that the Arabic root underlies *החמכר* and translate 'who shewed himself deceitful by doing evil'.

Again, in 2 Kings xvii 17, where the Israelites are charged with passing their children through the fire and with using divination and enchantments, they are said to have 'sold themselves (*ויחמכרו*) to do that which was evil in the sight of the Lord'. The LXX renders by *ἐπαθήσαν*, but the Vulg. on this occasion has *tradiderunt se*; while the Pesh. and Targ. translate as before by *לסבב* and *חשיבו* respectively.³ Here again the translation 'and shewed themselves deceitful by doing evil' is entirely suitable to a passage which has for its subject the apostasy of Israel from Yahweh.

A comparison of *מכר* with the Arabic root in these three passages yields a sense which accords well with the several contexts, and makes it unnecessary to assume for *מכר* 'sell' a figurative use which, to the present writer at least, appears to be of dubious authenticity. Should these three cases be explained by reference to a $\sqrt{\text{מכר}} = \text{مك} =$ 'practice deceit', Deut. xxviii 68 will remain the sole genuine occurrence in the O.T. of the Hithp. of *מכר* 'sell'.

Mention may also be made of Eccus. xlvii 24, where the Hithp. of *מכר* is perhaps to be explained similarly. In this passage it is said of Ephraim *והנרל חמאתם מאד לכל רעה התמכרו*, translated by Smend 'und ihre Sünde wurde sehr gross, und jeder Bosheit gaben sie sich hin'.⁴ The similarity in language between this passage and the passages already referred to, however, suggests that the second half of the verse might be more correctly translated 'according to all manner of evil they acted deceitfully'.⁵

D. WINTON THOMAS.

¹ Payne Smith *op. cit.* i 1395. Cp. *לסבב* *cogitatio, machinatio*, and phrases like *לסבב חסבב לסבב* *dolos in eum struent* (*ibid. loc. cit.*). In Gen. xxxvii 18 *ויחנכלו* 'and they knavishly planned' is translated in the Pesh. *לסבב*.

² Walton *Polygl. ad loc.*

³ *Ibid. ad loc.*

⁴ Smend *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* i, 55.

⁵ *Ibid.* 86.

⁶ It is worth while asking whether *מכר* 'sell' and *מכר* 'deal deceitfully' are really distinct roots, as suggested above, or whether they are in fact the same root. The Oriental seller habitually tries to deceive the buyer. Cp. the English phrase 'he has sold me' in the sense of 'he has deceived me'.

A FURTHER NOTE ON THE ROOT מִכַּר IN HEBREW

IN a note in an earlier issue of this *Journal*¹ I suggested that in three passages in the O.T., viz. in 1 Kings 21²⁰⁻²⁵, and 2 Kings 17¹⁷—and perhaps also in Ecclesiasticus 47²⁵—the Hebrew root מִכַּר does not mean ‘sold’, but, like the Arabic مَكَر, ‘practised deceit, guile’.² In the three passages in Kings the LXX translators, misunderstanding the meaning of מִכַּר, render it, as they normally do elsewhere,³ by πωπράσκειν. A similar mistranslation of מִכַּר is, it may be suggested, to be observed in 1 Maccabees 1¹⁵. In this verse we are told of the apostasy of some of the Jews, how they made themselves uncircumcised, and so on. The verse ends with the words καὶ ἐπράθησαν ποιῆσαι πονηρόν. It may with some confidence be suggested that the Hebrew original which lies behind the Greek text here was וַיִּתְּמְכְּרוּ לַעֲשׂוֹת הָרָע—precisely as in 2 Kings 17¹⁷, where the apostasy of Israel from Yahweh is likewise alluded to—and that the correct translation of the Hebrew original is not, as the Greek translators render it ‘and sold themselves to do evil’, but ‘and they showed themselves deceitful by doing evil’.⁴ This passage thus provides welcome supporting evidence for the equation מִכַּר = מָכַר.⁵

D. WINTON THOMAS

מלאו IN JEREMIAH IV. 5 :

A MILITARY TERM¹

The book of Jeremiah contains, we believe, some Hebrew military terms which have not so far been appreciated as such. One such term is מלאו in ch. iv. 5. The evidence we have to consider, if we wish to discover the true meaning of מלאו in this passage, is fourfold: the Old Testament itself, the ancient versions (more especially the LXX and Syriac versions), the evidence of comparative Semitic philology, and the writings of Jewish commentators. From a consideration of these four different types of evidence the correct interpretation of מלאו, which has been generally missed by lexicographers and commentators, will, it is hoped, become clear.

The Hebrew text of Jer. iv. 5 runs as follows:

הנידו ביהודה ובירושלם השמיעו ואמרו וחקעו שופר בארץ קראו מלאו
ואמרו האספו ונבואה אל-ערי המבצר

In the Revised Version the verse is translated thus:

"Declare ye in Judah, and publish in Jerusalem; and say,
Blow ye the trumpet in the land: cry aloud and say, Assemble
yourselves, and let us go into the fenced cities."

In this translation the word "cry" represents, of course, קראו, and the word "aloud" represents מלאו. The Revisers saw in the phrase קראו מלאו an asyndetous construction. For them the two words meant "cry, fill," the implied object of מלאו being קול "voice." So the phrase was taken to mean "cry, fill" (the voice), i.e., "cry with full voice," "cry aloud." This is indeed the way in which the phrase is translated in the LXX (*kekraate mega*), the Peshitta (*qerau beqala rama*) and the Vulgate (*clamate fortiter*), and the way too in which it is most commonly explained by grammarians,² lexicographers,³ and commentators.⁴ At least one commentator, however, finds the explanation of an asyndetous construction unsatisfactory, viz., Volz,⁵ who thinks that the original text here read, not קראו מלאו, but קראו מלחמה "proclaim war,"

¹ This paper was read at a meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study held in Rome on April 13, 1952.

² So Geseñius, *Hebr. Gram.* (Kautzsch-Cowley), 2nd ed., p. 387, *et al.*

³ So Geseñius-Buhl (16th ed.), p. 424; Zorell, p. 437; Koehler and Baumgartner, p. 524.

⁴ So F. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia*, p. 23; B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia*, p. 48; W. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, p. 26.

⁵ *Studien zum Text des Jeremia*, p. 26.

a phrase which does not, however, occur elsewhere in the O.T. No difficulty need be felt, however, about the supposition of an asyndetous construction here, and in the explanation of מלאו which will be suggested in a moment this construction is retained.

What, then, is the true meaning of מלאו? We may make the starting point of our investigation the explanation offered in 1895 by F. Perles¹ of the phrase מלאו השלטים in Jer. li, 11. Perles points out that the Peshitta here renders the verb מלא by *kannesh* "collect, assemble." To this he might have added that this same version renders מלא in 2 Sam. xxiii, 7 similarly by *kannesh*. Qimhi also, Perles points out, explains מלא here as meaning "collect, gather together"—his words are מלחמה להכניסם ולמלאם "gather them together and prepare them for war." The A.V. too has "gather the shields." This meaning "collect, gather together" Perles believes to be correct in Jer. li, 11, and in his remarks he includes a reference to Jer. iv, 5 and Job xvi, 10. His reference to these two passages is incidental only, and he does not elaborate upon it. In what follows an attempt is made to carry further the brief hint given by him as to the meaning of מלאו in Jer. iv, 5.

Let us look first at Job xvi, 10, one of the passages to which Perles refers. Here Job's adversaries are deriding him. The Hebrew text runs:

פערו עלי בפיהם בחרפה הכו לחיי יחד עלי יתמלאון:

The translation of the R.V. is as follows:

"They have gaped upon me with their mouth;
They have smitten me upon the cheek reproachfully;
They gather themselves together against me."

It is, of course, with the concluding words of the verse that we are now concerned—"they gather themselves together against me." That the Hithp. of מלא here means "mass themselves" is generally recognised by modern lexicographers² and commentators.³ The LXX render יתמלאון by *katedramon* "they have run" (upon me), and the Palestinian Syriac Lectionary by *rehet*.⁴ Rashi says the meaning of it is יתאספון "they gather themselves together," and Levi ben Gershon gives it the same meaning יתקבצון.⁵ It may well be that the Hithp. of מלא in this sense is a denominative from מלוו, which in the phrase מלא-הגוים (Gen. xlviii, 19) means "a multitude of nations," and in the phrase מלא רעים (Is. xxxi, 4) means

¹ *Analekten zur Textkritik des A.T.*, p. 80t.

² BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, p. 570; GESENIUS-BUHL, p. 424; ZORELL, p. 437; KOEHLER and BAUMGARTNER, p. 525.

³ K. BUDDE, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 85; B. DUHM, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 88; P. DHORME, *Le Livre de Job*, p. 213; G. HÖLSCHER, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 38; S. R. DRIVER and G. B. GRAY, *The Book of Job* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 145 (and philol. notes, p. 105).

⁴ *Supplement to a Palestinian Syriac Lectionary*, ed. A. S. LEWIS, p. 6.

⁵ Cp. NACHMANIDES at Ex. xxii, 28 (quoted by PERLES, *op. cit.*, p. 81).

מלא IN JEREMIAH IV. 5

49

"a mass, multitude of shepherds,"¹ Both in the verb and in the noun we have then the meaning "mass, crowd."

We may now turn to another passage, which is not mentioned by Perles, but which is important for our discussion, viz., Jer. xii, 6, of which the Hebrew text is as follows:

כי נִמְאָחִיד וּבֵית־אֲבִיךָ נִמְדָּמָה בָּנֻךְ נִמְדָּמָה קְרָאוּ אַחֲרֶיךָ מֵלֵא
אֶל־תִּאֲמַן בָּם כִּי יִדְבְּרוּ אֵלֶיךָ מִזִּבּוֹת:

In the R.V. this verse is translated:

"For even thy brethren, and the house of thy father, even they have dealt treacherously with thee; even they have cried aloud after thee; believe them not, though they speak fair words unto thee."

The translation of מלא "they have cried aloud" is the same as is given by the Revisers to קראו מלא in Jer. iv, 5, and it is the translation which is usually to be found in commentaries.² But the translation of the A.V. seems to be more correct—"they have called a multitude after thee,"³ i.e., Jeremiah's kinsmen have raised a hue and cry after him, they have massed together to hunt him down. For this translation the vowels of מלא need to be altered so as to read either *melo'* "mass, multitude," which will then be direct object after קראו ("they have called after thee a multitude"), or *malle'* (Pi. infin. absolute) "they have called after thee, mustering," the implied object being the members of the tribe. That this is the sense of the phrase is shown by the rendering of it by the LXX. Their translation is—*eboēsan, ek tōn opisō sou episunēchthēsan*. The last word *episunēchthēsan* "are gathered together" renders מלא.⁵ Rashi⁶ and Qimhi⁷ further support this meaning of מלא here. Streane⁸ remarks that the LXX, in spite of rendering מלא successfully in Jer. iv, 5, failed to see the force of מלא here. It seems more probable, however, that the reverse is the case—they saw the force of מלא here, but failed to see the force of it in iv, 5. There is thus no need to emend the text in this passage, as some commentators have done.⁹

Before we proceed to consider מלא in Jer. iv, 5, we must refer briefly to the use in Arabic of the word *mala'a*, with which the Hebrew מלא is cognate. This Arabic word means "filled," and

¹ See BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, p. 571.

² GIESEBRECHT, *op. cit.*, p. 73; DUHM, *op. cit.*, p. 116, et al.

³ Marg. "they cried after thee fully."

⁴ Cp. DUHM, *op. cit.*, p. 116; J. BARTH, *Die Nominalbild. in d. sem. Sprachen*, p. 14f, regards *mala'* as equivalent to the Arabic infin. (*qatil* form) in an abstract sense "Fülle"; cp. C. BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss. d. vergleich. Grammi. d. sem. Sprachen*, i, p. 337.

⁵ See further VOLZ, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

⁶ קבוצת מלא

⁷ קבוצת מלא

⁸ *The Double Text of Jeremiah*, p. 136.

⁹ So, e.g., VOLZ, *op. cit.*, p. 107; RUDOLPH, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

in the sixth form means "aided, assisted one another to do a thing."¹ Schultens² compared this sixth form with יִמְלֹאן in Job xvi, 10; and Hitzig,³ in reference to the same passage, drew attention to the Arabic phrase *tamala'u' 'ala qatlihi* "they massed together to kill him."⁴ The Arabic noun *mala'un* means "assembly," the same word as the Hebrew מְלוֹא, which we have already seen has this meaning in Gen. xlviii, 19 and Is. xxxi, 4. It is used in this sense in the Qoran, in Sura ii, 247 and Sura xi, 40. With this use of *mala'un* and מְלוֹא we may compare the Syriac *mulaya* "coetus"⁵ and *mela'a* "frequentia,"⁶ and in all probability the Accadian *millu* "band, company"⁷ belongs here. The Accadian *mu'du* (=Hebrew מֵאוֹד) means "fulness, mass, crowd,"⁸ and provides a parallel to the double meaning which we have in the Hebrew מְלוֹא "fulness, crowd."

We have so far seen reason to think that a study of the Hebrew text of Jer. li, 11, xii, 6; Job xvi, 10; Gen. xlviii, 19; and Is. xxxi, 4, in combination with the ancient versions, with the testimony of some Jewish commentators, and with the evidence of other Semitic languages, leads to the conclusion that the Hebrew root מִלֵּא can be used in the sense of "collect, assemble, mass," and that the noun מְלוֹא can mean "multitude, mass." It is not difficult to see how closely related are the ideas of "being full, fill"—מִלֵּא in Hebrew is used both transitively and intransitively,⁹ as are the corresponding roots in Accadian, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Aramaic—and the idea of "assemble, mass." People who "fill" a room "mass, assemble" in it; troops "mass" and "fill" (a breach), and so on. With this much clear, we are now in a better position to consider more closely the meaning of the phrase קְרָאוּ מְלוֹא in Jer. iv, 5. As I said earlier, the translation "cry aloud" is to be rejected. The implied object of מְלוֹא is not, as this translation would require, קוֹל "voice," but rather מְלוֹא which is then a cognate accusative after מְלוֹא. The phrase קְרָאוּ מְלוֹא means literally "proclaim, assemble

¹ LANE, *Arab. Eng. Lex.*, p. 2729. For the biliteral *ml* in verbs meaning "collect, heap up," see J. FÜRST, *Hebr. u. Chald. Wörterb. über das A.T.*, I, p. 736; ii, p. 39.

² *Commentarius in librum Jobi*, 1773, p. 374.

³ *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 123.

⁴ See F. A. ARNOLD, *Amrilkaisi Carmen (quartum)*, 1836, p. 2f.

⁵ PAYNE SMITH, *Thes. Syr.*, p. 2124.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 2126.

⁷ See F. DELITZSCH, *Assyr. Handwörterb.*, p. 414; cp. W. MUSS-ARNOLT, *A Concise Dict. of the Assyr. Lang.*, p. 545. The equation of the Egyptian *mrt* "common people, peasants," or the like, with the Arabic *mala'un* "assembly, crowd," is very doubtful; see A. ERMAN, *Zeitschr. d. deut. Morgenl. Gesellschaft*, xlyi (1892), p. 112.

⁸ MUSS-ARNOLT, *op. cit.*, p. 507.

⁹ A. RAHLES thinks that originally there must have been in Hebrew, as in Arabic, two roots, *male'* "be full" and *mala'* "fill," and that the former, because of its greater frequency, has absorbed the latter. See *Festschrift Friedrich Carl Andreas*, Leipzig, 1916, p. 135f.

מלאו IN JEREMIAH IV. 5

51

א מלאו " i.e., "assemble an assembly," a phrase which is equivalent to "proclaim mobilisation," "proclaim a muster" (of troops). The imperative מלאו stands in an asyndetous construction with קראו, and may be regarded as an example of a declarative Pi.¹ The Pi. may thus be taken to mean "declare mobilisation." So a word in common use meaning "be full, fill," has come to be used in the meaning "assemble," and here in Jer. iv, 5 we may see it applied in a military situation to mean the assembling for military purposes of available man power. In this passage a certain sequence may be traced. First, there is the blowing of the trumpet—a signal of danger, whether from the Scythians or from later invaders—and this is followed by mobilisation, an idea expressed again in the following האספו. Both Rashi and Qimhi explain מלאו here by אסיפה "a gathering together," and the A.V. renders it by "gather together."

It is of some interest to note that המלאו, the citadel in Jerusalem, to which reference is made in 2 Sam. v, 9, etc., is explained by Qimhi as a place where the people assembled. What he says is—"המלאו is a place adjoining a wall and the place was broad for people to assemble there; therefore it is called מלאו."² It is not necessarily to be claimed that Qimhi's explanation is correct, but the basis of his explanation, viz., that מלאו is to be connected with מלא in the special sense of "assemble" is at least noteworthy for our present discussion.

In conclusion, some considerations of general interest which arise from this brief paper may be pointed out. First, it may be noted how, as frequently, the LXX and Syriac versions have preserved the correct meaning of a Hebrew word. The translators knew that מלאו could mean "assemble, gather together," as also did the Jewish scholars to whom reference has been made. Secondly, as is often the case, the meaning given to a Hebrew word by the ancient versions finds corroboration in cognate words in other Semitic languages. Thirdly, the correct understanding of the meaning of מלאו makes unnecessary the emendations which have been proposed in Jer. iv, 5, xii, 6, and li, 11. Once again it may be observed how the correct meaning of the Hebrew text as it stands can be recovered by the application of proved methods of investigation. Fourthly, if our interpretation of מלאו in Jer. iv, 5 is correct, we catch a fresh glimpse into the military vocabulary of the ancient Hebrews. We now know a new way in which they expressed the idea of mobilising troops. And lastly, the concentration of attention upon the problems presented by a single

¹ For this type of Pi., see GESENIUS, *Hebr. Gramm.* (KAUTZSCH-COWLEY), 2nd ed., p. 141.

² On 2 Sam., v, 9—מלאו הוא מקום סמוך לחומה ואותו המקום היה רחבה להאסף הָעָם שָׁם—לפיכך נקרא מלאו כמו קראו כולאו ואסרו האספו. His explanation at I Ki. xi, 27 and I Chr. xi, 8 is given in similar terms.

Hebrew word may appear a small matter when compared with the larger themes which have been the subjects of papers at the meetings of our Society. It is, however, perhaps well that we should be reminded from time to time that the work of the textual critic and the Semitic philologist is fundamental to all our studies. Without firm bases achieved along these lines of study, sound exegesis of the Old Testament is not to be attained.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Cambridge.

A Note on the Hebrew Root נחם.

THE Arabic root *nahama* means 'to breathe pantingly or hard' (of a horse),² and this primary meaning may be expected to underlie or actually to occur in some of the passages in which the Hebrew root נחם is found.

The connexion between the Arabic and Hebrew roots can be seen in the frequent occurrences in Hebrew of נחם Pi. in the sense of 'to comfort,' the primary meaning being 'to make to breathe.' Dalman is probably right in believing that the Syriac ܢܚܡ meant from the first 'to draw a deep

² Lane, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.*, i. viii. p. 3029.

breath (of relief), breathe again,' and that from this primary meaning the further idea of 'to comfort,' *i.e.* 'to make to breathe again' was developed.¹

We may see further the meaning 'breathe pantingly or hard' underlying those occurrences of נחם (Niph. Hithp.) which are translated in the English Versions by 'ease oneself,' 'be comforted,' 'comfort oneself'; see, for example, Is 1²⁴ (Niph.), Ezk 5¹³ (Hithp.), Ps 119⁵² (Hithp.), etc. The underlying idea here will be that of relief gained by taking a deep breath (cp. the phrase 'a sigh of relief').

The primary meaning borne by the Arabic root is shown clearly in Gn 27⁴³, where Esau (according to the English Versions) 'doth comfort himself (מתנחם), purposing to kill thee.' The LXX, Vulg., and Pesh. translate נחם here by 'threaten' (ἀπειλεί, minatur, يهدد). The translation 'is breathing pantingly for (after) thee to kill thee' will express Esau's purposeful eagerness to relieve his feelings by killing Jacob. Such a rendering seems to facilitate the translation of נָחַם, which in the English Versions is represented by the clumsy 'as touching thee.'² In this connexion the use of ἀμβροδομαί in Jn 11^{32, 38} is instructive. The Greek word, translated in the English Versions 'groan' (R.V. marg. 'was moved with indignation') is used of horses 'to snort in' (harness). Jones and M'Kenzie,³ in giving this meaning, translate the word in the verses in John by 'was deeply moved.' It is the idea of heavy breathing combined with that of deep emotion that underlies מתנחם in the case of Esau.

Next, there are two cases where נחם is followed by הָלַל as object. First, in Job 21³⁴ אֵיךְ תִּנְחַמְתִּי הָלַל means perhaps not 'How then comfort ye me in vain' (so English Versions), but 'How do ye breathe mere breath at me!' ⁴ *i.e.* what nonsense you are talking (see the second half of the verse). Job's friends, therefore, are designated by him not vain comforters but 'windbags.' Secondly, in Zec 10³ יִנְחַמְּךָ הָלַל may mean, not as in the English Versions, 'they comfort in vain,' but 'they breathe mere breath,' *i.e.* the diviners talk nonsense.

The root occurs again in Job 16², where מְנַחֵם

may mean not 'miserable comforters' (as in the English Versions), but 'breathers out of trouble,' *i.e.* mischief-makers.

A further connexion with the Arabic root can be seen in the Syriac ܢܚܡܐ, which means 'spirare fecit, resuscitavit, excitavit mortuos.'⁵ It is clear that the idea underlying ܢܚܡܐ 'resurrectio' ⁶ is that of the dead being once more supplied with breath.⁷

It would seem, then, that the primary meaning of all three roots nahama = נחם = ܢܚܡܐ was 'to take a (deep) breath,' and that several instances of this are preserved in the Old Testament.

Mr. G. R. Driver has drawn my attention to the fact that the Hebrew root נחם has gone through a similar semantic development. The primary meaning of the root is 'to breathe, blow' (cp. the Syriac ܢܚܡܐ Pe. 'flavit, afflavit'),⁸ while in the Hiph. the root means 'to snort, puff' against a person.⁹ Further, in several passages in Proverbs (6¹³ 14^{6, 25} 19^{6, 9}), מְנַחֵם is found as the object of the Hiph., and the phrase 'breathe out lies' is very similar to the phrases already referred to in Job, where הָלַל and מְנַחֵם stand as objects of נחם in the sense of 'to breathe out.' It may be added that in Syriac ܢܚܡܐ, besides bearing the meaning 'flavit, afflavit,' also means 'respiravit, quievit,'¹⁰ and in this sense is comparable with התנחם 'be comforted' (see exx. of the Hithp. of נחם above).

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Durham.

¹ *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 71-72.

² For the use of *lamedh* with verbs of dealing or acting towards (whether with friendly or hostile intent), v. *Heb.-Eng. Lex.* (Brown-Driver-Briggs), sub ל, 1 d (p. 510).

³ *Greek-Eng. Lex.*, p. 540.

⁴ For the suffix denoting the remoter object, v. Gesenius *Heb.-Gr.* (Kautzsch-Cowley), 2nd ed., 117 x.

JOB'S "COMFORTERS"

THE phrase "Job's Comforters" has passed into the English language, and therefore a suggestion that the phrase may owe its origin to a mistranslation of the Hebrew text may perhaps be deemed to be of sufficient interest to be brought to the notice of those who are not especially concerned with comparative Semitic philology. The linguistic argument, fully worked out, may be found in the present writer's note in *The Expository Times* for January, 1933, pp. 191-2. The following is an attempt to reproduce, with the omission of philological technicalities, the suggestion made there.

The phrase is, of course, based on Job. xxi. 34, "How then do ye comfort me in vain, seeing in your answers there remaineth falsehood?" The word used in the Hebrew text and translated "comfort" occurs very frequently in the Old Testament in this sense. A comparison with the cognate Arabic and Syriac roots, however, makes a different translation possible, perhaps indeed probable.

This Arabic root means "to breathe pantingly or hard." The connection between the Arabic and Hebrew roots can be seen in the frequent occurrences in Hebrew of this root in the sense "to comfort," the primary meaning being "to make to breathe." Further evidence for such a connection is yielded by a comparison with the cognate root in Syriac, which meant from the first "to draw a deep breath (of relief), breathe again," and from this primary meaning the further idea of "to comfort," i.e. "to make to breathe again," was developed. This same Hebrew root in other conjugations is variously translated in the English Versions by "ease oneself," "be comforted," "comfort

oneself"—the underlying idea being that of relief gained by taking a deep breath (cp. the phrase "a sigh of relief").

This primary meaning "breathe," borne by the Arabic and Syriac roots, may, then, be expected to underlie or actually to occur in some of the Old Testament passages in which the Hebrew root occurs. It is proposed, therefore, to take the Hebrew word in Job xxi. 34 in this sense. The noun which follows as object, translated in the English Versions "in vain," bears in Hebrew also the meaning of "breath." This passage in Job should therefore be translated, "How do ye breathe mere breath at me!" i.e. what nonsense you are talking! Such a translation fits well the second half of the verse. Job's friends, therefore, are not vain comforters, but "windbags." Exactly the same phrase as is found in Job xxi. 34 occurs in Zech. x. 2, where its translation, it is suggested, will be, not as in the English Versions, "they comfort in vain," but "they breathe mere breath," i.e. the diviners talk nonsense. Should these renderings of the Hebrew phrase in Job and Zech. be correct, it will be seen clearly that the origin of our phrase "Job's Comforters" rests upon an error of translation.

It may be added that these two occurrences of the Hebrew root in its primary meaning of "breathe" do not stand alone in the Old Testament. Mention may be made of two further passages—Job xvi. 2, where "miserable comforters" may be translated "breathers out of trouble," i.e. mischief-makers, and Gen. xxvii. 42, where Esau does not "comfort himself, *purposing* to kill thee" (as the English Versions translate), but rather "is panting after thee to kill thee."

D. WINTON THOMAS.

A Note on the Meaning of מְתַנַּחֵם in Genesis xxvii. 42.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for January 1933, p. 192, I suggested that underlying מְתַנַּחֵם in Gn 27⁴² is the idea of heavy breathing (נָחַם = Arabic *naḥama* 'breathed pantingly'), and that the phrase מְתַנַּחֵם לִי לְהַרְגֶנִּי should be translated not, as in the English Versions, 'doth comfort himself, purposing to kill thee,' but 'is breathing pantingly for (after) thee to kill thee.' The evidence of comparative philology finds welcome confirmation in the Targumic renderings of the phrase, as well as in the explanations given to it by some rabbinical authorities and modern commentators. These interpreters, though they have not lighted upon the correct etymology of מְתַנַּחֵם, have rightly seen that a meaning other than 'comfort' is desiderated for it, and that it is in fact expressive of Esau's

active hostility towards Jacob. It is worth while briefly to record their testimony.

i. *Targumic renderings.* (a) Onkelos¹ renders the Hebrew phrase by כְּמִן לֵךְ לְמַסְתֵּךְ 'lying in wait for thee to kill thee' (b) Pseudo-Jonathan² similarly employs the word כְּמִן 'lay in wait,' and continues with the words וְחָתֵם עָלֶיךָ 'and is planning against thee' (c) The Samaritan Targum³ renders מְתַנַּחֵם by מְתַרְגֵּז 'raging, exciting himself.' Another reading⁴ is מְתַעֲרֵר 'making himself ready.'

ii. *Rabbinical authorities.* (a) Ibn Ezra notes that Sa'adya takes מְתַנַּחֵם in the sense of the Arabic *wa'ada* 'threaten'⁵ (b) The *Midrash Leqaḥ Tob*⁶ sees in it the meaning 'growling,' connecting it, by interchange of נ and ח, with נָחַם (c) the *Midrash Sekhel Tob* gives to it the meaning מְחַיֵּץ בְּלִבוֹ 'planning in his heart.'

iii. *Commentators.* The meaning 'avenge himself' or the like is attributed to מְתַנַּחֵם by many commentators, to mention only Dillmann,⁷ Holzinger,⁸ Ehrlich,⁹ and König.¹⁰ Some of them indeed, e.g. Procksch,¹¹ recognize in the Hebrew word the primary idea of breathing, without, however, indicating how they have arrived at it.

Cambridge.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

¹ *Targ. Onkelos*, ed. A. Berliner, 1884, p. 29.

² See Walton, *Polygl.*, ad loc.

³ H. Petermann, *Pentateuch. Samar.*, Fasc. 1, Genesis, 1872, p. 61.

⁴ M. Heidenheim, *Die Samar. Pentateuch-Version*, Die Genesis, 1884, p. 35.

⁵ Cf. Abu'l Walid Marwān Ibn Janāh, *The Book of Hebrew Roots*, ed. A. Neubauer, 1873, col. 425.

⁶ For the information contained in (b) and (c) I am indebted to the kindness of my colleague, Mr. H. Loewe.

⁷ *Die Genesis*, 1892, p. 332.

⁸ *Genesis*, 1898, p. 182.

⁹ *Randglossen zur hebr. Bibel*, Bd. 1, 1908, p. 133. He regards מְתַנַּחֵם as a guttural pronunciation of מְתַנַּחֵם, comparing Is 1¹⁴ and Jg 2¹⁴.

¹⁰ *Die Genesis*, 1925, p. 592.

¹¹ *Die Genesis*, 1913, p. 327. Cf. H. L. Strack, *Die Bücher Genesis, Exodus, etc.*, 1894, p. 91.

A Study in Hebrew Synonyms; verbs signifying “to breathe”.

By D. Winton Thomas.

I have recently endeavoured to show, by a comparison with the cognate roots in Arabic and Syriac, that the primary meaning of the Hebrew root נחם is “to take a (deep) breath”, and from such a primary meaning various stages in the development of the root can be traced¹). From the primary meaning “to take a (deep) breath” is developed the second stage “to blow, puff”, with or without an object expressing what is breathed, puffed out (e. g. breath), frequently with hostile intent (the object then is some such word as “trouble” or “lies”). The third stage is reached in “to comfort”, i. e. to make to take a (deep) breath (of relief), and the fourth in “to be comforted, ease oneself, find relief”, etc., i. e. by taking a (deep) breath (of relief).

Now there are several other roots in Hebrew whose primary meaning is “to breathe”, and a comparison with the cognate roots in Arabic and Syriac (where they occur) shows that similar stages of development can be traced in these roots as were observed in the case of נחם and פוח.

In the case of the first root the development stops short at the second stage. This root יפח, a by-form of פוח, means primarily “to breathe, puff”²) — it occurs only once in the O. T. (Jer. 4, 31, in the Hithp.) — and denotes the heavy breathing of a woman in travail. This is the first stage. The second stage is found in Ps. 27. 12 where the adjective יפח occurs — and only here in the O. T. — in the phrase ויפח חֲסָם “and puffing out violence”. This is very similar to phrases

¹) See *The Expository Times*, Jan. 1933, pp. 101—2, where attention is drawn to the fact that פוח “to breathe, blow” has gone through a similar semantic development as has נחם.

²) BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *Heb. Eng. Lex.*, p. 422.

like מנחמי עמל and יסיר כוכים in Jb. 16. 2. and Prov. 6, 19¹). The third and fourth stages cannot be traced in this root, which seems to be unknown in Arabic and Syriac²).

In the case of the root נשם all four stages can be traced.

- ³ It is used first of "the deep and strong breathing of a woman in travail"³). It occurs only once in the O. T. (Is. 42. 14), but is frequent in later Hebrew⁴), while in Syriac נעם means *flavit, spiravit, respiravit*⁵), and in Arabic نسم, which is used of the breeze *blowing gently*, bears the meaning in V "respire, breathe"⁶). In the second stage we find such examples in Syriac as ܢܥܡ ܐܝܪܐܡ *iram spirabat*, ܢܥܡܐ ܡܬܬܠܐ *"they breathed out wrath"*, and ܢܥܡܐ ܩܬܝܠܐ *qui mortem spirant*⁷). The third stage is found in נָסַם "to invigorate, inspirit"⁸) i. e. to cause to take a deep breath, like נָחַם Pi. "to comfort"⁹), and the fourth stage in נָשַׁם Ithp. "to take breath, rest, recover"¹⁰), and in נָעַם Ethpe. *spiratus, respiratus est*¹¹).

The root נשש shows the same development. The first stage is seen in Syriac where ܢܫܫ means *animam duxit*,

¹) See *Ex. Times*, loc. cit.

²) In later Hebrew נָחַם is used of the *blowing up* (of cheeks); see LEVY, *Chald. Wörterb. über die Targ.* II 252, JASTROW, *Dict. of the Targ.*, etc., 586.

³) BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, 675; cp. נָשַׁם "breath".

⁴) JASTROW, *op. cit.*, 941; LEVY, *op. cit.*, III. 451.

⁵) PAYNE-SMITH, *Thes. Syr.* II. p. 2476, 7; BROCKELMANN, *Lex. Syr.* (2nd. ed.), p. 451, where see the nouns ܢܥܡܐ, ܢܥܡܐ.

⁶) HAVA, *Arab. Eng. Dict.*, 787; cp. نَسَمَ "breath". It is possible that the idea of heavy breathing involved in effort may underlie "he sought a thing with labour and perseverance" (LANE, *Arab. Eng. Lex.* 3032); cp. נָחַם Hithp. in Gen. 27. 42 (see *Expos. Times*, loc. cit.)

⁷) PAYNE-SMITH, *op. cit.*, 2476. The *Supplement* 219 gives ܢܥܡܐ *"breathing out pitiless anger"*. BROCKELMANN, *op. cit.*, 451, gives for ܢܥܡ *anhelavit(ira)*, and the idea of hostility may be seen in ܢܥܡ *increpuit*, which he also cites.

⁸) HAVA, *op. cit.*, 767.

⁹) See *Expos. Times*, loc. cit.

¹⁰) JASTROW, *op. cit.*, 941; LEVY, *op. cit.*, III. 451.

¹¹) PAYNE-SMITH, *op. cit.*, II. 2476.

A Study in Hebrew Synonyms

313

*respiravit*¹⁾ (נָשַׁם "respiration, breathing"²⁾, and in Arabic where نَسَّ V means "to breathe"³⁾, while نَسَّ means "breath" and مَتَنَسَّ "having breath"⁴⁾. There seems to be no second stage, but the third is seen in نَسَّ "to console, cheer"⁵⁾, and نَجَّى Pa. *recreavit*⁶⁾. The fourth stage appears in Hebrew, ⁵ where the root נָשַׁם is used in the Niph. with the meaning "to take breath, refresh oneself"⁷⁾. This idea of refreshing oneself is frequent in Syriac, where نَجَّى Ethpe. means *recreatus, exhilaratus est* (Cp. Ethpa.)⁸⁾ Further نَجَّى means *recreatus* as well as *animatus*⁹⁾, نَفَسَ *respiratio, recreatio*, ¹⁰ *alleviatio*¹⁰⁾, and نَفَسَ *recreativus, qui levamen affert*¹¹⁾.

The last root we shall consider is נָשַׁם, which probably meant originally "to breathe, blow"¹²⁾. The idea of breathing is seen in the Syriac نָשַׁם *respiravit, spiritum duxit*¹³⁾, and in the

¹⁾ PAYNE-SMITH, *op. cit.*, 2430.

²⁾ *Ibid.*, *Supplement*, p. 216.

³⁾ LANE, *op. cit.*, 2826. Cp. *napsu* (MUSS-ARNOLT, *Dict. of the Assy. Lang.* p. 710).

⁴⁾ LANE, *op. cit.*, 2828—29. Cp. נָשַׁם (BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.* 659), نَجَّى (PAYNE-SMITH, *op. cit.*, 2430f.), *napištu* (MUSS-ARNOLT, *op. cit.*, 721).

⁵⁾ HAVA, *op. cit.*, 787; LANE, *op. cit.*, 2826.

⁶⁾ PAYNE-SMITH, *op. cit.*, 2430; BROCKELMANN, *op. cit.*, 441.

⁷⁾ BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, 661. Cp. JASTROW, *op. cit.*, 926, נָשַׁם "breathing, resting"; further LEVY, *op. cit.*, III. 425—6.

⁸⁾ PAYNE-SMITH, *op. cit.*, 2430; BROCKELMANN, *op. cit.*, 442.

⁹⁾ BROCKELMANN, *op. cit.*, 441.

¹⁰⁾ PAYNE-SMITH, *op. cit.*, 2432; BROCKELMANN, *op. cit.*, 441.

¹¹⁾ *Ibid.*, 2433. In view of the above it would seem worthwhile asking whether BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, 659 (cp. LEVY, *op. cit.*, III. 426) are correct in believing that the meaning of נָשַׁם in the sense of "monument, gravestone" arises because it represents a person (נָשַׁם), or whether JASTROW, *op. cit.*, p. 926, is not more correct in seeing in the word primarily the meaning of a resting-place, and then a structure next to or over a tomb. Cp. مَسْرَح "grave", i. e. place of rest or ease (LANE, *op. cit.*, 1183).

¹²⁾ BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, 924; cp. נָשַׁם "breath, wind" (*ibid. loc. cit.*), نَفَسَ PAYNE-SMITH, *op. cit.*, 3851, and نَفَسَ (LANE, *op. cit.*, 1181).

¹³⁾ PAYNE-SMITH, *op. cit.*, 3849.

Arabic اراح¹⁾. There appears to be no trace of a second stage²⁾, but the third stage is seen in פ Pa. *spirare fecit* (metaph. *placavit, lenivit*)³⁾, and in רוח "to cheer"⁴⁾. The fourth stage appears in אراح "he revived" and استراح "found rest or ease"⁵⁾, and in פ Ethpa. *pacatus est, levamen accipit, recreatur*⁶⁾ (cp. the phrase נשום לחם *respirabit cor tuum* (Is. 60. 5), sc. *recreabitur*)⁷⁾. Finally there may be mentioned מְסִיב sedatus, pacatus, מְסִיבָה status quietis, מְסִיבָה placatio, recreatio⁸⁾, and such words as רָוַח, etc., which signify "the expressing relief from grief or sorrow"⁹⁾.

¹⁾ LANE, *op. cit.*, 1179; HAVA, *op. cit.*, 276.

²⁾ But see BROCKELMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 718, who notes Job 4, 9. where both נשמה and רוח are used of God's destroying breath.

³⁾ PAYNE-SMITH, *op. cit.*, 3850.

⁴⁾ HAVA, *op. cit.*, 276.

⁵⁾ LANE, *op. cit.*, 1179.

⁶⁾ PAYNE-SMITH, *op. cit.*, 3850; BROCKELMANN, *op. cit.*, 718.

⁷⁾ PAYNE-SMITH, *op. cit.*, 3849.

⁸⁾ *Ibid.*, 3855.

⁹⁾ LANE, *op. cit.*, 1178.

A Note on the Hebrew Text of Judges 16, 20.

By D. Winton Thomas (Durham).

The words וְהָיָה כִּי יֵצֵא וְהָיָה are translated in the English Versions "I will go out as at other times (A. V. times before) and shake myself". The translation of וְהָיָה by "shake myself" is, however, hardly satisfactory. Commentators generally take it to mean "shake myself free (from bonds)"¹, i. e. the bonds with which Delilah, it is supposed, bound Samson. But nothing is said about his having been bound on this occasion², and it is not

¹) See, for example, G. F. Moore, *Judges* (*Intern. Crit. Comm.*), p. 356.

²) This difficulty is felt by G. F. Moore, *op.*

recorded elsewhere that he "shook himself".

The LXX (*ἐκταραξάμενος*) and Vulg. (*me excutiam*) support a derivation from a root נָעַר "to shake"³. The Pesh., however has אֲשַׁתֵּר בָּרוֹן "I will punish them"⁴, the suffix in בָּרוֹן referring, of course, to the Philistines; while the Targum of Jonathan has אֲתִנְקֵר *praevalebo*⁵.

That some such meaning as "punish, avenge oneself, gain the mastery", as is expressed in the Pesh. and Targ., is required, seems clear. Samson has in mind a sortie against the Philistines in retaliation for their attempts to seize him. In Arabic the root *nār* means "to boil, be in violent commotion, be very angry". If נָעַר here be equated with the Arabic root, we obtain some such meaning as this: "I will go out as at other times and show myself angry", i. e. I will punish them, have my vengeance upon them⁶. The sentence thus expresses Samson's intention to barry the Philistines once again, as he has done on previous occasions; the following sentence פָּתַעְתִּי וְרוּאָ provides the reason for his inability to carry out his intention.

In the translation of אֲנִי אֲנִי

cit., loc. cit., who conjectures that "the words *she bound him* have been accidentally omitted", Cp. C. F. Burney, *Book of Judges*, p. 384, n. *ad. loc.*, who approves this conjecture.

³) So Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebr.-Engl. Lex.*, p. 654.

⁴) Cp. this Syriac phrase in Acts 26, 11 where it represents *ταπεινά*.

⁵) See Waltons *Polyglott*, Tom. 2, p. 156.

⁶) Lane, *Arab. Eng. Lex.* I, VIII, p. 2817; cp. Hava, *Arab. Eng. Dict.*, p. 784. Cp. further our phrase "to boil with rage".

⁷) For the use of אֲנִי in a hostile sense, see Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 424.

⁸) Cp. 14, 19, where on a previous occasion when Samson has smitten the Philistines "his anger was kindled" (אֲנִי אֲנִי); see further 15, 7, when on another occasion Samson says "I will be avenged of you" (אֲנִי אֲנִי).

offered above, it is assumed that the rendering of אֲנִי אֲנִי as given in the English Versions contains a general reference to Samson's former exploits against the Philistines, as recorded, for example, in such passages as 14, 19, 15, 8, 15, 15. Such a general reference would seem to be present in the renderings of the phrase in, for example, the Vulg. *sicut ante feci*, and Pesh. אֲדָרְבֵּל וְבִן.

It is possible, however, that this phrase אֲנִי אֲנִי which means literally "as time on time", i. e. as formerly, as usual⁹, may contain a more specific reference to the three previous attempts on the part of Delilah to discover the secret of Samson's strength. Should the phrase be taken in this way, a difficulty arises because it is not recorded that Samson "went out" on the previous occasions. This difficulty however disappears if אֲנִי here be translated not "I will go out", but "I will escape"¹⁰. Samson thus affirms that on this fourth attempt to wrest his secret from him he will escape as he has done on the three former occasions. The sense of the passage will then be: "I will escape as on the previous occasions (i. e. the previous attempts to seize me), but (this time) I will show myself angry". Samson's patience is exhausted. This fourth attempt to seize him proves too much for him. He will show these Philistines he will stand it no longer! He is not content this time merely to escape from the trap laid for him — it is time for action — he will have his vengeance on the Philistines. So he thinks (אֲנִי), — "but he did not realise (לֹא יָדַע) that the Lord had departed from him", and that the vengeance which he thought would be his would be denied him.

⁹) Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 822.

¹⁰) For other instances of אֲנִי in this sense, see Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 423. Cp. G. F. Moore, *op. cit., loc. cit.*, who translates "I shall get off".

A NOTE ON סָחַר לִבִּי IN PSALM xxxviii 11

THE Hebrew root סָחַר, cognate with the Accadian *saḥāru* and the Arabic سَحَّرَ, in the sense of 'enchant' has already been detected in Isa. xlvii 15, where סָחַרְיָה is to be translated 'thy sorcerers'.¹ A further example is, I suggest, to be seen in סָחַרְיָה in Ps. xxxviii 11.

Hitherto this word has been generally translated 'palpitates, throbs'.² Briggs³ is surely right, however, in objecting that such a rendering is purely conjectural, and that it rests upon an unjustifiable interpretation of סָחַר. The difficulty he rightly feels he surmounts by emending סָחַרְיָה to סָחַרְיָה, 'be in a ferment'.⁴ Emendation is, however, unnecessary if to סָחַר in this verse is given the meaning 'enchant'.

According to Lane,⁵ سَحَّرَ means 'he hit, hurt his سَحَر lungs or his

¹ See R. Levy *Deutero-Isaiah* (1925) p. 210; H. Torczyner *ZAW* (1936) p. 134, where see also J. Hempel, footnote 1; and G. R. Driver *J.T.S.* xxxvi 400. The Accadian *ṣ* normally corresponds to the Arabic ح, but the equation *ṣ* = ح is permissible in certain circumstances (see B. Meissner *Kurzegefasste Assy. Gramm.* (1907) § 8 b, p. 6).

² Cf. Eng. Versions. See further H. Gunkel *Die Psalmen* (1926) p. 160 f; W. E. Barnes *The Psalms* (Westm. Comm.) (1931) i 193. The Versions render as follows: LXX ἐταράχθη, Aq. ἐπείμυετο, Pesh. גָּלַגַּל, Vulg. *conturbatum est*, Jer. *fluctuabat*, Targ. צַמְצַמ.

³ *The Book of Psalms* (Intern. Crit. Comm.) (1906) i 339, 342.

⁴ *Ibid.* comparing Lam. i 20, ii 11.

⁵ *Arab.-Eng. Lex.* 1316-1318.

NOTES AND STUDIES

391

سحر heart ; he turned him from his course, way or manner of being ;
 enchanted, fascinated him ; deceived, deluded, beguiled him', &c. To
 مسح is given the meaning 'enchanted time after time, so that his
 intelligence is disordered, or rendered unsound ; or enchanted much, so
 that his reason is overcome', while مسح has much the same meaning.
 In this connexion the following citation¹ is of interest—كان ملكهم ساحراً
 فسحر من عقولهم حتى جعلوه نبياً 'their king was a sorcerer and he
 bewitched them out of their minds until they made him into a prophet'.
 May it not be then that the true meaning of לִבִּי סִחֲרָחַר is 'my heart
 (mind) is bewitched, disordered'? Omitting פָּהִי (as a gloss)² and
 בְּמִדָּה (belonging probably to v. 12),³ we may translate the verse as
 follows :

'My mind is bewitched, it has taken leave of me,
 And the light of mine eyes (i.e. clear vision) is no longer with me.'
 D. WINTON THOMAS.

A LOST HEBREW WORD IN ISAIAH II. 6

THE theme of the poem in Isa. ii. 6–22 is the coming Day of Yahweh, when doom will fall upon Israel because she has shown herself disloyal to Yahweh by her offences, among them the practice of magic (verse 6). Many commentators have rightly seen that in this verse some word meaning ‘diviners’ or the like is required as the subject to the verb מָלְאוּ. The Targum indeed supplies such a subject, viz. טַעוֹן ‘idols’. The word מַקְדָּם has accordingly been variously emended—to קָסָם or מַקְסָם ‘divination’, or to רִסְמִים ‘diviners’; or מַקְדָּם is retained and one of these proposed readings—or another קִסְמִי—is supplied before it—thus ‘divination (diviners) from the east’, whence, it is supposed, Israel borrowed her magical customs.³ The word עֲנִיִּים ‘soothsayers’

¹ Lane, *Lexicon*, p. 278b, quotes the Arab lexicographers for the statement that it is the same as أَلْفٌ ‘remembered’, and the *Qāmūs* says that it means ‘was mindful of’.

² I prefer to take יְהוָה as a construct and so to make eternity an attribute of God in both halves of the verse.

³ See, e.g., the commentaries of Lowth, p. 149; Duhm, p. 18; Marti, p. 29; Procksch, p. 63; Feldmann, p. 31; Kissane, i, p. 25. ‘The east’ is generally taken to refer to Arabia and the Aramaean lands; cp. Rashi, ad loc., and the commentaries of Dillmann, p. 23; Hitzig, p. 26; and König, p. 63. Symm. translates מַקְדָּם by ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς, but the chief ancient versions give it a temporal sense—LXX ὥς τὸ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς; Vulg. *ut olim*; Pesh. ܡܝ ܝܨܡ ܒܝܡܢ; Targ. כִּיד מִלְקָדָמָן (which could, however, be translated ‘from the east’; see J. F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah*, p. 8).

that follows argues for a personal, rather than an abstract, subject, and the proposal to read קִסְמִים (קִסְמִי) provides such a subject and an appropriate meaning as well. It may be suggested, however, that a reading which fulfils both these requirements, and which is at the same time nearer to the consonants of the Massoretic text, is מַעֲקָדִים [מַעֲקָדִים].

The Hebrew root עֲקַד 'bound' occurs only once in the O.T. (Gen. xxii. 9), but in Arabic عَقَدَ commonly has the meaning 'tied', and it is used also of magic—عَاقِدَات means 'witches' and مُعَقِّد 'enchanter, charmer'.¹ The connexion between binding and magic is, of course, well known. An example of it in Hebrew is found in the phrase חֲבֵר חֲבֵר 'one who ties magic knots, a charmer' (Deut. xviii. 11; Ps. lviii. 6; חֲבֵר alone in Isa. xlvii. 9, 12). It is easily intelligible that a scribe, who may not have known the rare Hebrew word מַעֲקָד, should have been led into error in copying it.² The Hebrew text of Isa. ii. 6 should, it is suggested, run thus: כִּי מְלֵאוֹ מַעֲקָדִים וְעוֹנִים בְּפִלְשֹׁתִים 'For they are full of³ enchanter and soothsayers like the Philistines. . . .'⁴

D. WINTON THOMAS

THE TEXT OF JESAIA II 6 AND THE WORD שֶׁמֶךְ

By D. Winton Thomas

(4 Grantchester Road, Cambridge)

The poem in Jes ii. 6-22 is concerned with the coming Day of Yahweh, when Israel will be punished for her infidelity to Yahweh. Among her offences is the practice of magic (verse 6). I have recently suggested that מְקַדִּים 'from the east' in verse 6 is a corruption of קַעֲקָדִים 'enchanters'¹, and I would suggest now that the recognition of this corruption points the way to the recovery of what may well have been the original text of 6b-d, which is by general consent corrupt.

The corruption of מְקַדִּים 'enchanters' into מְקַדִּים 'from the east' led, it may be suggested, first to the insertion of a balancing gloss כְּפִלְשְׁתִּים 'like the Philistines'. It has indeed long been thought probable that כְּפִלְשְׁתִּים is a gloss,² and it has been rightly observed that 'there is no reason to suppose that the Philistines were specially remarkable for their superstition'.³ The next stage was the insertion of a second balanc-

¹ J. T. S. xiii, 1962, pp. 323f.

² See, e. g., GUTHIE, in E. KAUTZSCH, *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, 4th. ed. by A. BERTHOLET, 1922, 1, p. 593, and M. LÖHR, *ZAW*, 1916, p. 75.

³ E. J. KISSANE, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1, p. 28. Cf. G. B. GRAY, *The Book of Isaiah* (I. C. C.), p. 53.

ing gloss, viz., **ובילדי נכרים**. The present Hebrew text is thus due to an initial corruption which led to the subsequent insertion of two balancing glosses, referring, like **מקדם**, to non-Israelite peoples.

The last words of the verse — **ובילדי נכרים ישפיקו** — have in fact never been satisfactorily explained. The LXX's free translation καὶ τέκνα πολλὰ ἀλλόφυλα ἐγενήθη αὐτοῖς⁴ 'and many strange children were born to them' reflects the Hebrew verb **שפק** 'suffice, abound', as does the Pesh. **ܫܦܟܐ ܕܬܝܠܕܝܢ ܕܢܚܝܝܢ** 'and many strange children they brought up'. Jerome⁵ thought of pederasty, while the Targum renders freely — **ובנומסי עממא אזלין** 'and they walk in the ways of the nations'.⁶ Modern scholars have usually interpreted the text in one of two ways. In the first place, there are those who emend **ובילדי** to **בְּיָדַי**, and translate the phrase 'and they strike (**שפק**, **ספק** 'slap, clap') the hands of foreigners', i. e., they strike bargains, political and economic, with them.⁷ Others, however, see in the phrase some kind of superstitious practice whose nature remains obscure.⁸ If, however, as we believe, the words **ובילדי נכרים** are a gloss, the meaning of the phrase need not detain us.

The original text of verse 6 probably then ran as follows:

בית יעקב	כי ינטשת עמך
ועננים ישפיקו	כי ימלאו מקדשים

As has been pointed out, two roots **שפק** have come in for consideration here, but it can hardly be doubted that the parallelism with **מלאו**, as well as perhaps the repeated **ואין קצה** 'and there is no end' in verse 7, points to **שפק** 'suffice, abound' (as LXX, Pesh., A. V. marg.).¹¹ We may accordingly translate the verse:

'For thou hast forsaken thy people, even the house of Jacob,
For they are full of enchanters, and soothsayers abound'.¹²

⁴ Perhaps a reminiscence of Hos v. 7; see J. ZIEGLER, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*, p. 107, and I. L. SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, p. 72.

⁵ Nos vertimus *adhaeserunt*, ut vitiorum in gente Judaea turpitudine monstretur. Intantum autem Graeci et Romani hoc quondam vitio laboraverunt, ut et clarissimi philosophorum Graeciae haberent publice concubinos . . . (MIGNE, *Patrol.*, xxiv, 1845, col. 47). Against Jerome's translation, see F. DELITZSCH, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, I, 1886, p. 119.

⁶ J. F. STENNING, *The Targum of Isaiah*, p. 9.

⁷ So R. V., R. S. V.; BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *Hebr. Lex.*, p. 706; E. KÖNIG, *Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 64; B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 17; O. PROCKSCH, *Jesaja I*, p. 63; G. B. GRAY, *op. cit.*, pp. 52, 58, and earlier in *Z. A. W.*, 1911, pp. 112ff., reading **כנענים** 'merchants' for **עננים**. Symm. translates **ישפיקו** by ἀρότησαν, and Theodot. by ἡράκσαντο (J. ZIEGLER, *Isaias*, p. 129).

⁸ So. e. g., GUTHRIE, *op. cit. loc. cit.*; K. MARTI, *Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 30. J. A. BEWER, *J. B. L.* xxvii, 1908, p. 164, emends **ישפיקו** to **יבשקו** 'practice sorcery'. Kimḥi too has magic in mind (**מתעסקים בכספרי הכשמים והנחשים**). GES.-BUHL, *Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterbuch*, p. 791, refer to Arabic *tašfiq*, for which see J. WELLHAUSEN, *Reste arab. Heidentumes*, pp. 156f.

⁹ LXX's ἀνῆκεν γὰρ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ = **נטש עמו** 'he has forsaken his people', a reading adopted by GRAY, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

¹⁰ LXX's ἐνεπλήσθη ἡ γῶρα αὐτῶν = **מלאה ארצו** 'their land is filled'; Targ. **ארעכון** 'your land'. The text of the verse in the Isaiah scroll agrees with M. T.

¹¹ Cf. KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER, *Lex. in Vet. Test. Libros*, p. 928. LÖHR, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*, thinks **ישפיקו** could be a synonym of **מלאו**.

¹² The translation of 6c-d given above is in accordance with KISSANE's, *op. cit.*, p. 23. He, however, retains the words **ובילדי נכרים** and translates (reading **ובילדי**)

Since the verb שָׂפַק 'suffice, abound' (cf. Syr. ܫܦܩ 'suffice', and ܫܦܩ in later Hebrew and in Jewish Aramaic) occurs in the O. T. only here (Hiph.) and in I Reg xx. 10 (Qal), and the noun שָׂפָק 'sufficiency, plenty' only in Hi xx. 22, the opportunity may be taken to assemble those passages in Ben Sira — they are not all recorded in the dictionaries — in which שָׂפַק (ܫܦܩ), and a derivative שָׂפֻק, occur, always with the meaning which we have adopted for it in Jes ii. 6. The renderings of the LXX and Syriac versions are noted. There are altogether six passages.¹³

xv. 18a (Qal) ܫܦܩܬ ܚܝܬܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ (כִּי) ܫܦܩܬ ܚܝܬܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ
'For all sufficient is the wisdom of the Lord', LXX πολλή, Syr. ܫܦܩܬ
xxxiv. 12c ܐܠ ܬܐܡܪ ܫܦܩܬ ܥܠܝ
'Do not say, There is abundance to it'. LXX (xxxiv. 12) πολλά, Syr. ܫܦܩܬ + negat. ܘ

xxxiv. 30b (Pi.) ܡܡܝܢ ܕܚܝܬܐ ܕܡܫܦܩܬܐ ܕܡܫܦܩܬܐ
'(Wine) diminishes strength and increases wounds', LXX (xxxiv. 30) προσποιῶν, Syr. ܡܡܝܢ ܕܚܝܬܐ ܕܡܫܦܩܬܐ ܕܡܫܦܩܬܐ

xxxix. 16b (Qal) ܠܠ ܥܘܪܝܝܢ ܒܥܬܐ ܝܫܦܩܘ
'For every need in its time they (i. e. the works of God) suffice'
LXX translates freely, Syr. carelessly.
In the parallel verse, xxxix. 88, LXX χορηγήσει; Syr. again translates carelessly.¹⁴
xlii. 17 (Hiph.) ܠܐ ܬܫܦܩܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ
'The holy ones of God are not sufficient (to tell of his mighty wonders)'
LXX ἑσπερίσεν; Syr. ܠܐ ܬܫܦܩܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ

If I Reg xx — a North Palestinian source which has been called the 'Acts of Ahab' — is rightly regarded as belonging to the later part of the ninth century B. C.,¹⁶ the occurrence of שָׂפַק 'suffice, abound' in verse 10 will be the oldest in the O. T. Then follow in order the occurrences in Jes. ii. 6, Hi xx. 22 (שָׂפַק) and Ben Sira. The use of the word thus spans some six centuries. The history of the word has been thought to make Isaiah's use of it not very probable,¹⁷ but recent advances in the study of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages have made this kind of argument difficult to sustain.¹⁸

(Completed 27 July 1962)

Propter unam vocem corruptam in Is 2 6b duae glossae introductae sunt. Nostra inquisitione textus originalis restituitur ex sex locis Siracidae ubi *špq* (*špq*) eadem vi occurrit atque Is 2 6; notantur etiam lectiones LXX et Pescittae.

Die Verderbnis eines Wortes in Jes 2 6b hat zur Einfügung von zwei ausgleichenden Glossen geführt. Die Untersuchung stellt den ursprünglichen Text wieder her, zieht die sechs Stellen in Sirach heran, in denen *špq* (*špq*) in der gleichen Bedeutung wie in Jes 2 6 vorkommt, und notiert die Lesarten von LXX und Pescitta.

thus: 'The house of Jacob is (like the Philistines, And like the children of strangers).' In 6d LOWTH, *Isaiah*, p. 4, cf. p. 149, reads יִסְפִּיחוּ 'And they multiply a spurious brood of strange children.'

¹³ xxxix. 16b and xxxix. 88 are parallel verses. The Hebrew passages are cited from R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*, Hebr. u. Deutsch.

¹⁴ SMEND, *op. cit.*, p. 74 (Hebrew section) vocalises, with some doubt, ܫܦܩܬ. Cf. his *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, p. 277, where he thinks ܫܦܩܬ = ܫܦܩܬ is possible. ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 368f.

¹⁶ Cf. W. O. E. OESTERLEY and T. H. ROBINSON, *An Introduction to the Books of the O. T.*, pp. 97f. ¹⁷ So GRAY, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

¹⁸ See the present writer in *Record and Revelation*, ed. H. WHEELER ROBINSON, pp. 386f.

D. WINTON THOMAS

TRANSLATING HEBREW 'ĀSĀH

Some of our readers are called on to compile the first dictionary of the language into which they are translating; many others have to use old dictionaries in which they are constantly adding new material or correcting the old. The same process goes on in Hebrew and in Greek. In the accompanying article we see it applied to one of the most frequently occurring words in the Hebrew Old Testament by a scholar who is deeply involved with the study of Hebrew lexicography. Advances in the study of comparative philology suggest new renderings which are first discussed by scholars, after which many of them find their way into new dictionaries and new versions of the Bible. Ed.

The Hebrew verb 'āsāh 'to make' is of very frequent occurrence and is known to every Hebraist. The main purpose of this article is to show that in fact there are two Hebrew verbs 'āsāh, and to recover their true meanings. A distinction is indeed made in the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, where we find on the one hand the verb 'do, make' and on the other hand the verb meaning 'press, squeeze', which occurs in the intensive form only, and with a sexual sense in Ezek. 23: 3, 8, 21.¹

The distinction proposed in this article however maintains that the first 'āsāh is cognate with the Arabic *ghashā* which bears the meanings 'do, press, cover', while the second is cognate with the Arabic verb 'ashā and means 'turn'.

It would follow that the distinction made in the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon is unreal, for 'squeeze' or 'press' is regarded simply as an intensive form of 'making' or 'doing'. The cognate verb in Arabic *ghashā* has the basic sense of 'entering unexpectedly or inadvisedly upon a course of action and this can easily have been weakened into that of engaging in an activity, or doing an act'. (This basic meaning helps to explain the sense of the second half of Isa. 5: 4 'wherefore, when I looked to get (*la'asōt*) grapes, did it (i.e. the vineyard) get (*wayya'as*) bad grapes?')²

The Meaning 'Cover'

The sexual sense which the verb has in the Ezekiel passages already mentioned may also be found in Prov. 6: 32 'He who commits adultery with a woman lacks sense, He destroys himself who *presses* (covers) her

¹ Brown-Driver-Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, p. 796. With the sense 'press' W. F. Albright compares 'shy, 'attack', in the Ras Shamra texts (*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 94, 1944, p. 35).

² See G. R. Driver, *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy presented to Professor Theodore Robinson*, ed. H. H. Rowley, pp. 53 f., and refs. there.

D. WINTON THOMAS

191

(*ya'asennāh*).¹ This sense 'cover', which '*āsāh* like its Arabic cognate *ghashā* bears, may be seen in several other O.T. passages.

The following passages provide instances where '*āsāh* (Arabic cognate *ghashā*) in terms of the context would appear to convey the meaning 'cover':

- Gen. 6: 14 'With reeds² shalt thou cover (*ta'aseh*)³ the ark.'
- Num. 15: 24 'It shall be that, if [a sin] committed inadvertently is hidden (*ne'es'tāh*)⁴ from the eyes of the congregation (i.e. they have no knowledge of it), all the congregation shall offer. . . .'
Cf. Lev. 4: 13 'And if the whole congregation commit a sin inadvertently and the thing is hidden (*ne'lam*) from the eyes of the assembly. . . .'
- Isa. 32: 6 'For a fool utters folly, and his heart conceals (*ya'aseh*)⁵ iniquity so as to practise ungodliness.'
- Ezek. 17: 17 'For not by a mighty army nor by a great company will Pharaoh cover (protect, *ya'aseh*)⁶ him in the war.'
R.V. has here 'make for' while R.S.V. has 'help'.
- Obad. 6 Here R.S.V. translates 'How Esau has been pillaged, his treasures sought out!'
- Parallelism would suggest that '*ēsāw* should be translated as 'his hidden things' to balance 'his concealed treasures' (*mašpūnāw*) in the next line, so giving 'How are his hidden things exposed, / his concealed treasures sought out!'
- The name Esau, which is the sense in which '*ēsāw* is generally understood in this verse,⁷ may perhaps be explained from this same verb. The name will then mean 'covered' (with hair), that is the shaggy one.⁸ Cf. Gen. 25: 25.
- Psa. 9: 15 'The nations are sunk down in the pit which they hid (*asū*); (Hebrew v. 16) In the net which they hid is their foot caught.'
While 'the pit which they made' yields good sense, the parallelism (*asū* and *fāmānū* 'they hid') strongly suggests

¹ As proposed by J. J. Reiske, *Coniecturae in Iobum et Proverbia Salomonis*, 1779, p. 176. Cf. L. Kopf, *Vetus Testamentum*, IX, 1959, p. 270. The 'doeth it' of the English versions leaves the antecedent of the feminine suffix in the verb unexplained. For *ghashā* with meaning 'compressed' (a woman), see E. W. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, p. 2261.

² For this meaning—reading *qānīm* for *qinnīm*, 'nests'—see G. R. Driver, *Vetus Testamentum*, IV, 1954, p. 243.

³ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

⁴ See A. B. Ehrlich, *Randgl. z. hebr. Bibel*, II, pp. 166 f. The feminine in *ne'es'tah* refers to a subject not definitely expressed, but suggested by the context, here perhaps *ḥattāt* 'sin'; see Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd ed., Kautzsch-Cowley, 144b.

⁵ See I. Eitan, *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography*, p. 58; and in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XII-XIII, 1937-38, p. 74. For another view see G. R. Driver, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1944, p. 167.

⁶ See G. R. Driver, *Vetus Testamentum*, IV, 1954, p. 243.

⁷ Cf. I. Eitan, *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography*, p. 58; and S. Loewinger, *Revue des études juives*, Nouvelle Série, X, 1949-50, p. 94.

⁸ Long ago T. K. Cheyne wrote of the name Esau: 'we must assume a root '*āsāh*, "have thick hair"', and he translated '*ēsāw* 'the shaggy', comparing Arabic '*athiya*, 'have thick or matted hair', *a'thā*, 'having thick hair' (*Encycl. Bibl.* 1333). Further, D. Yellin, *op. cit.*, p. 454.

- that 'āsāh here is not the common 'āsāh 'do, make', but rather the less common 'āsāh 'cover, hide'.¹
- Psa. 139: 15 'My bones were not hid (*niḥḥad*) from thee, When I was covered (i.e. with skin '*ussēṭī*') in secret, skilfully woven in the depths of the earth.'²
- Prov. 13: 16 'In everything a shrewd man conceals (*ya'aseh*)³ what he knows, But a fool makes a display of folly'. In 12: 23 the verb used of the shrewd man is *kāsāh*, 'conceals'.
- Prov. 26: 28 'A false tongue hates innocence,⁴ And a flattering mouth conceals (*ya'aseh*)⁵ ruin.
- Job 15: 27 'Because he hath covered his face with fat, And covered (*wayya'as*)⁶ his loins with fatness'. 'And covered' (*wayya'as*) is parallel with *kissāh*, 'covered', in the first half of the verse.

The Meaning 'Turn'

The other distinct Hebrew verb 'āsāh is cognate with Arabic 'ashā and means 'turn'. This sense can be seen in the following passages:

- Ruth 2: 19 'And her mother-in-law said to her, Where hast thou gleaned today, and whither didst thou turn (betake thyself, '*āsit*)'⁷ The R.S.V. translates the verb here as 'worked'.
- 1 Sam. 14: 32 'And the people turned (*wayya'as*)⁸ to the spoil'. This is the meaning given to the Hebrew verb in the Septuagint (*ekliṭhē*), Symmachus (*etrapē*), and Targum. Emendation of the text, as proposed in Kittel (*Biblia Hebraica*, 3rd ed.) is accordingly unnecessary.
- 1 Kings 20: 40 'And thy servant was turning ('*ōsēh*) hither and thither, and he was gone'. This meaning 'turn' is correctly preserved in the Septuagint (*perieblepsato*), Vulgate (*me verterem*), Peshitta Syriac version, and Targum. Emendation, as proposed in Kittel, is

¹ Cf. D. Yellin, *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams*, p. 455.

² Cf. J. L. Palache, *Semantic Notes on the Hebrew Lexicon*, p. 57.

³ See I. Eitan, *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography*, p. 57. He suggests that the text originally read *ya'aseh da'ath*, and that the Massoretes confused *ya'aseh* with the common 'āsāh, 'do, make', and so added *beth*. Cf. D. Yellin, *op. cit.*, p. 454. It is unnecessary to emend *ya'aseh* to *kōseh*, 'hides', as proposed by H. Torczyner, *Zeitschrift d. deutsch. morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, LXXI, 1917, p. 107.

⁴ This is the meaning given to *dakkāw*, which is of doubtful interpretation, by the Septuagint, Vulgate, Peshitta, and Targum; see G. R. Driver, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1948, p. 168, and *Journal of Theological Studies*, XLI, 1940, pp. 174 f.

⁵ See D. Yellin, *op. cit.*, p. 454, and Ben Yehuda, *Thes. totius hebraicitatis*, p. 2089.

⁶ The suffix in *helbō* is omitted in translation, with most commentators. Further, W. B. Stevenson, *Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Poem of Job*, p. 64.

⁷ See G. R. Driver, *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 54.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

D. WINTON THOMAS

193

again unnecessary. The R.S.V. understands the verb here to mean 'was busy'.

Job 23: 9 'On the left hand when he turns (*ba'asōlō*),¹ but I see him not.' The parallel verb in the second half of the verse is '*āṭap*, 'turn aside'. Once again there is no need to emend the text as in the R.S.V.

1 Chron. 4: 10 '... and thou turnest thyself (*'āsītā*)² from evil so as not to vex me'.

The English versions understand the verb to mean 'keep'.

Conclusion

It will be seen from our enquiry into these verbs that there are a number of passages where the Massoretic text is found to be reliable and the need for conjectural emendation may be dispensed with. A better sense too is obtained.

These two verbs, the first of which is cognate with the Arabic *ghashā* meaning 'do, press, cover' and the second of which is cognate with Arabic '*ashā* meaning 'turn' should therefore be entered in the Hebrew dictionary as '*āsāh I* and '*āsāh II* respectively.

¹ *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*; cf. D. Yellin, *op. cit.*, p. 454.

² See G. R. Driver, *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 54.

Jeremiah v. 28.

MR. GASTER's suggestion in last year's November issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES that יַעֲלֶיךָ in Jer 5²⁸ is to be explained by reference to the Ethiopic *ṣalhawa* 'deceive, defraud' is interesting, but good sense can be obtained without departing from the meaning ordinarily given to עָלָה here, viz. 'prosper,' and without omitting the *wasu*, as Mr. Gaster proposes to do. Starting with the words יָדִין לְאֲדֹנָיו we may translate as follows:

' They defend not the right,
The right of the fatherless, that they may prosper
And the cause of the needy they do not judge.

² E.g. Mk 1⁴¹. The Arabic Tatian gives the ordinary reading, but that Tatian really had the Western reading is shown by Ephraem's comment: 'Because he said "If thou wilt," He was angry; because he added "Thou canst," He healed him' (see footnote in Legg's apparatus).

* * *

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

55

If the subject of יַעֲלֶיךָ is the wicked, 'prosper' will have the meaning of gaining some advantage. If, on the other hand, the fatherless are regarded as the subject, 'prosper' will then have the meaning of being successful in their cause.

In connexion with Mr. Gaster's equation of עָלָה with *ṣalhawa*, it is interesting to note that in Dn 8²⁶ the object of הַעֲלִיחַ is 'deceit.' While no certainty can be felt in the matter, it is worthwhile to ask whether the phrase הַעֲלִיחַ בְּרִמָּה might

not here be translated, not, as in the English Versions, 'he shall cause craft to prosper,' but 'he shall practice deceit' (literally 'he shall deceive with deceit'), בְּרִמָּה being a cognate accusative after הַעֲלִיחַ (for the use of a noun of kindred meaning in the accusative instead of a derivative from the verb, cf. Zech 8³).

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Cambridge.

THE ROOT צנע IN HEBREW, AND THE MEANING OF קדרניח IN MALACHI III, 14¹

The root *ṣn'* occurs only twice in the Hebrew Bible, viz., in Mic. vi, 8, and Prov. xi, 2. In the former passage it is found in the phrase *הצנע לכת עם-אלהיך* translated in the English Versions "to walk humbly with thy God". In the passage from Proverbs it occurs in the phrase *ואת-צנועים חכמה* translated in the English Versions "but with the lowly is wisdom". The lexicons² similarly give the meaning of *ṣn'* in these passages as "be humble, modest", and commentators³ generally give this same meaning to the Hebrew root. The evidence of the ancient versions—especially of the Greek versions—studied in the light of Semitic philology, suggests, however, that "be modest, humble" is not the basic meaning of *ṣn'*. We may mention first Quinta's rendering⁴ of *ḥaṣnē'a* in Mic. vi, 8, by *φροντισειν* "consider, reflect, pay attention" (cf. Vulg. *sollicitum ambulare*), and the rendering by Symmachus⁵ of *w'elḥ-ṣnū'im* in Prov. xi, 2, by *παρὰ δὲ τοῖς ἐπιμελεσι* "with the careful, attentive". How are these renderings, which give to *ṣn'* the meaning "pay attention, be careful", to be explained? It is to be observed that the word *ṣnū'a* is of passive formation, a fact which suggests that *ṣn'* is an active root. Now there are indications of the existence of such an active root in Jewish Aramaic. Thus, *ṣn'* is said to mean "guard, hold back"⁶—likewise *ṣn'* in New Hebrew⁷—a meaning which is seen also in the Aph. *'aṣna'* "keep secret, guard, store up", and the Ithpa. *'iṣtanna'* "was kept secret, was stored up, restrain oneself" (i.e. "keep oneself back").⁸ In Jewish Aramaic the passive participle *ṣnū'a* means "reserved, guarded"—e.g. in Baba Bathra 58a the question is asked of a woman *לא צניעת באיסורא* "Why are you not more guarded in your immoral conduct?"⁹ The word *ṣnū'a* is here used in a good sense—"guarded, reserved" means "careful". In Syriac the corresponding form *ṣnū'ā* is used both in a good sense "skilful, clever", and in a bad sense "crafty"¹⁰ (cf. the double meanings borne by *ṣna'* Ethpa. and by *ṣnū'āthā*).¹¹ This evidence from Aramaic points the way, it is suggested, to an explanation of the renderings of the Greek versions in the two passages under discussion. In Prov. xi, 2, the *ṣnū'a*, the "guarded, reserved" man, is taken by the translators to be the "careful, circumspect" man. In Mic. vi, 8, the divine requirement is taken by the translators to be that a man should "walk with care, attentively, with circumspection", with his God.¹²

¹ The substance of this paper was read at the twenty-first International Congress of Orientalists, Paris, on 30th July, 1948.

² e.g. BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, p. 857; GESENIUS-BUHL (16th ed.), p. 688.

³ e.g. WELLHAUSEN, *Die kleinen Propheten*, p. 26; NOWACK, *Die kleinen Propheten*, p. 216; MARTI, *Das Dodekapropheten*, p. 293; J. M. P. SMITH, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Micah, etc.* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 128; E. SELIN, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 2nd and 3rd ed., 1929, p. 341, 343.

⁴ In F. FIELD, *Origenis Hexapl.*, ii, 996, where see Jerome's interesting remarks (n. 12).

⁵ *ibid.*, ii, 331.

⁶ M. JASTROW, *A Dict. of the Targumim, etc.*, p. 1293; E. KÖNIG, *Hebr. u. Aram. Wörterb. zum A.T.*, p. 391.

⁷ G. H. DALMAN, *Aram.-Neuhebr. Wörterb. zu Targ., etc.*, p. 350.

⁸ J. LEVY, *Chald. Wörterb. über die Targ.*, ii, 332. Cf. his *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.*, iv, 205.

⁹ See JASTROW, *op. cit.*, loc. cit.

¹⁰ Cf. the phrase *nṣū'rath lēbh* (Prov. vii, 10), used of a harlot—"guarded of heart", i.e. keeping her own counsel, cunning.

¹¹ PAYNE SMITH, *Thes. Syr.*, p. 3421 f.; cf. BROCKELMANN, *Lex. Syr.*, 2nd ed., p. 633.

¹² Cf. the phrase *ἀκριβὸς περιπατεῖτε*, Ephesians v, 15.

THE ROOT צנע IN HEBREW

183

We may next consider Theodotus's rendering¹ of *ḥaṣnē'a* in Mic. vi, 8, by ἀσφαλίζου "fortify, secure, make fast". This rendering is highly interesting to the Semitic philologist, for it sends him right back to the South Arabic *ṣn'* "strengthen"—again an active root—with its derivative *mṣn'* "stronghold".² This latter recalls the New Hebrew expression *māqōm ḥammūṣnā'* "a well-guarded place".³ Cognate with the South Arabic root is the Ethiopic *ṣan'a* "be strong, hard", which in the form II, i, is used of "fortifying" a city; *ṣen'e* is "fortification".⁴

This evidence of the versions and of Semitic philology would seem then to indicate two lines of thought which lie at the basic meaning of *ṣn'*. The one, deriving from the side of Aramaic, gives us the meaning "guard, hold back, reserve". The other, deriving from the side of South Semitic, gives us the meaning "strengthen". The next question we have to ask is—are these two lines of thought ultimately connected? We may believe that they are. A guarded place is a strong place; reserves are strength. We may thus think of a root *ṣn'* with the basic meaning "guard, strengthen". The guarded, strong man is moreover in a state of readiness. "To be at the ready" is to be on guard. With this line of thought may be linked the rendering of *ḥaṣnē'a* in Mic. vi, 8, by the LXX by ἔτοιμον εἶναι,⁵ and Theodotus's translation of *ṣenū'im* in Prov. xi, 2, by ἐπιεικῶς "able, capable".⁶ In this connection it is interesting to note that in 1840 Samuel Lee, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, found the primitive notion of the root *ṣn'* to consist in readiness, activity, or the like.⁷

With this meaning for *ṣn'* in mind—the double meaning "guard, strengthen"—and for *ṣanū'a* the meaning "guarded, reserved, circumspect, discreet, careful", we may now go on to consider four passages in Ben Sira in which *ṣn'* occurs—interestingly enough in precisely those parts of the verb which occur in the Old Testament, viz. the Hiph. Inf. Absolute and the Passive Participle Qal. In each of the passages to be considered it will be seen that the basic meaning which we have obtained for *ṣn'* is more suitable than the meaning "humble, lowly".

(a) xvi, 25.⁸

אביעה במשקל רוחי ובהצנע אחזה דעי

We may translate:—

"I will pour out my spirit in due measure,
And with due care will I show my knowledge."

Here, **הצנע** stands in parallelism with **במשקל** "in due measure, exactly", and the meaning "with care, circumspection, discretion, moderation" for **הצנע** suits the context well, as some commentators have seen.⁹ The Greek has ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ¹⁰ "with exactness, precision".

¹ FIELD, op. cit., ii, 996.

² See CIS, Pars 4, Tom. i, fasc. i, p. 2; J. H. MORDTMANN and E. MITTWOCH, *Sabäische Inschriften*, p. 3, n. 2, and p. 262. Cf. further BROCKELMANN, op. cit., loc. cit.

³ JASTROW, op. cit., p. 1292; LEVY, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.*, iv, 205.

⁴ DILLMANN, *Lex. Ling. Aeth.*, 1288 ff.

⁵ Similarly Pesh. and Arabic Version. For the latter, see WALTON, *Bibl. Polygl.*, ad loc.

⁶ FIELD, op. cit., ii, 331.

⁷ *A Lexicon, Hebrew, Chaldee, and English*, p. 516.

⁸ This and other references to Ben Sira are cited from R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*.

⁹ See, e.g. I. LÉVI, *L'Écclesiastique* (deuxième partie), p. 121; SMEND, op. cit., p. 27 (of his translation). Cf. his commentary, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, p. 153. See further, S. SCHECHTER and C. TAYLOR, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, p. xxxiv, et al.

¹⁰ J. H. A. HART, *Ecclesiasticus in Greek*, p. 140, compares ἀκριβείᾳ here with Symmachus' ἐπιεικῶς in Prov. xi, 2.

(h) xxxiv, 22 (E.V. xxxi, 22).

בכל מעשיך היה צנוע וכל אסון לא יגע בך

We may translate:—

"In all thy works be careful,
And no trouble shall touch thee."

Clearly "humble" is not suitable here, as commentators have again seen.¹ The Greek has γινου ἐντρεχής "be skilful, ready".

(c) xxxv, 3 (E.V. xxxii, 3).

מלל שב כי הוא לך והצנוע שכל ואל תמנע שר

We may translate:—

"Speak, old man, for it becomes thee,
Being careful² as to the sense,³ and hinder not song."

For *הצנוע שכל* the Greek has ἐν ἀκριβοὶ ἐπιστήμη "with exact (or accurate) knowledge".

(d) xlii, 8.

והיית זהיר באמת ואיש צנוע לפני כל חי

We may translate:—

"And so thou shalt be truly careful,
And a discreet⁴ man before all living."

We may next ask whether, from the basic meaning of *šn'* which we have obtained—the meaning "guard, strengthen"—the translation "humble, lowly" can be justified. There is ancient authority for this meaning. In Prov. xi, 2, the LXX translates *š'nū'im* by ταπεινῶν, while the Vulgate has an abstract noun *humilitas*.⁵ As for Mic. vi, 8, we have seen that the evidence of the versions lends no support to this meaning. Yet it may perhaps be seen from this passage in Micah how the meaning "humble" for *šn'* has come about. For a man who is guarded, careful, in walking with his God, in carrying out the divine will, is, in relation to God, humble, or pious.⁶ The meaning "humble" is, however, a secondary meaning, and is not the primary meaning of the root. Similarly, with the meaning "be chaste" which *šn'* frequently bears in Jewish Aramaic and New Hebrew.⁷ A woman who is *š'nū'ā* is a woman who is "guarded, reserved" in her dealings with men. "Be chaste" is thus, like "be humble", a secondary meaning of the root. In this connection may be mentioned the use in Arabic of *ḥaṣūna*, meaning both "be inaccessible, fortified" and "be chaste".⁸ Similarly, the Arabic *ḥarūza* is used in the double sense of "be fortified, strong" (cf. South Arabic *šn'*, *v. supra*) and

¹ See SMEND, op. cit., p. 54; LÉVI, op. cit., p. 147. Cf. the similarly worded precept in Tobit, iv, 14.

² Cf. SCHECHTER and TAYLOR, op. cit., p. xxxviii; SMEND, op. cit., p. 55; LÉVI, op. cit., p. 153. HART, op. cit., p. 182, translates the phrase "preserve intelligence".

³ For this meaning of *sekkel*, cf. Neh. viii, 8.

⁴ Cf. LÉVI, op. cit., p. 49; SCHECHTER and TAYLOR, op. cit., p. xxxiv, *et al.*, LXX θεδοκιμασμένος.

⁵ W. FRANKENBERG, *Die Sprüche*, p. 71 f., thinks Jerome is probably right in taking *š'nū'im* as a substantive.

⁶ Cf. the remarks of HART, op. cit., p. 300, on the Pharisees. It is interesting to note that the same development of thought is to be seen in the Greek διακρίβεισθαι. The first meaning given to this word by LIDDELL and SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (H. STUART JONES and R. MCKENZIE), p. 426, is "take good heed to, beware of, be on one's guard against". The second meaning is "reverence". Cf. further the Arabic *taqā* "was cautious, guarded", and then "fear" (God), LANE, *Arab. Eng. Lex.*, 309 f.

⁷ See, e.g. JASTROW, op. cit., p. 1290 ff.

⁸ LANE, op. cit., 586.

THE ROOT שׁנ IN HEBREW

185

"be pious".¹ Mention may be made also of the Syriac phrase *naphshā lā m^hasanthā-animā haud munīta*, "an unguarded soul," and so *tentationibus obnoxia*.²

Brief reference must now be made to two further questions. The first is the view that *šn'* is an Aramaism in Hebrew.³ This view is based upon one-sided evidence. That we have called Jewish Aramaic into service for the purpose of arriving at the basic meaning of *šn'* has already been shown. But we have considered also the evidence of South Arabic. Now if we are right in seeing an ultimate identity between the Aramaic *šn'* "guard, keep back", and the South Arabic *šn'* "strengthen", we can as easily speak of an Arabism in Hebrew as of an Aramaism. Rather may we suppose, however, that *šn'* is an ancient Semitic root, and if it is, we may postulate the existence of such a root in ancient Hebrew, and we may suppose that it could have appeared in Hebrew literature at any period—whether in the eighth century, if Mic. vi, 8, belongs to this century, or to the post-exilic period, if it belongs to this later period. If Mic. vi, 8, as well as Prov. xi, 2, is post-exilic, as is Ben Sira, we should have an example of an ancient Hebrew word appearing for the first time in late passages, a phenomenon with which we are to-day quite familiar.⁴ Some scholars, who regard Mic. vi, 8, as early, and who have found it difficult to account for the presence of a supposed Aramaism in early literature, have not hesitated to emend *hašnē'a* in this passage.⁵ If, however, it be recognized that *šn'* is no Aramaism in Hebrew, but has a rightful place in the vocabulary of ancient Hebrew, their difficulty disappears, and with it the necessity they have felt for emendation.⁶

The second question which we have to consider is the relation of *šn'* to other Semitic roots. We have seen that the Hebrew *šāna'* = Aramaic (Syr.) *š^hna'* = South Arabic *šn'* = Ethiopic *šan'a*, with the double meaning "guard, strengthen". The suggestion has been made by many scholars that *šn'* is cognate with the common Arabic *šana'a* "make skilfully, well; take good care of".⁷ The derivative *šin'* means "fortress", and *mašāni'* (plural of *mašna'a*) has the same sense⁸ (cf. South Arabic *nšn'*, v. *supra*). This Arabic root is, we believe, certainly to be identified with our Hebrew root. In the meaning "make skilfully, well" we may perhaps see a weakening of an original meaning "strengthen". This is, we believe, the only Arabic cognate of those which have been proposed where we find a true cognate with *šn'*, for we cannot but feel much doubt about others which have been advanced, e.g. *dara(i)a* "was lowly, humble",⁹ and *šana'a* VIII "was abashed at, shy".¹⁰ These

¹ Ibid., 545.

² PAYNE SMITH, op. cit., 1335.

³ See, e.g. SIEGFRIED-STADE, *Hebr. Wörterb. zum A.T.*, p. 630; STADE in C. H. TOY, *The Book of Proverbs* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 225; F. SCHWALLY, *Z. ITW*, 1890, p. 222.

⁴ See the present writer in *The Recovery of the Ancient Hebrew Language*, p. 18 f.

⁵ e.g. SCHWALLY, op. cit., loc. cit. See further, J. M. P. SMITH, op. cit., p. 124. In Prov. xi, 2, *šna'in* has been emended to *nš'āšim* (cf. xiii, 10b); see TOY, op. cit., loc. cit., and cf. LAGARDE, *Anmerkungen zur griech. Übersetzung d. Prov.*, p. 36.

⁶ Their difficulty is in any case not a real one, for early Aramaisms are to be expected in Hebrew. See the present writer, in *Record and Revelation*, ed. H. WHEELER ROBINSON, p. 386 f.

⁷ See, e.g. GESENIUS-BUHL, loc. cit.; BROCKELMANN, op. cit., loc. cit.; PAYNE SMITH, op. cit., 3421. LAGARDE, *Mittheil.*, i, p. 81, remarks that the LXX's *τροφός* in Mic. vi, 8, reflects Arabic *šana'a* = Syr. *š^hna'*. For Arab *šana'a* = Eth. *šan'a*, see M. BITTNER, in *Vienna Oriental Journal*, xiv (1900), no. 4, p. 371.

⁸ LANE, op. cit., 1735.

⁹ So J. BARTH, *Wurzeluntersuchungen zum hebr. u. aram. Lexicon*, p. 42; F. HITZIG, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, p. 229; cf. P. HAUPT, *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, xxvi, p. 241.

¹⁰ So LEVY, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.*, iv, 204; see further, LAGARDE, *Bild. d. Nomina*, p. 21, and p. 66 of *Register u. Nachträge* to this work.

roots are to be regarded as quite distinct from the Hebrew *sn'*. It is difficult to see any justification for Gesenius' *dana(i)'a* "submit se alicui, et in malam partem, abiectus, vilis fuit",¹ or Hitzig's² equation with *daniya* "was slender, diseased". There is, so far as I know, no root in Accadian to which *sn'* may be referred; nor has it turned up yet at Ras Shamrah. The occurrence of it in Samaritan—to translate the word *mishteh* "feast" in Gen. xxi, 8³—is to be explained by reference to the Arabic *ṣana'a* VIII "prepare a banquet" (*ṣanī* "banquet").⁴

We may now turn to consider a Hebrew word which at first sight would seem to have little, if anything, to do with the root *sn'*, viz. the word *q'dhōrannith* in Mal. iii, 14. The suggestion I wish to make is that the phrases *עַם הַזֶּה לֹכֵת עִם* in Mic. vi, 8, and *הִלְכֵנוּ קִדְרִית מִפְּנֵי* in Mal. iii, 14, mean basically very much the same thing.

The English Versions translate *q'dhōrannith*, which occurs only in this passage, by "mournfully" (A.V. marg. "in black"; R.V. marg. "in mourning apparel"), and this is the meaning generally given to the word by lexicographers⁵ and commentators.⁶ This meaning is obtained by connecting *q'dhōrannith* with the root *qđhr* (= *qadhi(n)ra* "be dirty")⁷ which means "be dark" (see, e.g. Mic. iii, 6, Ezek. xxxii, 7 f., Jo. ii, 10, iv, 15). The meaning "mourn" for *qđhr* appears to rest upon a supposed connection between the ideas "be black" and "mourn", the connection being explained by the squalid dress worn by the mourner.⁸ The phrase "we walk mournfully" has been explained in a variety of ways.⁹ Quite different from this treatment of *q'dhōrannith* is that of Perles,¹⁰ who regards the word with suspicion, and suggests that in its place *q'dhādhannith* should be read. This word, from the root *qđhdh*, means "bowed down", and is the etymological equivalent of the Accadian *kaāḏānūtš* "with bowed head". It was *q'dhādhannith*, not *q'dhōrannith*, which, Perles believes, was perhaps read by the LXX (ἡέρον), Pesh. (*makikā'ith*), and Targ. (*במכירות רוח*).¹¹ Similarly, he suggests that *qōdh'rim* (*sh'phalim*) in Job v, 11, should be read *qōdh'dhim*; and, in fact, wherever *qōdhēr* is combined with *hālakh*,¹² he is inclined to think that *qōdhēdh* should be read. Haupt¹³ has made the same suggestion about *qādh'rā* in Jer. xiv, 2, where *qādh'dhā*, he thinks, should be read. And recently T. H. Gaster,¹⁴ independently of Perles and Haupt, has recommended the reading *qōdhēdh* for *qōdhēr* in some passages.¹⁵

¹ *Thesaurus Ling. Hebr. et Chald.*, p. 1175.

² *op. cit.*, loc. cit.

³ WALTON, *op. cit.*, ad loc. Cf. M. HEIDENHEIM, *Die samar. Pent.-Version. Die Genesis*, p. 24.

⁴ LANE, *op. cit.*, 1733 f.; cf. HAVA, *Arab. Eng. Dict.*, p. 407.

⁵ BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, p. 871; GESENIUS-BUHL, p. 702, et al.

⁶ e.g. NOWACK, *op. cit.*, p. 409; SELLIN, *op. cit.*, p. 613; F. HORST, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, Nahum-Malachi*, p. 264; J. M. P. SMITH, *The Book of Malachi* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 76; A. VON BULMERINCQ, *Kommentar zum Buche des Propheten Maleachi* (Acta et Commentationes Univ. Tartuensis), 1932, p. 476, et al.

⁷ BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, p. 871, et al. The Arabic root *kadi(n)ra* is sometimes brought into connection with *qđhr*; see, e.g. BARTH, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

⁸ See I. BENZINGER, *Hebr. Archäologie*, 3rd ed., p. 244, and the references in von BULMERINCQ, *op. cit.*, p. 476.

⁹ See von BULMERINCQ, *op. cit.*, pp. 476 ff.

¹⁰ *Analekten zur Textkritik des A.T.*, N.F., 1922, p. 36 f.

¹¹ *Vulg. tristes*; Arab. *sā'ilin* (*supplices*). The Eth. text is obscure; see von BULMERINCQ, *op. cit.*, p. 475.

¹² As in Ps. xxxviii, 7; xlii, 10; xliii, 2; Job xxx, 28.

¹³ In *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, xxvi, p. 213.

¹⁴ In *Semitic Studies in memory of Immanuel Löw*, ed. A. SCHEIDER, 1947, p. 287.

¹⁵ In Gen. xxv, 13, Samar. has *qādhā* for *qđhr* (Κηθαρ). See *Supplement to Hatch and Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint*, p. 98.

THE ROOT צוּע IN HEBREW

187

The suggestion may, however, be made that *q^ddhōrannīth* has nothing to do with *q^dhr* = *qadhi(u)ra*, but is to be derived from a root *q^dhr* = *qadara*. This Arabic root means "measured" (quantity, measure, size, bulk, proportion, etc.). In the Koran (vi, 91) we have *mā qadarū* 'llāha *haqqa qadrihi* "they have not estimated God with the estimation that is due to him", or "they have not magnified or honoured God with the magnifying or honouring that is due to him". The noun *qadr* means "quantity", then "estimation, value, majesty".¹ There is a most interesting rendering in Erpenius' Arabic Bible of 1616 of the word εὐσεβῶς "decently" in 1 Cor. xiv, 40, by *biqadrin*.² This rendering may suggest that *q^ddhōrannīth* in Mal. iii, 14, may mean "in due measure, proportion", i.e. moderately, decently, discreetly. If this should be the meaning, we should have a more general parallel to the other phrases in this verse than the usual "walk mournfully". It is vain, the people say, to serve God (עבד אלהים), and what profit is it, they ask, that they have kept his charge (שמר משמרת), and that they have walked moderately (decently, discreetly) before him, i.e. piously, reverently, humbly. It may be mentioned here that the Latin *modestus* is connected with *modus* "measure". In the same way, it is suggested, *q^ddhōrannīth* is to be connected with *qadara* "measure", and means, therefore, much the same thing as the Latin *modeste* "moderately, temperately, discreetly". *Modestus* is, as is well known, a meaning often given to *ḥānū'a*. So, from different starting points, the phrases עַם הַצְנֵע לַכֶּתֶם and הַלֵּךְ קַדְרִינִי מִנִּי develop a like meaning. It may be added that in Ethiopic *maṭan* means "*modus, mensura, quantitas, proportio*, then *auctoritas, honoris gradus*"; and that *maṭna* means *deceat, convenit*.³

We are, of course, aware that there is a danger in the adducing of Arabic roots in explanation of Hebrew roots unless evidence is forthcoming to show that the root in question is an ancient one. In the case of *ṣn'* it is, as has been shown, possible to demonstrate that it is an ancient root—its occurrence in South Arabic carries it far back into antiquity, while the evidence of the LXX at Mic. vi, 8 also carries the root well back into the pre-Christian era. Is there any ancient evidence to support the equation *q^dhr* = *qadara*? Not decisive evidence perhaps. Yet there is one piece of evidence which is at least suggestive. I refer to the LXX's striking rendering of מִן הַקְדָּרִים in the phrase הַקְדָּרִים קָרָה מִן מִי in Job vi, 16. This phrase means that the streams (the subject of *haqqōdhrīm* is *n^eḥālīm* of the previous verse) "are turbid, muddy, because of the ice"—*q^dhr* here = *qadhi(u)ra* "be dirty".⁴ The LXX translators have here, as so often, mistaken the sense of the Hebrew, but even their mis-translations enable us frequently to recover a lost Hebrew word. And so it may be here. For they translate *haqqōdhrīm minni* by οἱ τινές με διευλαβούντο "they who used to be on their guard against me, used to reverence me". Where did they get this meaning for *q^dhr*? Perhaps they gave to *q^dhr* here the meaning which *qadara* can, as we have seen, bear, viz. "magnify, honour" (more literally "put an estimate, value on").⁵ This suggestion must not be pressed too far. But we are perhaps led by it a little way further towards the establishment of a Hebrew root *q^dhr* = *qadara* in ancient time. As was the case with *ṣn'*, there is nothing in Accadian, nor in the vocabulary of Ras Shamrah, so far as I know, to help us.

¹ LANE, op. cit., 2494 f.

² *Novum D.N. Jesu Christi Testamentum Arabice*, p. 446.

³ DILLMANN, op. cit., 221.

⁴ Cf. BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, p. 871; further, DRIVER and GRAY, *The Book of Job* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 63.

⁵ C. J. BALL, *The Book of Job*, p. 161, thinks that διευλαβούντο represents an original *y^ghōrīm*.

In conclusion it may be recalled that Julius Fürst¹ explained *haqqôdh'rim* in Job vi, 16, by reference to *qdhr* = *qadara*. The meaning he gave to it is, however, not that which we have suggested for *q'dhōrannīth*, but another, which the root in Arabic can bear, viz. "be able, be strong"—"the streams through ice become thick, solid". Fürst also explained the name *qēdhār* as *Machtvoller* (cf. Arabic *qādir*), again connecting it with *qdhr* = *qadara* "be strong".² These suggestions are of interest in that they illustrate an earlier attempt than my own to equate the Hebrew *qdhr* with the Arabic *qadara*.

D. WINTON THOMAS,

Cambridge.

A Pun on the Name Ashdod in Zephaniah ii. 4

It has been suggested by the present writer that in Pr 19²⁶ the word *קָשַׁד* may mean 'drives away' (Ethiopic *sadada* 'expel, eject'), a meaning which provides a good parallel to יִבְרִיחַ.¹ This meaning of *קָשַׁד*, it is now proposed, may throw light on Zeph 2⁴, which, as is well known, contains several plays upon words. Thus, 'Gaza' (עֲזָה) will be 'forsaken' (עָזוּבָה), and 'Ekron' (עֶקְרוֹן) will be 'uprooted' (תִּעְקַר). In the case of 'Ashkelon' (אַשְׁקֶלוֹן), which will become 'a waste' (אֶשְׁמָה), at least a slight assonance is discernible.² The same might indeed be said in the case of 'Ashdod' (אַשְׁדּוֹד)—'at noon will they drive her out' (יִנְרֹשָׁהּ). May it not be, however, that in the case of אַשְׁדּוֹד something more is intended? It may be that, if אַשְׁדּוֹד suggested to the hearer a connexion with *קָשַׁד* in the sense 'drive away',³ יִנְרֹשָׁה 'they will drive her away' could be a deliberate pun in thought on the name of the Philistine city. If this be the case, emendations of יִנְרֹשָׁה to יִשְׁרֹשָׁה 'they will uproot her'⁴ or to יִשְׁדּוֹדָהּ 'they will devastate her'⁵ will then be unnecessary. The M.T.'s יִנְרֹשָׁה is in fact supported by the versions (LXX ἀναρριπύσεται; Vulg. *ejicient*; Targ. יִחְרֹבוּנָה; Pesh. *n'dabb'run*). And at the same time some additional, if slight, support for the existence in Hebrew of a verb *קָשַׁד* in the sense 'drive away' will have been gained.

D. WINTON THOMAS

Cambridge

Mitteilungen.

1. The root שָׁנָה = سَنَى in Hebrew. By D. WINTON THOMAS, The University, Durham, England. — The correct interpretation of Prov 24 21 b has for long been a matter of difficulty. The English Versions render "And meddle not with them that are given to change". Such a rendering of שֹׁנִיָּם¹, however, is vague, and has been variously interpreted². Because this word has not been satisfactorily explained, the Massoretic Text is usually emended (on the basis of the LXX αἰ ἀντιπαρισταμένους ἀντιπαρισταμένους) to אֶל־תִּתְעַבְּבֵם עַל־שֹׁנֵיהֶם "against both of them show thyself not angry"³. But the proposed שֹׁנֵיהֶם is itself by no means free from difficulty⁴, and a further objection to its acceptance is the fact that it necessitates the alteration of וְתִתְעַבְּבֵם (cp. Prov 14 10 20 10) to וְתִתְעַבְּבֵם.

No alteration of the text seems necessary, however, if שֹׁנֵיהֶם here be connected with the Arabic root سَنَى⁵. LANE⁶ gives this root with the meaning "to become high, exalted in rank". In IV it means "to raise, exalt", and further there are cited سَنَاءٌ "high, exalted rank or condition", and سَنِيٌّ "high, exalted in rank or condition"⁷. The Syriac cognate root is apparently unknown, but سُلَالٌ *sublimitas, majestas, honor magnus*, is given by PAYNE SMITH⁸.

Should שָׁנָה here be rightly equated with these Arabic and Syriac cognates, not only is emendation of the text unnecessary, but at the same time a parallel to וְתִתְעַבְּבֵם

¹ Cp. BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *Heb. Engl. Lex.*, sub שָׁנָה (1), p. 1040.

² See C. H. TOY, *Book of Proverbs* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 450, where the renderings of the Versions (which seem not to have understood the word) are also given.

³ So W. O. E. OESTERLEY, *Book of Proverbs* (Westm. Comm.) p. 215; TOY, *op. cit.*, p. 451; BEER in KITTEL, *Bibl. Hebr.*, 1053.

⁴ See TOY, *op. cit.*, p. 450.

⁵ The Book of Proverbs, as is wellknown, has been formed gradually from various collections of proverbs, originating from various sources and different dates. It is to be expected, therefore, that rare and unusual words, which can only be explained by appeal to the cognate languages, will occur therein.

⁶ *Arab. Engl. Lex.* I IV 1448; cp. HAVA, *Arab. Engl. Dict.* 341.

⁷ LANE, *op. cit.*, 1450, also mentions سَنَاءًا as applied to a man; cp. HAVA, *op. cit.*, loc. cit.

⁸ *Thes. Syr.* II 4239.

and גִּלְגָּל, which seems to be required, is provided. The verse may now be translated:

My son, fear thou the Lord and the king,
But meddle not with those of high rank (the nobility, perhaps).

The verse thus offers a warning against meddling with those in high places. The citizen is recommended to go about his business, keeping himself aloof from those who move in higher social spheres than his own, and to refrain from entertaining thoughts of social or political dignity. God and the king rightly demand his respect, even his fear, — but association with those of high rank may prove dangerous and corrupting¹.

In v. 22 b of this chapter the word שְׂנִיָּה has caused difficulty, and therefore commentators have emended, with some degree of probability, to שְׂנִיָּה, as in v. 21². Giving to שְׂנִיָּה in this verse the meaning suggested for it in v. 21, we may translate v. 22 as follows:

For their calamity shall rise suddenly,
And who knoweth the destruction of those of high rank?,
The suffix in שְׂנִיָּה referring, of course, to שְׂנִיָּה.

The same root שְׂנִי is also underlie שְׂנִיָּה in Esth 2 a, where the words שְׂנִיָּה וְאֶת־הַנְּעוּרִיָּה לְטוֹב בֵּית הַנָּשִׁים are translated in the Revised Version "and he removed (A. V. preferred) her and her maidens to the best place of the house of the women". Should שְׂנִיָּה here not be the same word as שְׂנִיָּה "to change"³, but cognate with שְׂנִי, it becomes possible to translate "and he exalted her and her maidens" etc., i. e. "he did not allow her to remain in the ordinary quarters of prospective concubines, but assigned her apartments such as were reserved for royal favourites"⁴. The special honour paid to Esther by the king⁵ seems more explicitly affirmed if שְׂנִיָּה here be equated with the Arabic root than if it is classed under שְׂנִיָּה "to change".

One further instance of שְׂנִיָּה is perhaps worth mentioning, for it may be that it too receives its best explanation by a comparison with שְׂנִי. In Sabb. 10 b occurs the sentence שְׂנִיָּה אֵל יִשְׁנֶה אָרֶם בֶּן בִּין הַבְּנִים. LEVY⁶ derives שְׂנִיָּה here from שְׂנִיָּה "to repeat", and translates „nie soll der Vater ein Kind vor dem andern bevorzugen (besser behandeln)". This rendering comes very near to the translation suggested by a comparison with שְׂנִי "Let no man exalt (show special honour to) one son above his other children".

¹ For similar advice, see the injunctions of Shema'iah in C. TAYLOR, *The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 2nd ed., Ch. 1 section 11, page 18, and notes *ad loc.*; cp. K. MARTI and G. BEER, *Abot*, pp. 23—24.

² See OESTERLEY, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.* and TOY, *op. cit.*, pp. 450. 451.

³ So BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *op. cit.*, 1040.

⁴ L. B. PATON, *Book of Esther* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 175.

⁵ He exalts to honour also her maidens, according to the text, where וְאֶת־הַנְּעוּרִיָּה stands as second object of שְׂנִיָּה Pl. Her maidens would quite naturally accompany her to her special apartments, and would no doubt experience considerate treatment at the hand of the king on account of their mistress (as brought out in the LXX καὶ ἐχρήσατο αὐτῇ καλῶς καὶ ταῖς ἑβραῖς ἐν τῇ γυναικῶνι and Pesh. ܠܗ ܥܒܕܬܐ ܠܗ ܥܒܕܬܐ ܠܗ ܥܒܕܬܐ ܠܗ (ܥܒܕܬܐ ܠܗ)). But the special honour was, of course, intended to be paid to Esther in the first instance, the favour shown to her maidens being only incidental, inasmuch as they were her constant companions.

⁶ *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.* IV 585; cp. JASTROW, *Dict. of the Targ. etc.*, p. 1605.

Should this equation of שָׁנָה and سَنَى in these three instances be correct, there will be some grounds for believing in the existence in Hebrew of a separate root שָׁנָה "to become high, exalted in rank", quite distinct from the other roots שָׁנָה which are already known.

[Completed April 22nd 1933.]

2. "Thou shalt not covet." By J. R. COATES, Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, England. — JOHANNES HERMANN's interesting discussion of the meaning of נָכַד (Ex 20 17) in the Sellin-Festschrift (1927) seems to be inadequate, for three reasons: (a) it leaves out of account the nominal derivatives (נִכְדָּה etc.), in which the idea of "desire" is quite clear; (b) it makes no reference to the Arabic use of the same root to indicate "praise" or "eulogy"; (c) it does not take into consideration the evidence afforded by the Comparative Study of Religion.

The bearing of the study of Primitive Religion on the study of the Decalogue was shewn by SÖDERBLOM (Gottesglaube 147 f.), and KITTEL has drawn attention to this in GVI⁴ I 446. Ought we not to add the tenth commandment to the examples given by SÖDERBLOM? In order to do this it is not necessary, with HERMANN, to equate "coveting" with "scheming to get", much less to adopt the view expressed by SMEND (ATRelGesch.² 286) more than thirty years ago in the words, "Das zehnte Gebot richtet sich nicht gegen das böse Gefülste, wie Paulus es versteht, sondern gegen die böse Praktik, in die es sich umsetzt." On the other hand, the following evidence seems to shew that we may regard the idea of "coveting" as primitive, without at the same time claiming for it, with CHARLES (Decalogue, xlvii), "that this Commandment stands on a higher level than the preceding nine", or seeing in it a differentia of Moses, as JIRKU does (Weltl. Recht AT. 159).

I owe to EDWIN SMITH, of the British and Foreign Bible Society, — himself a distinguished anthropologist, — a reference to "The Basutos" (1861), by E. CASALIS, p. 306, which seems to throw light on the problem.

"I remember, a short time after our arrival in Lesuto, a chief, trying to enumerate the Ten Commandments, could only find nine. We reminded him of the tenth: 'Thou shalt not covet.' 'That is not a separate commandment,' replied he; 'I have already reckoned it in saying, 'Thou shalt not steal'; 'thou shalt not commit adultery'".

Taken by itself, this might seem to confirm HERMANN's contention. But CASALIS further says that "Covetousness has its distinct designation", and I learn from EDWIN SMITH that among the Bantu, as he knows them, it is considered wrong, e. g., to praise a baby, because that is equivalent to coveting it, and covetousness of itself both exerts an evil influence upon the object towards which it is directed, and is injurious to the person who covets. The idea, of course, belongs to the dynamistic world of primitive peoples, in which "Mana" and "Tabu" play such an important part. It is instructive to compare this with the fact, already noticed, that the word which means "desire" in Hebrew, means "praise" in Arabic, the two ideas being doubtless connected here in the same way as among the Bantu. It may be suggested that this is the first form of the notion so widely prevalent among more advanced peoples, that admiration and eulogy are to be avoided, lest the jealousy of the gods be provoked. (Cf. also the evil eye.)

In any case it seems to be established that primitive peoples know what coveting is, and believe it to be dangerous. We cannot therefore agree with KÖHLER (Theol. Rundschau, 1929, Heft 3) that HERMANN's view "hat alles für sich". According to the view here presented, the Commandment, which has

The Root שנה = سنى in Hebrew II.

By D. Winton Thomas in Durham.
(Durham, England, 22 Old Elvet.)

It was with much interest that I read Professor MONTGOMERY'S communication on שנה = سنى (ZAW, 1935, H. 2/3, p. 207 f.) in which he records his discovery in a Ras Shamra tablet of this equation which I had already detected in Biblical Hebrew (ZAW 1934, H. 3, p. 236 f.). Now that we may with good reason believe that Hebrew knew a separate root שנה = سنى in the sense of "to become high, exalted in rank", I would suggest that this same root is to be found elsewhere in the O. T.

First in Proverbs 59. vv. 3-14 of this chapter are devoted to a description of a harlot and to a warning against the dangers which may result from association with her kind. "Remove thy ways far from her, and come not nigh to the door of her house" — so runs v. 8; the Hebrew text of v. 9 is as follows: פָּרִיתָסָן לְאֶחָיִים הָרָגָד וְשִׁנְתָּ לְאֶבְרָרִי, translated in the English Versions:

"Lest thou give thine honour unto others,
And thy years unto the cruel".

Now it is clear that "years"¹ forms no satisfactory parallel to "honour". This difficulty has been felt by commentators, e. g. by Toy, who translates:

"Lest thou give up thy wealth to others,
The (toil of) thy years to aliens"².

i. e. "all the outcome, the earnings, of the man's life pass into the hands of others"³. Toy's translation, however, is not convincing; for, in order to obtain the parallelism which he rightly feels to be necessary, he not only has to translate שנתך by "the toil of thy years" — in itself a doubtful and forced rendering — but he has further, in the belief that שנתך in this passage is the plural of שנה "year", to

¹ LXX βλοῦν, Vulg. annos tuos, Pesh. ܠܫܢܝܝܐ, Targ. שניך.

² *Book of Proverbs* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 107, reading נכרִי (p. 111). See below note 3.

³ Toy, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

emend רוֹדֵךְ to רוֹדֵךְ.¹ This emendation is unnecessary, for an excellent parallel to רוֹדֵךְ is provided if שנהך be equated here with سنى. The verse may then be translated:

"Lest thou give thine honour unto others,
And thy dignity unto the cruel".

The verse will then refer, not, as Toy holds, to the loss of worldly wealth, but to the loss of human dignity. By the surrender of oneself to the power of the "others", the "cruel" i. e. the harlot and her various associates², that exalted condition of mankind which the sages visualised as its ideal is thereby lowered³.

The equation of שנה with سنى in this passage then, by providing the necessary parallelism, rids the passage of all difficulty of translation, and renders emendation of the text unnecessary. As for the vocalisation of שנהך, either שנהך (infin. construct of the verb שנה) or שנהך (if we may assume the existence of a noun שנה "honour", cp. Syr. ⁴ *sublimitas, majestas, honor magnus*⁴) is possible.

The other passage to be considered is Isaiah 11 11, the opening words of which are וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יוֹסִיף אֶדְנִי שְׁנִית יָדוֹ לְקִנּוּת אֶת־שָׂאֵר עַמּוֹ — "and it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people" (so the English Versions). The difficulty about the M. T. as it stands, however, is that there is no infinitive dependent on יוֹסִיף and governing שְׁנִית⁵. Most modern commentators, therefore, following the LXX (ἡσυχίᾳ... τοῦ δεῖξαι...) achieve an infinitive by emending שְׁנִית, which has been generally treated adverbially "a second time" (root שנה "to repeat"), to שָׂאֵר "to raise his hand"⁶. Is it not possible, however, that underlying שְׁנִית here is a corruption of an infinitive construct of שנה = سنى? There are grounds for believing that a

¹ LXX ² *ἡσυχίᾳ* ³ *τοῦ δεῖξαι*, representing תִּיִּי, probably arose from a similar belief. Toy would render רוֹדֵךְ, if retained, by wealth "called *honour* because it gives a man an honourable position among men" (*op. cit.* p. 108).

² As noted above Toy emends מְבֹרָא to מְבֹרָא. This is hardly necessary, for "the cruel one" (or "ones" — G. BEER in KITTTEL *Bibl. Hebr. ad loc.* reads plural) is an apt enough description of the pitiless character of the harlot and her associates. The Versions, except Targ. ³ *לְבִרְאִין*, support M. T. (LXX ἀνελεῖται, Vulg. *crudeli*, Pesh. ⁴ *سجسجس*).

⁴ SCHULTENS (*Proverbia*, p. 41) who interprets אֶת־רִיבִים as Israel's enemies, writes "pondus et decus tuum; Gloriam nominis, gloriam gentis Deo sacratae, gloriam libertatis, et praerogativam gloriosae immortalitatis, ad quam vocatus es".

⁵ PAYNE SMITH, *Thes. Syr.* II., 4239.

⁶ See G. B. GRAY, *Book of Isaiah* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 228.

⁷ *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*; see also G. W. WADE, *Book of the Prophet Isaiah* (Westminster Comm.), p. 87; O. PROCKSCH, *Jesaja* 1, p. 156, etc.

literal meaning of this root is possible ¹. Pointing then as an infinitive (perhaps Piel *הָרָאָה*?) we obtain the translation which commentators feel to be required and which they have striven to obtain by other means, viz., "to raise up his hand".

[Completed October 1st, 1936.]

THE LXX'S RENDERING OF שְׁנוֹת לֵב טוֹב
IN ECCLUS. XXXIII 13

The Hebrew text of Ecclus. xxxiii 13 runs as follows ¹⁾:

שְׁנוֹת לֵב טוֹב תַּחַת מַטְעָמִים וּמֵאֵכְלוּ יַעֲלֶה עָלָיו

LXX (xxx 25) λαμπρά καρδία καὶ ἀγαθὴ ἐπὶ ἐδέσμασιν
τῶν βρωμάτων αὐτῆς ἐπιμελήσεται.

SMEND argues that the LXX translator appears to have omitted שְׁנוֹת and to have translated טוֹב twice, once by λαμπρά and again by ἀγαθὴ; though he thinks it is possible that the translator (and the Syriac translator too—ܠܒܐ ܬܘܒܐ ܡܬܥܡܝܡܐ ܡܬܥܠܐ ܥܠܐܝܗ read (2) ²⁾ I. LÉVI ³⁾ is in general agreement with this view, but he suggests that the LXX translator read טוֹב לֵב טוֹב.

It may be questioned, however, whether these two commentators are correct in thinking that the LXX translator failed to translate the Hebrew word שְׁנוֹת. The suggestion I wish to make is that λαμπρά represents שְׁנוֹת and ἀγαθὴ represents טוֹב. The Hebrew root שָׁנָה = سنى in the sense 'became high, exalted in rank' has been detected in a number of passages in the O.T. ⁴⁾ The Arabic root means also 'shone, gleamed' ⁵⁾. May it not be that λαμπρά 'bright, radiant' is the Greek translator's rendering of שְׁנוֹת in this sense, a meaning perhaps suggested by the presence of the word טוֹב 'cheerful'? ⁶⁾

If the suggestion offered here is correct, two gains result. First, the text which lay before the Greek translator contained the word שְׁנוֹת which was duly translated by him. And secondly, from the LXX's translation of שְׁנוֹת, even though it may be an incorrect one ⁷⁾, we may recover a further piece of evidence in support of the existence in Hebrew of a root שָׁנָה = سنى.

Cambridge

D. WINTON THOMAS

¹⁾ R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach Hebr. u. Deutsch*, p. 24.

²⁾ *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, p. 272.

³⁾ *L'Ecclesiastique ou la Sagesse de Jésus, Fils de Sira*, 11, p. 135.

⁴⁾ See the present writer in *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East* (Suppl. to Vet. Test. iii), p. 286, and n. 8.

⁵⁾ LANE, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.*, 1448.

⁶⁾ The Greek word has the further meaning 'illustrious', just like שָׁנָה = سنى (cp. Latin *clarus*). See LIDDELL and SCOTT, *Greek-Eng. Lex.*, rev. ed., p. 1028.

⁷⁾ See SMEND, *Die Weisheit . . . erklärt*, loc. cit., and LÉVI, op. cit., loc. cit. Both think that the meaning 'sleep' is suitable to the passage.

THE ROOT ידע IN HEBREW.¹

THE Hebrew root ידע 'to know' is very perplexing. It has been generally classed under פ"ו verbs, and more specifically under that class of פ"ו verbs which are to be regarded as genuinely פ"ו.² It is, of course, the forms in the Niph. (יָדַע), Hiph. (הוֹדִיעַ), and Hithp. (הִתְיַדַּע) which have led grammarians to class it under verbs genuinely פ"ו. But here they seem to have been in error. For the fact that the first radical is *yodh* not only in Hebrew, but in Aramaic (יָדַע, יִדַּע), Ethiopic³ ('*aiḏe'a*'), and Assyrian (*idû*),⁴ would seem to justify the belief that the verb is really a פ"י.⁵ True פ"י verbs are rare in Hebrew, but where they occur the corresponding Arabic root, when found, also has *yodh* as the initial radical.⁶ Is there any trace, therefore, of an Arabic root يَدَع, corresponding with ידע? Nöldeke⁷ seems to have found traces of such a root, though its occurrence is very rare. We may accept as probable, therefore, that the root ידע is a true פ"י, and that the forms in the Niph., Hiph., and Hithp. (and derivatives like מִדָּע 'kinsman' and מִדָּעַת 'kindred') have been made falsely to conform to verbs פ"ו,⁸ unless we care to regard as more probable that both ידע and ודע were current side by side.⁹

It is not surprising then that attempts have been made in the past,

¹ A paper read before the Society for Old Testament Study in London on January 3, 1934.

² So J. Olshausen, *Lehrb. d. hebr. Spr.* (1861), p. 518; E. König, *Hebr. Gramm.* (1908), p. 71; Gesenius, *Hebr. Gramm.* (Kautzsch-Cowley), 2nd ed. 69b, &c.

³ A. Dillmann, *Eth. Gramm.*, p. 127.

⁴ C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss d. vergleich. Gramm. d. sem. Spr.* I, p. 604. In Assyrian proper names apparently *ydh*; see C. F. Burney, *Book of Judges*, p. lxxv.

⁵ So Wright, *Compar. Gramm. of the Sem. Lang.*, p. 235; Bauer and Leander, *Hist. Gramm. d. hebr. Spr. d. A. T.*, 55 i; C. Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

⁶ Apart from ידע, the following verbs may be regarded as true פ"י: יָמַב:—יָמַב, יָמַב (only in Hiph.)—these three seem to have no Arabic parallels; יָמַב (יָמַב), יָמַב (יָמַב), יָמַב (יָמַב). Three other roots, though they are not actually used in Biblical Hebrew, but are assumed as roots in Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Heb. Lex.*, may be mentioned—יָמַב (יָמַב) 'ascend' assumed as the root of תִּלְוַעְפָּה 'eminence', יָמַב (יָמַב) 'insane' of יָמַב 'proud', and יָמַב (יָמַב) 'be an orphan' of יָמַב 'orphan'.

⁷ *Neue Beitr. zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 202. *Contra* P. Haupt (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, xxxiv, p. 72). I am indebted to Dr. S. A. Cook for this latter reference.

⁸ The Hiph. הוֹדִיעַ (יָמַב), Niph. הוֹדִיעַ (יָמַב), Hiph. הוֹדִיעַ (Kethibh in Ps. v 9) have been formed similarly. Cf. מִדָּע side by side with מִדָּע. See Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 242; Gesenius, *op. cit.*, 70 c, *et al.*

⁹ So Nöldeke, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

NOTES AND STUDIES

299

when ידע was considered to be a true פ"ו, to find a connexion between the Hebrew root and the Arabic دَع. It was Albert Schultens, apparently, who first sought this connexion,¹ his explanation being that as دَع means 'to put, place, store up, deposit', what we know is that which we have placed or stored up in the mind.

Further, G. M. Redslob² similarly held that the Hebrew and Arabic words are really the same. He, like Schultens, finds the connexion in the meaning of the Arabic root 'to put, place'. According to his view, there is an ellipse of the object of ידע, which is אֶת לְבֹי or אֶת נַפְשִׁי, i.e. one puts one's mind upon or places oneself in relation to some object.³ The phrase then becomes comparable with שֵׁית לֵב עַל.

Both these views will lapse, however, if ידע is to be regarded as a true פ"ו, for if any Arabic equivalent is to be compared, it should be דַּע and not דَع. At this point we may leave the questions whether ידע 'to know' is a פ"ו or not, and whether in such a case it can be equated with any Arabic root, and turn to a consideration of the case which can be made out for a Hebrew root ידע (quite distinct from ידע 'to know'), which is genuinely פ"ו and the philological equivalent of the Arabic دَع. The attempt will be made to shew that this root ידע bears in Hebrew much the same meaning as does the Arabic root.

Before, however, we proceed to treat of this connexion between ידע and דַּע, in this particular meaning, it will be as well if we first refer to two attempts which have already been made to connect these two roots, not this time in the sense of 'to know', but in other senses. One of the senses borne by this Arabic root, in the second form, is 'to say farewell to'.⁴ In this sense Eitan⁵ has plausibly explained יִדְעֵתִי in

¹ So Robertson Smith in a foot-note in Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 235. Unfortunately he gives no reference. Actually this view of Schultens is to be found in his *Proverbia Salomonis*, 1748, at end *Index hebraearum vocum sub ידע*. His own words are דַּע ידע *Posuit, condidit speciatim vase aut cista asservandum; metonymice scivit q. d. recondidit, deposuit in mentem.*

² In *ZDMG*, 1871, p. 506 f.

³ For the ellipse of the object he compares Job viii 8, where is the phrase הִתְחַקֵּר אֲבוֹתָם בִּזְנוֹן לְחַקֵּר אֲבוֹתָם 'direct thyself to (i.e. give attention to) the search of their fathers'. The object—some such word as לֵב—is omitted here (so Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, 467).

⁴ According to Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, 1011, the preposition in this phrase is either ל or אֶל; seems not to occur. There is, however, the phrase ידע על (e.g. Hg. i 5, 7, Job i 8). Redslob might have instanced ידע על in Job xxxvii 16 (the only occurrence of ידע followed by על).

⁵ Lane, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.*, 3051; Hava, *Arab.-Eng. Dict.*, 859.

⁶ *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography*, p. 48 f.

300 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

1 Sam. xxi 3. The occasion is David's arrival at Nob and his interview with the priest Ahimelech. The latter exhibits fear at David's solitary arrival. 'Why art thou alone, and no man with thee?' he asks. David's reply is, 'The king hath commanded me a business, and hath said unto me, Let no man know anything of the business whereabout I send thee and what I have commanded thee; and I have appointed my servants to such and such a place.' This יִרְעֵתִי, translated in the English Versions 'I have appointed', is usually taken as a Po'el¹—in which case the Po'el of יָרַע occurs only here—and the meaning given to it is 'I have caused to know', i.e. directed.² Driver,³ on the basis of the LXX διαμεμαρτύρημαί, would emend to יִרְעֵתִי—Po'el of יָרַע 'to appoint' (in which case the Po'el will occur only here), or simply the Qal יָרַעִי. The merit of Eitan's suggestion is that it involves no alteration of the M.T., while at the same time it yields tolerable sense—David is alone on his errand, for he has said farewell to his servants, i.e. he has left them behind.⁴

The second attempt to be mentioned is that of Professor D. S. Margoliouth, who has suggested that the true sense of some of the Hebrew proper names, compounded of יָרַע and a divine name, which occur on the South Arabian inscriptions, is to be found in Arabic and not in Hebrew; and that the element יָרַע in these names is not to be connected with the Hebrew יָרַע 'to know', but with the Arabic دَعَى in the sense of 'care for, keep in mind'. In such names the meaning will then be not 'known of God' or 'knowing God', which 'implies a stage in spiritual religion which seems to be beyond the old Arabian paganism', but 'cared for by Il'.⁵

In view of Professor Margoliouth's remarks, it is interesting to find that one of the meanings Schultens gives for יָרַע is *curare*,⁶ and it seems not impossible that this meaning underlies some of the occurrences of יָרַע in the O.T. Schultens would interpret in this way, for example, Prov. xii 10 יָרַע צַדִּיק נֶפֶשׁ בְּהֶמְתּוֹ which he translates *Curat justus*

¹ So Gesenius, *op. cit.*, 55 b ('unless הוֹדַעְתִּי should be read'). See also E. König, *Syntax d. hebr. Spr.*, i, p. 424.

² So Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, 394.

³ *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel* (2nd ed.), p. 173.

⁴ The אֵל in אֵל מְקוֹם פִּלְנִי אֵלֶּמֶנִי will then mean 'at'. For אֵל in this sense, see Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, 40.

⁵ *The Relations between Arabs and Israelites prior to the Rise of Islam* (Schweich Lectures, 1921), pp. 14–15, and foot-notes *ad loc.* Cf. the phrase *الله في ودائع* 'à la garde de Dieu' (R. Dozy, *Suppl. aux dictionnaires arabes*, vol. 2, p. 792 *sub* ودائع). For other South Arabian names compounded with יָרַע, see D. H. Müller, *ZDMG*, 1875, p. 612.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

NOTES AND STUDIES

301

animam pecudis suae.¹ There are also other passages where יָדַע with נַפְשׁ as object occurs which may be translated suitably by 'care for the life of'. For example, there is Job ix 21 where Job exclaims לֹא אֶדְרֹךְ נַפְשִׁי, for which the A.V. has 'yet would I not know my soul' (i.e. my life); yet some such translation as 'I care not for my life' (which is more in accordance with the R.V. 'I regard not myself') provides an excellent parallel to the second half of the verse (אֶמְאֵס חַיִּי 'I despise my life'). Then there is Ps. xxxi 8, where for יָדַעְתָּ בְּצָרוֹת נַפְשִׁי the English Versions have 'Thou hast known my soul in adversities'; but 'thou hast cared for my soul in adversities' is, if not preferable as a translation, at least possible.² There are other passages, too, in which Schultens would translate יָדַע by *curare* (Prov. v 6, ix 13, &c.).³

We have noted so far, then, attempts first to identify יָדַע 'to know' with דָּע—we have seen reason for abandoning this identification—and secondly, to find a connexion between יָדַע and דָּע in the sense of 'to say farewell to' and next 'to care for'. The equation of the Hebrew and Arabic roots, therefore, is no new thing. But, as has been remarked above, the Arabic root has many senses, and we now wish to suggest the equation of יָדַע (of course as a פ"ו) with דָּע in yet another sense. An examination of certain passages in the O.T., where יָדַע occurs, leads to the belief that the translation of the English Versions 'know' is erroneous, and that the root is to be explained by reference to דָּע. According to Lane דָּע means 'to become still, quiet, at rest',⁴ and the particular meaning which concerns us in connexion with these O.T. passages is that of 'being made still or quiet', in the sense of being reduced to submission or humiliation.⁵ We will now examine these passages which seem to receive their best explanation if יָדַע is equated with דָּע in the sense just mentioned.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 113; LXX *οκλείπει*, English Versions, 'regardeth the life of'. See further E. Baumann, יָדַע u. seine Derivate, in *ZATW*, 1908, Heft I, p. 28 f, where other examples of יָדַע in this sense are given. For the latter reference I am indebted to Dr. S. A. Cook.

² LXX *ἑσώσας ἐκ τῶν ἀναγκῶν τὴν ψυχὴν μου*. In this passage יָדַע is parallel with רָאָה, which sometimes means to look with kindness, helpfulness, as in Gen. xxix 32, I Sam. i 11, Ps. cvi 44 (see Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, 908). The latter (p. 393) takes בְּצָרוֹת as object of יָדַע (so Pesh.), but there is nothing which makes the rendering of the English Versions impossible.

³ *Op. cit.*, *ad loc.*

⁴ Lane, *op. cit.*, 3051; Hava, *op. cit.*, p. 859.

⁵ Hava, *op. cit.*, p. 860, gives مَوْدَع and مَوْدَع as 'submissive' (of a horse), that is, 'made quiet, tractable'. (Cf. Freytag, *Lex. Arab.-Lat.*, iv 450.) On page 859 is given وَدَاعَة 'meekness, mild temper', and on page 860 وَادِع 'peaceful, quiet', وَدِيع 'quiet, tractable', &c.

302 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

The first passage is Jud. xvi 9. The first unsuccessful attempt on Delilah's part to wrest the secret of Samson's strength from him ends with the words **וְלֹא נִדְרַע כֹּחוֹ**, which the English Versions translate by 'So his strength was not known' (so LXX καὶ οὐκ ἐγγνώσθη ἡ ἰσχύς αὐτοῦ, and Targum **וְלֹא אֶחָדֵיע חִלִּיה**). But clearly from his very exploit—his breaking of the withes with which he was bound—his strength was known. Only by putting upon **כֹּחוֹ** some such meaning as 'the secret of his strength' or 'wherein his strength lay' (so Vulg. *et non est cognitum in quo esset fortitudo ejus*) can the sense 'known' be held to be reasonable; and to ascribe such a meaning to **כֹּחוֹ** can hardly be regarded as legitimate. If we connect **נִדְרַע** here with **וְדַע**, we obtain the sense 'and his strength was not brought to submission'—a rendering which is well in accord with the translation of the Pesh. **וְלֹא נִדְרַע כֹּחוֹ** 'and his strength was not shaken, disturbed'.¹ In connexion with this, v. 19 should be taken into consideration. This verse, which recounts Delilah's shaving of Samson's head, ends with the words **וַתִּחַל לְעֹנֹתוֹ** 'and she began to afflict him, and his strength went from him'. The word to be noticed particularly here is **לְעֹנֹתוֹ**, which is translated 'to afflict him'. This root **עָנָה**, whose meaning in Hebrew is 'to be bowed down, afflicted',² bears in the cognate Arabic root **عَانَا** the meaning 'be lowly, humble, submissive, obedient'.³ So what Delilah did in v. 19 was to 'make him submissive', and the departure of his strength by the shaving of his head marked the triumphant conclusion to the many, but previously unsuccessful, attempts to reduce him to submission. In v. 9 his strength was not brought to submission (**וְלֹא נִדְרַע כֹּחוֹ**); in v. 19 this submission is brought about.

The next two passages to be considered are in Proverbs. The first is xiv 33:

**כָּל־בַּיִת נְבוֹן תִּנְיָח חֲכָמָה
וּבְקֶרֶב בְּסִילִים תִּדְרַע**

which is translated in the English Versions as follows:

'Wisdom resteth in the heart of him that hath understanding:

But *that which* is in the midst (R.V. inward part) of fools is made known.'

¹ The Arabic Version, following the Pesh., has **وَلَمْ تَضَعْفْ قُوَّتَهُ** *viribus tamen ejus haudquaquam debilitatis* (Walton, *Polygl.*).

² Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, 776.

³ Lane, *op. cit.*, 2178. See also under iv, 2179, and the noun **عَنَوَة** which can mean 'lowliness, humility, or submissiveness', and the adjective **عَانِي** 'lowly, humble, submissive'. See further **حَنِ** and derivatives in Payne Smith, *Thes. Syr.*, vol. 2, 2925 f, and C. Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.* (2nd ed.), pp. 534-535.

NOTES AND STUDIES

303

The word חִידָע has been felt to be a difficulty by commentators.¹ The LXX, Syr., and Arab. Versions attempt to get over the difficulty by inserting a negative (οὐ διαγινώσκειται, لا يعرف, ولن تعرف) i.e. wisdom is not known in fools. The Targ. renders שְׁמִיּוּתָא חִידָע 'folly is known' (or 'makes itself known')—no easy phrase. Nor is the rendering of the Vulg. any more satisfactory, for by translating M.T. by *et indoctos quosque erudiet* it gives to the Hebrew a meaning it can hardly bear. The attempts on the part of the Versions to render the M.T. have this in common—they 'all leave the strange term *known*, which yields no satisfactory sense'.² Since finally the translation of the R.V. quoted above is hardly possible, we can only conclude, with Toy, that the present text seems impracticable. Toy himself prefers to read חִידָע (the reading of the Targ. noted above) instead of חִידָע, the resulting translation being—'but in the heart of fools is folly'.³ Emendation of the text, however, is unnecessary if ידע here be taken in the sense of the cognate Arabic root. The translation will then run:

'In the heart of the prudent resteth wisdom,

But in the heart of fools it is made submissive'—

that is, wisdom is made submissive to folly. By the equation of ידע with ودع, the translation of this difficult half-verse would seem to be much facilitated.⁴

The next example is in Proverbs x 9:

הוֹלֵךְ בַּתוֹם יֵלֶךְ בְּטוֹה
וּמַעֲשֵׂה שָׁרָה יִדָּע

which runs in the English Versions as follows:

'He that walketh uprightly walketh surely:

But he that perverteth his ways shall be known',

i.e. known as (= discovered to be) a wrongdoer, and punished.⁵ Toy, however, points out that the parallelism calls for a mention of punishment, and this parallelism he brings about by emendation of the M.T. in accordance with xi 15, where the verb ידע occurs. The translation of the emended text will then run:

'But he that perverteth his ways will suffer hurt.'⁶

¹ For example, C. H. Toy, in *Proverbs* (International Critical Commentary), p. 301.

² *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

³ *Ibid.*, loc. cit. So also W. O. E. Oesterley, *Book of Proverbs* (Westminster Comm.), p. 116.

⁴ Elieser b. Iehuda, *Thes. totius hebraeatis*, vol. 3, p. 1980, takes ידע here as equivalent to ودع 'to deposit', explaining it by הוֹשֵׁם לַפְקֻדִין.

⁵ Toy, *op. cit.*, p. 204. The LXX, Syr., Targ., Vulg., Arab. all represent ידע 'to know'.

⁶ *Ibid.*, ad loc. So Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 76, note ad loc.

304 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

The M.T. admittedly yields no satisfactory sense if ידע here is the ordinary root 'to know'. But if once again we compare ידע here with the Arabic root, we not only avoid the necessity of emendation, but we obtain perfectly good sense:

'But he who perverts his ways is made submissive',
i.e. to the law—a translation which provides the necessary parallelism—
'the man of upright life has nothing to fear from his neighbours or the Law—a dishonest man will be punished'.¹

The next passage is Jer. xxxi 18. In vv. 15–17 the prophet hears in imagination Rachel, the mother of Joseph and Benjamin, bewailing the exile of her sons. But, says Yahweh, 'Refrain thy voice from weeping', &c., 'thy children shall come again to their own border' (vv. 16–17). Now the ground for this hope is Ephraim's penitence. This penitence is expressed clearly in v. 18—'Thou hast corrected me, and I let myself be corrected, as a calf untrained; O bring me back, that I may return (to thee)'.² Then v. 19, with which we are particularly concerned, gives expression no less clearly to Ephraim's grief—'For after that I turned (from thee), I have repented; and after I was brought to knowledge (הִנֵּנִי), I have smitten upon my thigh; I am put to shame, yea, even confounded, because I do bear the reproach of my youth'.³

We have then in these verses the combined ideas of penitence and grief. 'Brought to knowledge', the translation of הִנֵּנִי given above, is to be understood, it seems, in a spiritual sense—knowledge which comes through chastisement. Some critics indeed would read here 'was chastised';⁴ and certainly the tone of the passage, which is brimful of remorse and sorrow, seems to require some such sense. Emendation, however, will be unnecessary, if ידע here is equated with دَع; the translation will then be—'and after my being made quiet, submissive'—a further statement of the acceptance of correction and the repentance mentioned previously.

There remain two further passages in which it is possible that ידע has hitherto been erroneously derived from ידע 'to know'. First, in Jud. viii 16 in the story of Gideon's pursuit and capture of Zeba and Zalmunna, the kings of Midian, and his subsequent treatment of the men of Succoth, we meet the strange words וַיִּדַּע בָּהֶם אֶת־אֲנָשֵׁי סִבּוֹת, which are rendered in the English Versions—'and with them he taught the men of Succoth'—the בָּהֶם 'with them' referring to the thorns of the wilderness with which Gideon threatened to tear the flesh of the

¹ *Ibid.*, *ad loc.*

² Driver's translation in *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah*, p. 187.

³ So Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, 394.

⁴ See G. A. Smith, *Jeremiah* (Baird Lecture, 1922), p. 304, note 3, reading presumably some such word as הִנֵּנִי?

NOTES AND STUDIES

305

men of Succoth when the kings of Midian should fall into his hands (v. 7). If the M.T. is retained, it is usually explained by a parallel usage of the verb in I Sam. xiv 12 וְנִלְיָעָה אֶתְכֶם דָּבָר, uttered by the Philistines who, catching sight of Jonathan and his armour-bearer, cry out—'Come up unto us, that we may teach you a thing', i.e. perhaps 'we may teach you a lesson, give you something to think about'.¹ The M.T. seems to be supported amongst the Versions only by some LXX manuscripts—the others are content to paraphrase.² The strangeness of the expression has led to a general acceptance of the emendation וַיִּדְּשׁ 'and he threshed'³ (cf. v. 7, where וְנִשְׁתִּי 'and I will tear' is part of Gideon's threat). But if ידע here be cognate with ودع, it becomes possible to retain M.T. as it stands, and to translate 'and he made quiet (submissive) therewith the men of Succoth'.⁴

Finally, a reference may be made to Ecclus. vii 20.⁵ The text as given by Smend⁶ runs as follows:

אל תרע עבד עבד באמת

'Ill-treat not a servant who serveth faithfully' (so the Greek text μὴ κακῶσθης). Smend, however, notes a variant תרע. This has, perhaps naturally, been regarded as a mere copyist's error.⁷ No certainty can be attained in the matter, of course, but it is just possible that the copyist was not at fault in this instance. Should the original reading in this passage be תרע (pointed as a Hiph. jussive) a connexion with ودع would seem not impossible. The sense obtained by a comparison with the Arabic root will then be—'Humiliate not (i.e. reduce not to submission) a servant who . . .', &c.—a sense which is suitable, though it can hardly be claimed to be preferable to that yielded by תרע.

If ودع really underlies the root ידע in some of these passages—in almost all of which the root has been a matter of difficulty to commentators—the case for ידע = ودع will be much strengthened. It may not be too much to claim that the difficulties surrounding these

¹ So C. F. Burney, *Book of Judges*, p. 233, who, however, admits that the parallel is not exact. The presence of a second object (דָּבָר) to the verb in I Sam. xiv 12 makes it doubtful whether it can be regarded at all as a parallel to our passage.

² The renderings of the Versions are conveniently tabulated in C. F. Burney, *loc. cit.*

³ *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*; G. F. Moore, *Judges* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 226; R.V. marg., &c.

⁴ Elieser b. Ichuda, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*, regards ידע in this passage as a separate root, explaining it by עָנַשׁ and יָסַר.

⁵ Mr. G. R. Driver has drawn my attention to this passage.

⁶ *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*, p. 7.

⁷ So Schechter and C. Taylor, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, p. 46.

306 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

occurrences of ירע may to some extent be dissipated, and a truer sense of the passages obtained, by postulating that a root ירע in the sense given above may have been current in Hebrew as well as in Arabic.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

THE ROOT ידע IN HEBREW, II

In a former number of the JOURNAL (xxxv 298) I drew attention to several passages in the O.T. in which ידע seems to receive its best explanation if it is referred, not to the common Hebrew word meaning 'to know', but to another root ידע = ודע meaning 'to become still, quiet, at rest', with the particular meaning of being reduced to submission, humiliation. I now add several other passages in which the Hebrew word may be similarly explained.

In Ps. cxxxviii 6 the Hebrew text runs as follows—בִּירְדָם יְהוָה וְשָׁפַל יֵדָע, which is translated in the R.V. 'For though the Lord be high, yet hath he respect unto the lowly; but the haughty he knoweth from afar'; the LXX, Pesh. and Vulg. similarly take יֵדָע in this passage from ידע 'to know' (γινώσκει, *cognoscit*). Since, however, the verb ראה here has the meaning, as elsewhere,¹ of looking kindly upon (the lowly), the sense which seems to be required for יֵדָע is the antithesis of this, viz. punishment or humiliation (of the proud).² Such an antithesis is readily obtained if ידע here be connected with ידע = ודע. The translation will then run—'For exalted is the Lord, yet he regardeth the lowly, but the proud he reduces to submission (humiliates) from afar'.³

The equation of ידע with ודע in this passage may also help to explain the peculiar grammatical form יֵדָע. Brown-Driver-Briggs regard it

¹ E.g. in Ps. xxxi 8, cvi 44, Gen. xxix 32, &c. See Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Heb. Lex.*, 908. The Targ. here has וּמְכִיךְ יַחְמִי לְטַב *et humilem respiciet in bonum* (Walton, *Polygl.*, *ad loc.*).

² Rosenmüller, *Scholia, Psalmi*, pp. 1858-1859 remarks *nam ידע vi oppositionis notitiam judicis, qui, quos reos cognovit, poenis promeritis plectit, significat, ut Jer. xxix 23.* So similarly those who would emend the text to יֵרָע (e.g. Buhl in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, *ad loc.*).

³ So the Targum's paraphrase וְגִיּוּחָנָא מִן שְׁמִיָּא רַחֲמִין יִמְאַיֵּךְ *et superbum de cœlis longinquis deprimet* (Walton, *Polygl.*, *ad loc.*).

410 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

as the Qal of ידע 'to know', but recommend that it should be read יִדְעַי.¹ Briggs, however, finds this reading unacceptable, and prefers to regard the double yodh as having arisen through dittography.² The difficulty of the double yodh, however, disappears, if ידע is equated with גַּע—it may be pointed as Pi'el יִדְעַע 'he causes to be submissive', i.e. he humiliates.³

In Is. viii 9 the words רַעוּ עַמִּים וְהוּוּ are translated in the R.V. 'make an uproar (רַעוּ), O ye peoples, and ye shall be broken in pieces'. Brown-Driver-Briggs⁴ derive רַעוּ from רָעַע II 'break', but recommend that רַעוּ (LXX γυνῶτε) should be read as a parallel to הִאֲזִינוּ.⁵ But it is at least doubtful whether it is justifiable to assume parallelism between these two words, for the reading הִאֲזִינוּ has not passed unchallenged.⁶ Assuming that רַעוּ represents the original text and connecting it with גַּע, we may translate—'be ye reduced to submission, O ye peoples, and be ye dismayed (shattered)'. It is interesting to note that for רַעוּ the Pesh. has שָׁסוּ 'shake', which is the word used in the Syriac version to translate נִדָּע (ܢܝܕܝܥ) in Jud. xvi 9 in the sense of 'was brought to submission'.⁷

In Jer. ii 16 occur the words גַּם-בְּנֵי-נֹפֶחַ וְיִתְּחַבֵּי-יָרְעוּן קִרְלָךְ, translated in the R.V. 'the children also of Noph and Tahpanhes have broken the crown of thy head'. Brown-Driver-Briggs⁸ derive יִרְעוּן from רָעָה 'to pasture' in the sense of 'crop, strip', i.e. devastate. Would it not be more natural to derive it from רָעַע 'to break'?⁹ We are not so

¹ *Op. cit.*, 393, Cp. Gesenius, *Hebr. Gramm.* (Kautzsch-Cowley), 2nd ed. 69, 2 R. 3.

² *The Book of Psalms* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 491.

³ That a causative sense underlies יִדְעַע has long been recognized, e.g. by F. Delitzsch (*Comm. on the Psalms*, vol. 3, p. 341) who held that it was formed after the analogy of Hiph'il forms like יִלְיִל (Is. xvi 7, &c.) and יִטִּיב (Jb. xxiv 21, &c.); see also Gesenius, *op. cit.*, 70, 2 R. 2. Cp. further Rosenmüller, *op. cit.*, loc. cit., who notes incidentally that some regard the form as Pi'el, but in the sense *penitus cognoscit, pernoscit*.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 949.

⁵ So also Gray, *The Book of Isaiah* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 149, G. W. Wade, *The Book of Isaiah* (Westm. Comm.), p. 57 et al. The latter notes that Aq., Symm. and Theodot. have συναθροίσθητε (cp. Vulg. *congregamini* and Targ. אִתְּחַבְרוּ)—no doubt the reading רַעוּ underlies these renderings, connected in the minds of the translators with רָעָה 'associate with' (Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, 945).

⁶ E.g. Schmidt (in O. Procksch, *Jesaja* I, p. 135) reads הִאֲזִינוּ 'equip yourselves', which would seem to stand in parallelism not with רַעוּ but with הִתְאָזְרוּ.

⁷ See *JTS* xxxv, 302.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, 945.

⁹ Driver, *The Book of Jeremiah* (Westm. Comm.), p. 9, n. a, thinks, however, that 'break' is a less probable translation than 'lay bare' (i.e. shave)—connecting the word apparently with עָרָה.

NOTES AND STUDIES

411

much concerned, however, with the root from which ירעוך is to be derived as with the interesting fact that some manuscripts and the LXX (ἐγγισάν σε) have a variant reading ירעוץ.¹ May we not believe that underlying this variant reading is ירע = רגע? The translation will then run—'caused thee to be submissive (humiliated thee) as to the crown of the head' i.e. caused thy head to hang in shameful submission.

It is not surprising that the book of Job should furnish some examples of the use of ירע in the sense of the Arabic root. A good example occurs in XX 20 בְּבִטְחוֹ שָׁלוֹם לֹא־יָדַע שָׁלוֹם 'Because he knew no quietness within him', &c. (R.V.). The word שָׁלוֹם, however, translated 'quietness' is an adjective and not a noun. If the translation of the R.V. is to be retained, therefore, שָׁלוֹם must be read.² But since the rhythm here is 3+3, שָׁלוֹם may be safely deleted as a gloss explaining the difficult ירע, which again may be taken in the sense of رגע—'he is not quiet (at ease) in his belly'. This explanatory gloss is most striking and lends strong support to the belief that ירע here receives its best explanation if it is equated with the Arabic root.

The translation of Jb. xx 26 is particularly difficult. The central thought is the doom of the wicked. The 'fire not blown (by man)' which devours him may be taken to mean lightning.³ The last three words are יִרְעֵה שְׂרִיר בְּאֶהֱלוֹ, translated in the R.V. 'it shall consume that which is left in his tent', i.e. 'lightning . . . strikes him dead and destroys what has survived previous disasters'.⁴ The word יִרְעֵה here is usually derived from רעה 'to pasture', used figuratively for 'consume'.⁵ The LXX (κακώσαι) seems to have connected it with רעע 'to hurt' whereas the Pesh. (ܡܠܚܕ) apparently misread it as ܝܒܫ. Now if אֵשׁ לֹא נִפַח is the subject of ירע there is a strange change of gender—תאכלהו but ירע.⁷ This difficulty may, however, be surmounted if, with the LXX, Pesh., Vulg., and Targ. we regard שְׂרִיר not as the object of ירע, but as its subject; also it is to be noted that some manuscripts have for ירע a variant ירע.⁸ Equating then this variant with רגע, and taking שְׂרִיר as the subject of the verb, we obtain excellent sense—'every survivor in his tent is brought to humiliation, disgrace'.

¹ See Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, ad loc.

² Mr. G. R. Driver has kindly drawn my attention to this passage.

³ See Driver and Gray, *The Book of Job* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), pt. ii, p. 139.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 181. (Cp. Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, 518.)

⁵ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

⁶ Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, 944.

⁷ But see Gesenius, *op. cit.*, 145 t.

⁸ Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, ad loc.

412 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

Jb. xxi 19 provides a further example. Job's argument here is complicated by the uncertainty of the text, but the main thought is that of divine punishment.¹ In the last three words of the verse יְשַׁלֵּם אֱלֹהֵי יִדְעָ we have, if ידע be taken in the sense of the Arabic root, an expression of submission consequent upon divine chastisement—'he requites (punishes) him and he is submissive'. The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary has for ידע in this passage ܡܠܝܢܐܡܝܢܐ, but a variant ܡܠܝܢܐܡܝܢܐ is also preserved.² Is this alternative reading to be connected with זסן (דוה, דגى) *tristis, miser fuit*, Pa. Aph. *vilem, miserum reddidit, afflixit, contristavit*?³ If so, it goes some way to support the translation suggested for ידע in this passage.

D. WINTON THOMAS.*

¹ Driver and Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

² *Studia Sinaitica*, No. vi, ed. A. S. Lewis *et al.*, p. 75.

³ Payne Smith, *Thes. Syr.* I 828; cp. Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.*, and. ed., p. 143.

A NOTE ON לֹא תִדַע IN PROVERBS v 6

I HAVE previously suggested in this JOURNAL¹ that in several passages of the O. T. in which יָדַע occurs, it is to be explained, not by reference to the common יָדַע 'know', but by reference to a distinct יָדַע, cognate with the Arabic يَدَع, in the sense of 'become still, quiet, at rest'. To these passages I now add Proverbs v 6.

This verse, which forms part of a description of a harlot, runs in Hebrew as follows:—

אֲרַח חַיִּים בְּדֶרֶךְ פֶּלֶם נָעִי כִּעֲלִיָּהּ לֹא תִדַע:

and is translated in the R.V.:—

'So that she findeth not the level path of life:

Her ways are unstable, and she knoweth it not.'²

With regard to the first half of the verse, two observations need to be made: First, in place of the unintelligible פֶּלֶם a negative (לֹא or בִל) must be read.³ Secondly, Mr G. R. Driver has recently shewn that the true meaning of פֶּלֶם here and elsewhere is not 'weigh, make level',⁴ but 'examine, search out' (Accad. *palāsu*).⁵ The first half of the verse may then be translated: 'She does not scrutinize carefully the way leading to life', i.e. the way of quiet and peaceable prosperity.⁶

The second half of the verse continues the description of the harlot's

¹ In vol. xxxv pp. 298-299.

² The A.V. has:—

'Lest thou shouldest ponder the path of life,

Her ways are moveable, that thou canst not know them.'

³ So all the Versions.

⁴ So Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Heb. Lex.* 814; cp. C. H. Toy *Book of Proverbs*, p. 105.

⁵ In *J.T.S.* xxxvi 150-151.

⁶ The verb פֶּלֶם has frequently been taken as a second person (as in A.V.; s. Toy *op. cit.* p. 107, and Rosenmüller *Scholia, Proverbia* pp. 132-133), but there can be no doubt that the harlot is the subject throughout the verse (s. Toy *op. cit.* p. 105).

60 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

life. There is no difficulty about the words נַעַן מַעַנְלָתֶיהָ 'her ways are unstable', but the final phrase לֹא חָרַע has been the subject of much criticism. It has been argued, for example, that the phrase mars the parallelism and that it provides no appropriate sense.¹ Such criticism, however, is based upon the belief, commonly held hitherto, that underlying חָרַע in this passage is the $\sqrt{\text{ידע}}$ 'know';² it loses its force entirely if חָרַע be referred to the $\sqrt{\text{ידע}} = \text{נדע}$. This equation provides at once the required parallelism—'her ways are unstable, she is not quiet', i.e. she leads a feverish existence, her life is one of rush and excitement, she enjoys no peace or security—she is not שְׁלֵמָה.³ The Hebrew phrase is neither an addition, as 'some expression here seems required by the rhythm',⁴ nor does it need to be emended,⁵ for a comparison with the Arabic roots yields a sense which is entirely suitable to a description of the harlot's hazardous and unsettled way of life.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

MORE NOTES ON THE ROOT ידע IN HEBREW

To the increasing number of occurrences of ידע in the O.T., which appear to receive their best explanation by reference, not to ידע 'knew', but to a distinct $\sqrt{\text{ידע}}$ cognate with the Arab. ودع 'was still, quiet, at rest' (in the sense of being reduced to submission or humiliation), Mr G. R. Driver has now added the well-known phrase ידוע חלי in Isa. liii 3, which he translates 'humbled, disciplined by sickness'.¹

Mr Driver's rendering finds interesting confirmation in Jewish tradition. R. Yizḥaq Eliyyah Kohen, for example, commenting upon the phrase, remarks² ידוע חולי הוא מענין שבירה כמו וידוע בהם את אנשי. סכות ר"ל שהוא נשבר מחולי חזק as "And he broke with them the men of Succoth" (Judges viii 16), i.e. he was broken by a severe sickness'.³ Similarly R. Ben Asher Altschüler⁴ and R. Sh'lomoh Astruc⁵ record that the phrase is explained by some authorities by reference to שבר, as does an anonymous glossator,⁶ while Herz Homberg explains it by the words מיוסר ומדכא בחלים רעים 'chastened and broken by sore diseases', and again compares Judges viii 16.⁷ These examples are sufficient to shew that Jewish tradition has preserved a reminiscence of a $\sqrt{\text{ידע}}$ distinct from ידע 'knew'; and the recurring reference to Judges viii 16 is noteworthy in view of the present writer's suggestion⁸ that underlying it is the Arab. ودع .

This use of ידע = ودع in Isa. liii 3 suggests that ידעתו in verse 11 may also be referred to this same Arabic root. The difficulties attaching to the word on the usual assumption that ידעת here means 'knowledge' may be seen by consulting any commentary. A derivation from ידע 'knew' is, however, still retained by some modern commentators, though the obscurity of the suffix (is it *per cognitionem sui* or *per cognitionem suam*?)⁹ leads them to prefer the reading ידעת יהוה = ידעתו.¹⁰ But more generally resort is had to emendation. Kittel, for example, reads ידעתו 'in his evil plight',¹¹ and Elliger (following Sellin) would

¹ In *J.T.S.* xxxviii 49.

² S. R. Driver and A. Neubauer *Jewish Interpreters of Isa. liii* i 132.

³ *Ibid.* ii 141.

⁴ *Ibid.* i 282.

⁵ *Ibid.* i 124.

⁶ *Ibid.* i 337.

⁷ *Ibid.* i 344; ii 402.

⁸ In *J.T.S.* xxxv 304-305.

⁹ F. Delitzsch *Prophecies of Isaiah* ii 336.

¹⁰ e.g. P. Volz *Jesaja II* 17; J. S. Van der Ploeg *Les Chants du Serviteur de Jahvé* 15, who adopts it with caution. Torrey, however (*Second Isaiah* 254), retains the suffix of the third person and translates 'in knowing himself true he will be satisfied'.

¹¹ In *Bibl. Hebr.* (1929), *ad loc.*, where it is noted that one MS. has בר'. Cp. R. Levy *Deutero-Isaiah* 26, who, in interpreting ידעתו as 'his knowledge of the

NOTES AND STUDIES

405

read *בְּעִבְדוֹ* 'by his service'.¹ It may well be, however, that the M.T. is after all correctly preserved and that *רַעְתּוֹ* here is to be explained by reference to *וַדַּע*. The sense obtained will then be 'his submission, humiliation, discipline'—a meaning which accords well with the general characterization of the Servant's degradation and silent submission to his martyr's fate as portrayed throughout the Songs. The equation of *ידע* here with *וַדַּע* would seem to go far towards ridding the passage of both textual and exegetical difficulty.

The Massoretic punctuation of this first half-verse whereby *בְּרַעְתּוֹ* is unconnected with *יִשְׁבַּע* must be regarded as erroneous. The parallelism is clearly between the phrases *מַעֲמַל נַפְשׁוֹ יִרְאֶה* and *יִשְׁבַּע בְּרַעְתּוֹ*. Connecting then *יִשְׁבַּע* with *בְּרַעְתּוֹ*,² and taking *יִרְאֶה* as the equivalent of *יִרְוֶה*, and transferring *צָרִיק* to the first half of the verse,³ we may translate:

'Of the toil of his soul shall the righteous have his fill,
He shall be sated with his humiliation.'

One further passage may be mentioned where the rendering of a Greek version rests on the assumption of *ידע* = *וַדַּע*, viz. Hos. vi 3.⁴ The verse opens *וְנִדְעָה נִדְרָפָה נִרְדָּפָה לָרַעַת אֶת־יְהוָה*, which is translated in the R.V. 'And let us know, let us follow on to know the Lord'. The Versions in general derive *וְנִדְעָה* similarly from *ידע* 'knew' (Targ. *נִילָה*), but *Quinta's* rendering by *παυσιπνευσμεν*⁵ may point to a derivation from *ידע* = *וַדַּע*, even though such a translation cannot be correct.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

A NOTE ON **וְלֹא יָדְעוּ** IN JEREMIAH xiv 18.

Jer. xiv forms part of a dialogue between Yahweh and the prophet, in which the latter, who interprets the drought which has come about as a sign of Yahweh's anger, pleads for his people—with no success, however, for Jerusalem's doom is certain and imminent. Verse 18, occurring in Jeremiah's lament, which he is bidden to undertake for the horrors that are to come upon Judah, runs in Hebrew as follows:—

אִם יֵצְאוּ הַשָּׂדֶה וְהָיָה תִּלְלֵי-חָרָב
וְאִם בָּאתִי הָעִיר וְהָיָה תִּחְלֹאֲנִי רָעָב
כִּי-גַם-נָבִיא גַם-כֹּהֵן אֶל-אֶרֶץ וְלֹא יָדְעוּ:

and is translated in the English Versions:—

'If I go forth into the field, then behold the slain with the sword! and if I enter into the city, then behold them that are sick with famine! for (A.V. yea) both the prophet and the priest go about in the (A.V. into a) land and have no knowledge (A.V. that they know not).'

The A.V.'s translation of **וְלֹא יָדְעוּ אֶרֶץ** 'a land that they know not' might seem at first sight to be justified in view of similar phrases in such passages as xv 14, xvi 13, xvii 4, and xxii 28, which are sometimes adduced as parallels.¹ The phrase under discussion, however, differs from these other phrases in one important point, namely, in the presence of the *waw* (**וְלֹא יָדְעוּ**). Some scholars strike it out.² Others go further and delete the whole phrase³; others again regard it as part of an incomplete sentence.⁴ Such attempts to explain what is admittedly a difficult phrase cannot be regarded as satisfactory; and we may well believe that no satisfactory interpretation is likely to result so long as

¹ e.g. by S. R. Driver, *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* (1906), p. 86.

² See, for example, W. Rudolph in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.* (1931) *ad loc.*; F. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia* (1907), p. 87; Gesenius, *Hebr. Gramm.* (Kautzsch-Cowley), 2nd ed., 155 h, &c. The *waw* is omitted by the LXX, Vulg., and some MSS.

³ See Duhm in C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch Jeremia* (1905), p. 187.

⁴ Cornill, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*, regards Duhm's suggestion as to this possibility as 'eine sehr ansprechende Vermuthung'.

274 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

יָדַע here is connected, as it has hitherto been, with the common יָדַע 'know'.¹ Good sense can, however, be obtained if יָדַע in this passage is regarded as a quite distinct root and is referred to the Arabic دَع, 'became still, quiet, at rest'—a root which occurs in a number of other passages.² We may then translate—'both the prophet and the priest travel about in the land and have no rest'³—when the terrors of the future break upon the land, prophet and priest, bereft of their honourable offices, roam restlessly about.⁴

It may be added that for שָׁחֲרוּ some would read שָׁחֲרוּ 'they wear black clothes in mourning', or שָׁחֲרוּ 'they are bowed down',⁵ or נִסְחָבוּ 'they are dragged';⁶ others again take it in the rare sense borne by the Syriac ܫܚܝܐ 'go about as beggar'.⁷ Whichever of these possibilities be preferred, the suggested translation of יָדַעוּ וְלֹא 'and have no rest' is equally appropriate.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

¹ Cornill, *op. cit.*, p. 186, writes 'der Begriff *unversehens, unvermuthet*, vgl. L 24, Jb. ix 5, Ps. xxxv 15, nicht passt, und eine Uebersetzung *und wissen nichts, wissen nicht was zu thun und wie sich helfen* exegetisch unstatthaft ist'. The Versions render as follows: LXX οὐκ ᾔδεισαν, Vulg. *ignorabant*, Pesh. ܫܠܐ ܒܝܕܝܢ, Targ. וְלֹא בָקְרוּ.

² See the present writer in *J.T.S.* xxxv 298 f, xxxvi 409 f, xxxvii 59 f, xxxviii 404 f, and G. R. Driver in *J.T.S.* xxxviii 49.

³ The translation of אֶל-אֲרֶץ by 'in the land' is regarded as dubious by some (e.g. S. R. Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 359); but does not אֶל here stand for עַל, as often in Jeremiah? [G. R. D.]

⁴ Cp. a similar use of יָדַע = דַּע, in the description of the harlot's restless mode of life in Prov. v 6; see the present writer in *J.T.S.* xxxvii 59 f.

⁵ So Giesebrecht, *op. cit.*, p. 87 *et al.*

⁶ So Rudolph, *op. cit.*, *ad. loc.*

⁷ So S. R. Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 86 (note b); F. Nötscher, *Das Buch Jeremias* (1934), p. 127; P. Volz, *Der Prophet Jeremia* (1928), p. 162, *et al.* The Versions render as follows: LXX ἐπορεύθησαν, Symm. ἐκύκλωσαν, Vulg. *abierunt*, Pesh. ܫܚܝܐ, Targ. אַתְּפִיאוּ לְסַחֲרוֹתָהוֹן. Attention may perhaps be drawn to the

Arabic root سَحَرَ (used as a synonym of تَبَاعَدَ) in the sense of 'went, or removed to a distance, or far away'. See Lane, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.*, 1316.

A NOTE ON THE MEANING OF יָדַע IN HOSEA ix. 7 AND ISAIAH ix. 8

THE first nine verses of Hosea ix are concerned with the horrors of the Exile soon to overtake the northern kingdom. In ver. 7 its near approach is solemnly announced—בָּאוּ יָמֵי הַפִּקְדָּה בָּאוּ יָמֵי הַשָּׁלָם 'Come are the days of visitation, come the days of recompense'. Then follow the words יָדַעוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל, a phrase which commentators, assuming a derivation of יָדַע from יָדַע 'knew', have found difficult. The Massoretic Text, however, presents no difficulty if יָדַעוּ here is regarded as a further example of the $\sqrt{\text{ידע}}$, cognate with the Arabic $\sqrt{\text{دع}}$, in the sense of 'was humiliated'.² We may then translate:

'Come are the days of visitation, come the days of recompense, Israel shall be humiliated.'³

The LXX's rendering is generally assumed to represent an original reading יָדַע. May it not be, however, that $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omega\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ represents, not יָדַע, but יָדַע (singular for M.T.'s plural),⁴ which the LXX translators recognized as belonging to the $\sqrt{\text{ידע}} = \text{دع}$? It is worth noting that some other Hebrew words, which are nearly allied in meaning

¹ Or 'Like a mighty storm does it come', if the Divine name is taken purely as an intensive. Cf. such passages as: Gen. x. 9 לְפָנַי יוֹהוּה = a very mighty hunter; Jonah iii. 3 עִיר גְּדוֹלָה לְאֱלֹהִים = a very great city; Cant. viii. 6 אֵשׁ שְׁלֵה בְתִיָּה רֶשֶׁת רֶשֶׁתִּי = a mighty flame. מִשְׁדִּי is so interpreted by S. P. Behrmann, in his Hebrew commentary on Isaiah אור בהיר (Vilna, 1903). He finds the Kaf of קִשְׁד difficult, on the usual rendering 'destruction'.

² For other examples see the present writer in *J.T.S.* xxxv. 298 f., xxxvi. 409 f., xxxvii. 59 f., xxxviii. 404 f., xxxix. 273 f., and G. R. Driver in *J.T.S.* xxxviii. 49. Some of these examples (e.g. in Jer. xiv. 18, Ps. cxxxviii. 6, Job xxi. 19) occur in passages where, as here, divine punishment is the theme.

³ The translation of the rest of the verse is very uncertain. The meaning seems to be: 'The prophet has become a fool, the man of spirit a madman' (so you, the people, think); (if so, retorts Hosea) 'it is because of the greatness of thine iniquity.' Cp. Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 332. The words מִשְׁטָמָה belong probably to ver. 8: see Driver, *J.T.S.* xxxix. 159.

⁴ The singular is read—unnecessarily, as it seems—by some editors, e.g. Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 1922, p. 56.

44 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

to ידע in the sense of the Arabic root, are rendered similarly by κακοῦν by the LXX translators, e.g. שחח in Ps. cvii. 39, and ענה in Zech. x. 2 (in Qal; in Is. liii. 7 in Niph.; and in Dan. x. 12 in Hithp.).¹

Another passage whose theme is that of divine punishment and of pride brought low is Isa. ix. 7ff. Verse 8 runs in Hebrew as follows :

יִדְעוּ הָעַם כָּל־אֲפֹרִים יוֹשְׁבֵי שְׁמֶרֶן
בְּגִנְאָה וּבְגִדְל לִכְב לְאֹמֶר :

and is translated in the English Versions :

‘And all the people shall know, even Ephraim and the inhabitant of Samaria, that say in the pride and (RV. in pride and) stoutness of heart. . . .

Here again the Massoretic Text runs quite smoothly if we suppose that יִדְעוּ here has nothing to do with ידע ‘knew’, but is cognate with ידע. Verses 7 and 8 may then be translated :

‘The Lord sendeth a word against Jacob, and it shall light upon Israel.

And all the people, even Ephraim and the inhabitant of Samaria shall be humiliated

Because of (their) pride and insolence in saying² Bricks are fallen,’ &c.

D. WINTON THOMAS

JULIUS FÜRST AND THE HEBREW ROOT ידע

IN a number of issues of this JOURNAL³ I have drawn attention to many passages where the root ידע has nothing to do with the common

¹ *Nid.* 41 b is a little difficult, טיפי מ' of drops of menstrual blood. Rashi (in the margin) is determined to preserve the sense 'pearl', and explains דם לבן וצליל 'blood white and clear'. In *B. Bathra* 16, 6, there is a variant אבן טרב מ' for מ' which suggests the equivalence of מ' to טרב.

² The ambiguity of the French *perle* and German *Perle* is no true parallel, these words in their generic sense meaning not precious stones, but pearl-shaped beads, bulbs, &c. The true analogy is in the floral vocabulary. Persian گل = 'rose' in particular and 'flower' in general; and probably שושן = 'iris' in particular and 'flower' in general. [Similarly Maltese *warda* has the two meanings of 'rose' and 'flower'. *Mejju hu ix-xahar tal-ward* = 'May is the month of flowers'. *Warda bla xewk ma tinsabx* = 'There's never a rose without a thorn'.—E.F.S.]

³ See xxxv. 298 ff., xxxvi. 409 ff., xxxvii. 59 f., xxxviii. 404 f., xxxix. 273 f., xli. 43 f. See further G. R. Driver in xxxviii. 49, xl. 177, xli. 162.

* * *

NOTES AND STUDIES

65

root meaning 'knew', but is to be explained by reference to the Arabic *وَدِع* 'became still, quiet, at rest', with the particular meaning of being reduced to submission or humiliation by means of discipline or punishment. It was with great interest, therefore, that I recently noticed for the first time that Julius Fürst distinguishes a second root ידע.¹ This second root means properly, according to him, 'scheiden, trennen, spalten, schneiden' (ידע = ידע). As examples of this literal meaning of the root he cites Ezek. xix. 7 and xxxviii. 14; in the first case ידע is said to mean 'zertrümmern, -stören', and in the second case 'einbrechen, -hauen'. In a figurative sense the root means 'züchtigen, heimsuchen'. This figurative meaning may be seen, according to Fürst, in five passages. In three of them (Prov. x. 9, Jer. xxxi. 19, Judges viii. 16) the present writer has shown that ידע is best explained if it is equated with *وَدِع*;² while in a fourth passage (Isa. liii. 3) the Hebrew root has been similarly explained by Professor G. R. Driver.³ Of these four passages nothing more need be said here. There remains Gen. xviii. 21, where אדעה is said by Fürst to mean 'bestrafen'. This is the meaning given to it by the Targum (איחפרע); and Abu Sa'id renders it similarly by اعاقب.⁴ Is אדעה here—if it means 'punish'—also explicable by means of the equation ידע = *وَدِع*? If it is, the Hiph'il (אדעה) must be read for the Qal of the M.T.

D. WINTON THOMAS

SOME RABBINIC EVIDENCE FOR A HEBREW ROOT

נָדַע = יָדַע

THE existence of a Hebrew root נָדַע = יָדַע "was still, quiet" (in the sense of being "reduced to submission" or "humiliation") may now be regarded as well established, the root with this meaning being found in a number of passages in the Hebrew Bible.¹ It has already been noted² that confirmation is to be found in Jewish tradition of the explanation of יָדַע חָלִי in Isa. 53.3 by reference to this Hebrew root. In this article further evidence is added that Jewish tradition appears to have preserved a reminiscence of a root נָדַע distinct from יָדַע "knew." In the four passages first to be considered, נָדַע has already been explained by the present writer by reference to יָדַע = נָדַע.³

(a) Judg. 8.16. On נָדַע in this passage Rashi comments וַחֲבֵר בָּהֶן "and he broke with them." This is similar to the rendering of the Targum עליהן, וַחֲבֵר, which is referred to by Kimchi, who mentions also the phrase יָדַע חָלִי in Isa. 53.3, יָדַע being explained by שְׁבִירָה "breaking." The word נָדַע is explained by Yehiel Hillel ben David Altschul⁴ by הִיא מִסְרָם וּמִשְׁבָּרָם "he disciplined them and broke them."

(b) Ps. 138.6. On יָדַע here Rashi comments יִסֵּר "he disciplines" (with a reference to Judg. 8.16), while Ibn Ezra (also with a reference to Judg. 8.16) remarks מִלֵּךְ יִדְעֵנוּ יִלְמְדֵנוּ דַּעַת שִׁיִּסְרֵנוּ "the word יָדַע teaches us that He will discipline us." Yehiel Hillel ben David Altschul⁵ likewise explains יָדַע here by יִסֵּר (he too refers to Judg. 8.16).

(c) Job 21.19. Ibn Ezra explains נָדַע here by reference to נָדַע in Ezek. 19.7, concerning which there is a Jewish tradition that it means "and broke."⁶

(d) Prov. 10.9. On נָדַע Rashi comments יִשְׁבֵּר וְיִחַסֵּר "shall be broken and disciplined," and once more reference is made to Judg. 8.16. Ibn Ezra, after first explaining נָדַע by reference to יָדַע "knew," remarks

¹ See the present writer in *Journ. of Theol. Stud.* xxxv. 298 ff.; xxxvi. 409 ff.; xxxvii. 59 f.; xxxviii. 404 f.; xxxix. 273 f.; xli. 43 f. See further G. R. Driver in xxxviii. 49, xl. 177, xli. 162, and J. P. Hyatt in *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, lviii. 99 f.

² *Journ. of Theol. Stud.*, xxxviii. 404.

³ *Ibid.*, xxxv. 304 (Judg. 8.16); xxxvi. 409 (Ps. 138.6); xxxvi. 412 (Job 21.19); xxxv. 303 f. (Prov. 10.9).

⁴ In *מַצֹּרֶת דָּוִד*.

⁵ In *מַצֹּרֶת צִיּוֹן*; cf. *מַצֹּרֶת דָּוִד*.

⁶ *Infra*.

that there is a tradition that it here means ישבר "shall be broken," and he refers to the phrase ידוע חלי in Isa. 53.3. Yehiel Hillel ben David Altschul⁷ explains ידע by ישבר וירוכא "shall be broken and crushed."

One further passage may be referred to, viz., Ezek. 19.7, where the phrase ידע אלקנותיו occurs. Rashi, giving first to ידע the sexual sense it frequently bears in Hebrew, goes on to say that some interpreters regard אלקנותיו here as meaning, not "widows," but "palaces," אלקנותיו being the equivalent of ארמנותיו, and that they give to ידע the sense of פור והרס "breaking and pulling down;" and for this meaning ידע in Ps. 138.6 is cited as a parallel. Kimchi, like Rashi, first interprets ידע in a sexual sense, and then refers to the Targum's rendering ואצדי ברניתה "and laid waste its palaces," remarking ידע ענין שבר וחרבן "ידע has the meaning of breaking and destruction;" and for this meaning ידע in Judg. 8.16 is referred to. Yehiel Hillel ben David Altschul,⁸ treating אלקנותיו as equivalent to ארמנותיו, explains ידע by שבירה "breaking," and once again Judg. 8.16 is cited.

As is well known, the Hebrew text of the first half of Ezek. 19.7 presents many difficulties of interpretation. While in the four passages referred to earlier it may with some confidence be thought that ידע is correctly interpreted by reference to ידע = ידע, it is not suggested that this equation provides the correct interpretation of ידע in this passage from Ezekiel. It is only intended to suggest that the Jewish writers, whose comments on ידע have been given, may furnish additional evidence that there has been preserved in Jewish circles a tradition that there existed in Hebrew a root ידע distinct from ידע "knew." Taken in isolation, it might, it is true, be suspected that the interpretations of these Jewish authorities represent no more than a guess on their part at the meaning of a word of peculiar difficulty. The references in their comments to Judg. 8.16 and Ps. 138.6, where, as has been said above, ידע is most satisfactorily explained by reference to ידע, are, however, perhaps not without significance; and they may suggest that the Jewish writers are not guessing, but that they are giving to ידע here a meaning which this root was known to have in Jewish tradition, and which today can best be recovered by reference to the Arabic يَدَع.

D. WINTON THOMAS

St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, England

⁷ In מצודת דוד.

⁸ *Ibid.*

A NOTE ON וַיִּדַע אֱלֹהִים IN EXOD. II. 25

It has long been recognized that in many passages in the Old Testament the Hebrew root ידע means, not 'knew', but 'cared for, kept in mind' (cf. Arabic *دعا*, in the same sense).¹ In this note brief consideration is given to yet another passage, viz. Exod. ii. 25—which so far, it seems, has failed to attract the attention it deserves²—where ידע, in the phrase וַיִּדַע אֱלֹהִים, is, we believe, most satisfactorily explained if it is given the meaning 'cared for, kept in mind'.³

It may be noted first that, if ידע here is translated 'knew' (as A.V.^m; cf. R.V.), the omission of an object to the verb is curious.⁴ What was it that 'God knew'? In face of this difficulty some commentators, on the basis of the LXX's *καὶ ἐγγνώσθη αὐτοῖς*, emend וַיִּדַע אֱלֹהִים to וַיִּגְדַע אֱלֹהִים 'and he (i.e. God) was made known (made himself known) to them';⁵ while others prefer to read וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהִים 'and he (God) appeared to them'.⁶ If, however, ידע here is given the meaning 'cared for, kept in mind', the omission of the object is less striking, for the object is omitted after ידע in this sense in some other passages.⁷ The phrase וַיִּדַע אֱלֹהִים 'and God cared for (them)' can thus be accepted without emendation.⁸

Secondly, it is to be observed that the opening words of the verse—וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהִים—are significant for the proper understanding of וַיִּדַע. The verb רָאָה sometimes means 'looked with kindness, helpfulness',⁹ and in this sense it stands in parallelism with ידע in Ps. xxxi. 8, which

¹ See the present writer in *J.T.S.*, xxxv. 300 f., and footnotes there.

² There is no reference at all to this passage in the dictionaries of Brown-Driver-Briggs, Gesenius-Buhl, or Zorell; nor is it included among the many instances of ידע, discussed by E. Baumann in his two articles ידע u. seine Derivate, *Z.A.T.W.*, 1908, pp. 22 ff., 110 ff.

³ Cf. A.V.'s 'had respect unto' and Luther's *und nahm sich ihrer an*.

⁴ Dillmann, *Die Bücher Ex. und Lev.*, 3rd ed., ed. V. Ryssel, p. 27; cf. A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zum hebr. Bibel*, i. 267.

⁵ See, e.g., G. Quell in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, 3rd ed., ad loc.; G. Beer, *Exodus*, p. 24, reads וַיִּגְדַע אֱלֹהִים לְמֹשֶׁה 'and God made himself known to Moses' (cf. vi. 2).

⁶ See, e.g., Dillmann, op. cit., loc. cit. Cf. E. Kautzsch, *Die Heilige Schrift des A.T.*, 4th ed., ed. A. Bertholet, p. 102. *Contra* Ehrlich, op. cit., loc. cit.

⁷ e.g. 1 Kings, i. 11, 18; Hos. viii. 4. See Baumann, op. cit., p. 23 f., and Gesenius-Buhl, *Handwörterb.*, p. 287.

⁸ It is the Hebrew text represented by the Vulgate and the Peshitta.

⁹ e.g. Gen. xxix. 32; 1 Sam. i. 11; 2 Sam. xvi. 12; Ps. cvi. 44; see Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 908a. The insertion of עָנִי 'affliction' after וַיֵּרָא, as suggested by Beer, op. cit., loc. cit., is thus unnecessary.

144 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

is one of the passages where **ידע** has the meaning 'cared for'.¹ Similarly in this verse **ראה** and **ידע** stand side by side, and the meanings to be attached to them are, we suggest, exactly those that they bear in Ps. xxxi. 8. We may then translate the whole verse as follows: 'And God looked with kindness upon the children of Israel, and God cared for (them)'—or 'kept (them) in mind'. There does indeed seem to be some parallelism in thought and form between verses 24 and 25. Thus **וישמע** (ver. 24)—**שמע** sometimes has the meaning 'hear favourably'²—corresponds to **וירא** (ver. 25) 'looked with kindness',³ and **ויזכר אלהים את-בריתו** (v. 24) 'and God remembered his covenant' corresponds to **וידע אלהים** (ver. 25) 'and God cared for (them), kept (them) in mind'.

Lastly, the rendering of **וידע** here in the Arabic Version⁴ by **رحمهم** 'and he (God) had pity on them' is not without its interest.

D. WINTON THOMAS

A NOTE ON בְּמַדְעָךְ IN ECCLES. X. 20.

THE Hebrew root ידע with the meaning 'became still, quiet, at rest' (the Arabic دَع, has the same meaning) has been detected in a number of Old Testament passages.¹ Professor Driver has drawn my attention to a further passage, viz. Eccles. x. 20, where the word בְּמַדְעָךְ may, with some plausibility, be explained by reference to ידע in this sense. The English Versions render בְּמַדְעָךְ 'in thy thought' (A.V.^m 'conscience'), a rendering which finds some support among lexicographers² and commentators.³ 'Thought', however, is a poor parallel to חֲפְצֶיךָ 'thy bed-chambers'. Some other commentators, who similarly connect the word with ידע 'knew', but this time in its sexual sense, translate מדע here *Ehegemach*, *Schlafgemach*,⁴ thereby obtaining a better parallel to חֲפְצֶיךָ. Yet others, following Perles,⁵ prefer to emend the text to בְּמַצְעָךְ 'on thy bed'.⁶ The LXX's ἐν συνειδήσει σου (cp. Pesh. ܚܒܝܘܝܢܐ ܠܒܚ, Targ. במנדעך בחביוני לבך, Vulg. in cogitatione tua) clearly reflects, however, our consonantal text. If, as is here suggested, בְּמַדְעָךְ—perhaps vocalized בְּמַדְעָךְ—is translated 'in thy rest, repose' (cp. Arabic مَدَّع 'repose, rest'),⁷ the requirements of parallelism are adequately met, and resort to emendation is unnecessary. We may therefore translate:

Even in thy repose curse not a king,
Nor in thy bed-chambers⁸ curse one of the rich.

D. WINTON THOMAS

¹ See especially J.T.S. xxxv. 301 ff.; xxxvi. 411; xxxvii. 59; xxxix. 273 f.

² e.g. Brown-Driver-Briggs, 396. Cp. Gesenius-Buhl, 16th ed., 400.

³ See, for example, L. Levy, *Das Buch Qoheleth*, p. 127; G. A. Barton, *The Book of Ecclesiastes* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), pp. 175, 179 *et al.* In the other passages where מדע occurs (ii. Chron. i. 10, 11, 12; Dan. i. 4, 17), it has the meaning 'knowledge'. Also connected with ידע 'knew' is the meaning 'study', i.e. place of study, which is given to מדעך by some scholars; see, for example, F. Zorell, *Lex. Hebr. et Aram.*, pp. 412 f.

⁴ e.g. G. Wildeboer, in *Die Fünf Megilloth* (Kurzer Hand-Comm. z. A.T.), p. 159. ⁵ *Analekten z. Textkritik des A.T.*, 1895, pp. 71 f.

⁶ See, for example, F. Horst, in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, 3rd ed., ad loc., where בְּמַדְעָךְ 'among thy kinsfolk' is also proposed.

⁷ See the dictionaries of Hava, 860; Kazimirski de Biberstein, ii. 1510; Freytag, iv. 450.

⁸ In Kittel, op. cit., loc. cit., it is noted that three manuscripts, together with Syr., Vulg., and Targ., read the singular בְּחֶדְרְךָ.

A NOTE ON מוֹעֲדִים IN JEREMIAH 24, 1

IN Jeremiah 24¹ the prophet relates that Yahweh showed him in a vision two baskets of figs (שְׁנֵי דִּירָאֵי תְאֵנִים) which are described as מוֹעֲדִים לְפָנֵי הַיְיָ, words which are translated in the English Versions 'set before the temple of the Lord'. While the meaning 'set' is doubtless intended—it is supported by the renderings of מוֹעֲדִים in the ancient versions (LXX κειμένους; Pesh. **ܩܠܒܐ**; Vulg. *positi*; Targ. מוחתין; Arab. مرفوعة)—Professor G. R. Driver is surely right when he says that such a translation of מוֹעֲדִים 'compels the root יעד to bear a sense alien to its whole usage'.¹ The word מוֹעֲדִים has indeed long been suspected, and is commonly emended either to עומדים 'standing'² or מַעֲמִידִים 'placed'³ (lit. 'made to stand'). I suggest, however, that a more satisfactory solution of the difficulty results if מוֹעֲדִים be regarded as a corruption of a participial form, not of עמד, but of ידע. The M.T.'s מוֹעֲדִים (Hoph. ptcp. יעד) is, I believe, wrongly written for מוֹדְעִים (Hoph. ptcp. ידע) which is then to be explained from the Arabic ودع 'put, placed, deposited'. Thus all that is needed to obtain the sense required is the transposition of the letters ע and ד, and an appeal once more to the equation ידע = ودع.⁴ D. WINTON THOMAS

seems to be that these psalms were not, in fact, arbitrarily selected; they were the *proper psalms* for the season when our Lord ascended, and behind the Christian doctrine of the ascension and heavenly session stands the liturgical worship of the temple and synagogue.

¹ *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.*, 1934, p. 288. His suggestion that underlying מוֹעֲדִים is a word *mo'ed* 'early fruit' (cf. Arab. معد)—so 'ripe, tender figs'—is not easy to accept, since תְאֵנִים is feminine (cf. verse 2).

² So F. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia*, 1894, p. 133; cf. the lexicons of Gesenius-Buhl, p. 306; Zorell, p. 317, and Koehler and Baumgartner, p. 388.

³ So B. Duhm, *ibid.*, 1901, p. 197, and P. Volz, *Studien zum Text des Jeremia*, 1920, p. 197. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 1947, p. 134, gives both emendations as alternatives; cf. him in Kittel, BH3, ad loc.

⁴ For this equation and the meaning see the present writer in *J.T.S.*, xxxv, 1934, pp. 299 and 303, n. 4.

NOTE ON בַּל-יָדָעָה IN PROVERBS 9¹³

THE Hebrew text of Proverbs 9¹³ runs as follows:

אִשָּׁת כְּסִילוֹת הוֹמִיָּה פְתִיחַת וּבַל-יָדָעָה מָה :

and is translated in the R.V.:

The foolish woman (marg. 'Or, Folly') is clamorous;

She is simple (marg. Heb. *simplicity*') and knoweth nothing.¹

What is the meaning of בַּל-יָדָעָה? C. H. Toy, remarking that 'Folly is primarily a moral, not an intellectual term', adopts, with some reserve, the reading קָלָמָה (LXX αἰσχυρή) for מָה 'she knows no shame'.² Other commentators give to the phrase the meaning 'she cares nothing'.³ Such a meaning is indeed possible, since יָדַע means 'care, care for' in a number of O.T. passages.⁴ We may suggest, however, that a more satisfactory sense is obtained if we see in יָדָעָה here a further example of the equation יָדַע = Arabic دَع, 'became still, quiet, at rest'.⁵ The phrase בַּל-יָדָעָה will then mean 'she is not still, quiet in anything',⁶ i.e. she is restless, living a life of rush and excitement.

The two sections Prov. 9¹⁻⁶ and 13-18 'give the contrast between rectitude and sexual debauchery', and the picture drawn in verses 13ff. is based, at least in part, on the descriptions of the harlot in chapters 5 and 7.⁷ In both these descriptions reference is made to the harlot's restless life. In 5⁶ לֹא תָדַע means, I have suggested,⁸ 'she is not quiet, at rest', i.e. she is unsettled; while in 7¹¹ הִמְיָה very probably means

¹ The A.V. has: 'A foolish woman is clamorous: she is simple, and knoweth nothing.'

² *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 189; so also G. Beer, in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, 7th ed., ad loc. W. Frankenberg, *Die Sprüche*, p. 64, prefers to read הַכֹּלָם, as in Jer. 8¹². M. Scott, *Textual Discoveries in Proverbs, Psalms and Isaiah*, p. 36, reads עֲרָמָה 'discretion' for מָה.

³ e.g., B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos*, p. 40; cf. Frankenberg, loc. cit.

⁴ See *J.T.S.* xxxv. 300 f. and xlix. 143 f.

⁵ For further examples see *J.T.S.* xxxv. 301 ff.; xxxvi. 411; xxxvii. 59; xxxix. 273 f. and l. 177.

⁶ For מָה 'anything', see Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Heb. Lex.* 553 b. Cf. Kautzsch-Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebr. Gramm.*, 2nd ed., 137 c.

⁷ Cf. Toy, op. cit., p. 188.

⁸ *J.T.S.* xxxvii. 59 f.

24

NOTES AND STUDIES

'wandering to and fro, roving'.¹ In the verse under discussion בל־יָדָעָה 'she is not still, quiet' thus echoes the thought contained in לא־תָדַע in 5⁶, and provides an excellent parallel to הוֹמָיָה, which doubtless means here, as in 7¹¹, 'roving'. Adopting the reading יִמְסַפֵּה for פְּחִיזָה, we may translate:

The foolish woman wanders to and fro,
Seducing, and is ever restless.

D. WINTON THOMAS

NOTE ON לָדַעַת IN JOB 37¹

THE Hebrew text of Job 37¹ runs as follows:

בְּיָד-כָּל-אָדָם יִהְיֶה לָדַעַת כָּל-אִישׁ מַעֲשָׁהוּ;

and is translated in the R.V.:

'He sealeth up the hand of every man;
That all men whom he hath made may know it.'

The first half of the verse is commonly and correctly interpreted to mean that God keeps men shut up and inactive indoors during the winter. The second half of the verse has been variously interpreted. According to the R.V. כָּל-אִישׁ מַעֲשָׁהוּ means 'all the men of his (God's) creation'. The phrase אִישׁ מַעֲשָׁהוּ is, however, unique; and moreover, an object to לָדַעַת (R.V. *it*) has to be supplied. Many modern commentators¹ read either כָּל-אִישׁ or כָּל-אֲנָשִׁים as the subject of לָדַעַת, with מַעֲשָׁהוּ as object—'that every man (all men) may know his (God's) work', i.e. that men, in their enforced inactivity, may know that they are subject to a higher will than their own.² This is certainly preferable to the rendering of the R.V.

Another possibility suggests itself, however, if לָדַעַת here is explained, not by reference to יָדַע 'knew', but by reference to יָדַע = Arabic *وَدَعَ* in the sense 'became still, quiet, at rest'.³ Many examples of יָדַע in this sense have been noted in earlier issues of this *Journal*.⁴ Perhaps the original text was לָדַעַת כָּל-אִישׁ [מִן] מַעֲשָׁהוּ 'so that every man might rest from his work' (in the fields; for מַעֲשָׁהוּ 'husbandry', cf. Ex. 23¹⁶, Jud. 19¹⁶). The loss of the first *mēm* in מַמַּעֲשָׁהוּ might perhaps appear more easily explicable on the assumption that the original text had כָּל-אֲנָשִׁים rather than כָּל-אִישׁ—'so that all men might rest from their work'. It is of interest to note that in Job 33¹⁷ מַעֲשָׂה, which is preceded by the word אָדָם, has similarly lost a prefixed *mēm* through

¹ See, for example, S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *The Book of Job* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 290 (of philological notes); K. Budde, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 222; G. Hölscher, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 85; C. J. Ball, *The Book of Job*, p. 407; G. Beer, in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, 7th. ed., ad loc.

² Cf. LXX, which renders מַעֲשָׁהוּ by ἑαυτοῦ ἀσθένειαν. This rendering probably represents a paraphrase of M.T. rather than a different Hebrew original. Targ. has לְמִידַע כָּל בְּנֵי נִשְׂא עֹבְדֵי; Pesh. *للميدع كل بني نساء عوبي*; Vulg. *ut noverint singuli opera sua*.

³ I owe this suggestion to Prof. G. R. Driver.

⁴ See *J.T.S.* xxxv. 301 ff.; xxxvi. 411; xxxvii. 59; xxxix. 273 f.; l. 177; N.S. iv. 23 f.

NOTES AND STUDIES

57

haplography.¹ The singular suffix in *מַעֲשָׂהוּ*, following on the plural *אֲנָשִׁים*, is no objection to the reading *אֲנָשִׁים*, for it can quite properly refer to the collective idea contained in the plural.² The verse may then be translated:

'He seals (the door) behind³ every man,
So that every man (all men) may rest from his (their) work.'

The picture thus presented is that of God locking up men in their houses in winter time, so that they have a respite from work out of doors. The winter is a time of rest for men as well as for animals (cf. verse 8).

D. WINTON THOMAS

1. SOME REMARKS ON THE HEBREW ROOT יָדַע

In a survey of the *Australian Biblical Review*, Vol. III, Nos. 1-4, March-December, 1953, published in this issue of the Journal, I refer to some comments I have to make on Professor Goldman's suggestions concerning the meaning of the Hebrew root יָדַע in some passages in the Hebrew Bible (see below pp. 56). His suggestions are of much interest to me, since I have myself made proposals concerning the meaning of this root in many Old Testament passages, including some of the passages to which Professor Goldman refers.¹ Both Professor Goldman and I believe that the root יָדַע can sometimes be explained by reference to the Arabic *wada'a*. Whereas, however, the particular meaning of the Arabic word which Professor Goldman adduces in explanation of יָדַע in the relevant passages is that of "put, lay down," the meaning with which I am chiefly concerned is that of "became still, quiet, at rest," with the special meaning of "being made still, quiet" in the sense of being reduced to submission or humiliation.

The Arabic *wada'a* can indeed mean "put, lay down." It is, however, important to be clear as to what is meant by the words "put, lay down" when they are given as the meaning of *wada'a*. A study of the Arabic word shows that it means "put, lay down" in the sense of "deposit" (e.g. in a chest or wardrobe).² With this meaning "deposit" in mind, we may now look at Professor Goldman's treatment of the passages in question.

(a) Judges viii, 16. In this passage, Gideon's punishment of the men of Sukkoth is described in the words וַיִּדַּע בָּהֶם אֶת אֲנָשֵׁי סֻכּוֹת, which Professor Goldman translates "and he had the men of Sukkoth laid (or put) in them" (i.e. in the thorns and briars; cp. verse 7). If it be granted that the suggested translation is sufficiently near to the meaning "deposit" to make it unobjectionable, it may yet be felt that it suggests a rather odd picture—of Gideon "depositing" the men of Sukkoth in the thorns and briars. It may be felt too that it is a somewhat weak description of what was evidently a severe form of punishment. The translation which I have proposed,³ viz. "and he made quiet (submissive) therewith the men of Sukkoth," seems to me more apt in the

¹ See *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, (hereafter abbreviated as *J.T.S.*), xxxv, 298ff.; xxxvi, 409ff.; xxxvii, 59f.; xxxviii, 404f.; xxxix, 273f.; xli, 43f.; xlii, 64f.; l, 177; N.S., iii, 55; iv, 23f.; v, 56f.

² See HAVA, *Arab.-Eng. Dict.*, 859; LANE, *Arab-Eng. Lex.*, 3051.

³ *J.T.S.*, xxxv, 305.

NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

51

context, and is more in line with Jewish tradition, which sees in **ידע** here the meaning of "breaking, disciplining."⁴

(b) Isaiah liii, 3. Here Professor Goldman translates **ידע חלי** "laid down by illness." "The verb," he says, "would then have preserved its pristine meaning." The phrase "laid down" can, of course, in certain contexts, be equivalent to "deposited," which is the true meaning of *wada'a*. But the meaning "deposited" is not at all applicable in this passage—a person is not "deposited" by illness. Professor Driver⁵ is surely right in translating the Hebrew phrase "humbled, disciplined by sickness"—a translation which, as I have pointed out, is supported by Jewish tradition.⁶

(c) Ecclesiastes x, 20. In this passage Professor Goldman translates **במדעך** "in thy resting room," **מדע** meaning, he says, "place where ones lies down." But the Arabic *wada'a* means, not "lie down," but "lay down, deposit." My proposed translation "in thy rest, repose" (cp. the Arabic *maudu'* "repose, rest")⁷ is based upon the now well-established use of **ידע** = *wada'a* in the sense "became still, quiet, at rest."

The two other passages discussed by Professor Goldman are Ezekiel xix, 7 and Zechariah xiv, 7. In the former he translates **ידע אלמנותיו** "he laid down (= tore down) their palaces." Here again there seems to be a departure from the true meaning of *wada'a* "laid down, deposited." The meaning of **ידע** in this difficult passage must remain uncertain. Jewish commentators have certainly found it puzzling, and it does not appear easily explicable from *wada'a* in the sense "became still, quiet."⁸ In Zech. xiv, 7 Professor Goldman translates—"There will be one day, it will be set aside (**יודע**) for the Lord." Once more, it is not easy to see how the meaning "set aside" can be justified on the basis of *wada'a* "deposited." Moreover, it does not seem necessary to suppose that **ידע** here is anything else but the ordinary root meaning "knew."⁹

Professor Goldman's equation of **ידע** = *wada'a* in the sense "put, lay down," which incidentally is not new,¹⁰ thus fails, as it seems to me, to offer a convincing explanation of **ידע** in the passages under discussion. In four of the five passages dealt with, his translation of the Hebrew root is not in accord with the

⁴ *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, xxxvii, 177.

⁵ *J.T.S.*, xxxviii, 49.

⁶ *Ibid.*, xxviii, 404, where it is suggested that **ידע** in verse 11 means "his submission, humiliation, discipline."

⁷ *Ibid.*, 1, 177.

⁸ *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, xxxvii, 178.

⁹ For **ידע** **יורה** "it is known to Yahweh" as a pious ejaculation characteristic of the timelessness of eschatological hopes, see J. WELLHAUSEN, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Heft 5 (*Die Kleinen Propheten übersetzt, mit Noten*), p. 193; cp. W. NOWACK, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, p. 385.

¹⁰ *J.T.S.*, xxxv, 299, 303 n. 4, and N.S., iii, 55.

meaning, viz. "put, lay down, deposit," which *wada'a* has in Arabic.

Professor Goldman has done me the courtesy of referring to my contributions on the root **דע** and he states that his remarks "are not to be regarded as polemics, but rather as supplementing the results" of my own studies. These brief comments of mine upon his suggestions are likewise offered in no spirit of polemics. On the contrary, I am grateful to Professor Goldman for having taken up the study of this Hebrew root. For it is by means of suggestion and counter-suggestion that we may hope to move gradually nearer to the truth.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Cambridge.

NOTE ON הַדָּעַת IN DANIEL XII. 4

THE word הַדָּעַת in Dan. xii. 4 is generally explained in one of two ways. Either it is given its usual meaning 'knowledge';¹ or it is emended to הַרְעַת 'evil things, calamities' on the basis of the LXX's rendering of the phrase הַדָּעַת הַרְבֵּה (καὶ πλησθῆν ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας).² The phrase הַרְעַת וְתִרְבֶּה (om. ἡ γῆ)³ then means 'and many shall be the calamities'—an expectation which is well in keeping with the eschatological thought of the time.⁴ If, however, 'calamities', or such like, be the meaning required here for הַדָּעַת, such a meaning can, it may be suggested, be obtained from the Hebrew word as it stands, if דָּעַת here be connected not with יָדַע 'knew', but with the now well-established root דָּע = دَع 'became still, quiet, at rest',⁵ with the particular meaning of being reduced to humiliation or submission by means of discipline or punishment. The phrase הַדָּעַת הַרְבֵּה will then mean 'and great shall be the humiliation (punishment)'. 'The revelation must remain concealed', writes Bevan,⁶ 'because there is to ensue a long period of commotion and distress.' The sense 'humiliation, punishment' here suggested for דָּעַת suits such a situation well enough, and is sufficiently near in meaning to the proposed reading דָּעַת as to render unnecessary the adoption of this emendation.

D. WINTON THOMAS

NOTE ON נִדְעוּ IN AMOS III. 3

'ANY interpretation of the Hebrew text, which assigns to "agree" a metaphorical meaning such as "be in harmony" ("be agreed", A.V., Harper and cp. van Hoonacker) lacks foundation in etymology, and cannot stand.' So writes R. S. Cripps,¹ who, after considering and rejecting two other explanations of נִדְעוּ in this passage, namely, 'made an appointment' and 'agreed' (that is, agreed to walk together), concludes that the simplest solution of the difficulty is to adopt the reading of the LXX (γυνώσκω αὐτούς = נִדְעוּ).² The meaning is then, 'Will two walk together unless they know one another?' Against this rendering it may be objected, however, that it is at least doubtful whether the reciprocal use of the Niph. of יָדַע which this translation presupposes can be justified. Certainly it would not be easy to find examples of such a usage in the O.T. How else then may the LXX's rendering be explained? I would suggest that the LXX translators, in connecting נִדְעוּ here with יָדַע 'knew', failed to see the true meaning of the verb, and that it should rather be connected with יָדַע = Arabic وَدَعَ, 'was still, quiet, at rest',³ which in the third and sixth forms means 'was reconciled, made peace with'.⁴ On this explanation of נִדְעוּ, the verse will then mean—'Will two walk together unless they are at peace with one another?'⁵—an altogether more vigorous thought than one which implies only knowledge of one another. The meaning suggested thus comes very close to that of 'be in harmony, be agreed', which Cripps, in the quotation given above, rightly holds cannot be legitimately obtained from יָדַע. This

¹ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos* (2nd ed., 1955), pp. 288 f.

² Cp. K. Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton*, p. 173; Vulg. has *convenerit eis*, and similarly Pesh. (ܢܕܥܘ) and Targ. (אִידְמַנּוּ).

³ For further examples of this equation see *J.T.S.* xxxv. 301 ff.; xxxvi. 411; xxxvii. 59; xxxix. 273 f.; l. 177; N.S. iv. 23 f.; v. 56 f.; vi. 226. The LXX translators render נִדְעוּ by γινώσκω (= נִדְעוּ) in Exod. xxix. 42, xxx. 6, 36, and Num. xvii. 19 (LXX, verse 4). In Jer. xxiv. 1, מִדְעִיִּים is wrongly written for מִדְעִיִּים (Arabic وَدَعَ 'put, placed, deposited'; see *J.T.S.*, N.S. iii. 55).

⁴ Lane, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.* 3051; Hava, *Arab.-Eng. Dict.* 859.

⁵ For the use of the Niph. to express the intimacy of personal relationship cp., for example, נִדְבַר 'spoke together' (Mal. iii. 16) and the frequent use of נִדְעָא 'took counsel together'. There is an Arabic proverb المراقبة الموافقة 'The (first) condition of friendship is to agree with each other'; see J. L. Burckhardt, *Arabic Proverbs* (1875), no. 351, p. 110.

70

NOTES AND STUDIES

meaning can, however, be obtained from **יָדַע** = **وَدَعَ**, and the application of the question posed in this verse to the relationship between Yahweh and Israel in terms of 'reconciliation, harmony' is entirely appropriate to the context.¹

D. WINTON THOMAS

A NOTE ON **וְנָדַע לָכֶם** IN I SAMUEL VI. 3

WHEN the ark of the Lord had been in Philistine country seven months, the Philistines summoned the priests and diviners and asked them what they should do with the ark, and with what they should send it back. In reply they are told that they should not send it back empty, but that some offering should be made to Yahweh by way of compensation (**אֲשֶׁם**) for the wrong which they conceive has been done to the ark while in their territory (1 Sam. vi. 1 f.). 'Then', the text continues, 'ye shall be healed, and it shall be known to you (**וְנָדַע לָכֶם**) why his hand is not removed from you' (E.VV., verse 3). The word **וְנָדַע** has been emended by A. B. Ehrlich¹ to **וְנָשַׁע** 'and ye shall be saved', or, as he prefers, to **וְנָחַ** 'and ye shall have rest'. If this latter meaning is the one required, and such a meaning follows very suitably after **אֲזַ מְרַפָּאוּ** 'then ye shall be healed', it can be obtained without resort to emendation if **וְנָדַע** here, as in many other passages in the O.T.,² is explained by reference to **יָדַע** = Arabic **وَدَعَ** 'was still, quiet, at rest'. The phrase **וְנָדַע לָכֶם** may then be translated 'then shall rest be granted to you'³ (cp. Targ. **וְיִתְרוּחַ לָכֶם** 'and relief shall come to you'), and the words **מָה לָּא-תְסִיר יָדוֹ מִכֶּם** taken, with LXX and Targ., as a question—'Why should not then his hand turn away from you?'

The LXX renders **וְנָדַע לָכֶם** by *καὶ ἐξίλασθήσεται ὑμῖν* 'and atonement shall be made for you'. According to Ehrlich,⁴ the Greek represents **וְנָסַח**, while O. Thenius⁵ thinks of **וְנָכַסַר**. Perhaps, however, it is not necessary to suppose that the LXX translators had a different Hebrew text before them, for **וָדַע**, in its third and sixth forms, has the sense 'became reconciled with', a sense which, it has been suggested, the Niph. of **יָדַע** can bear.⁶

D. WINTON THOMAS

¹ *Randgl. z. hebr. Bibel*, iii, p. 186. The reading **וְנָשַׁע** is adopted by W. Caspari, *Die Samuelisbücher*, p. 76, where further emendations are mentioned.

² See *J.T.S.* xxxv. 30 ff.; xxxvi. 411; xxxvii. 59; xxxix. 273 f.; l. 177; N.S., iv. 23 f.; v. 56 f.; vi. 226; vii. 69 f. Professor G. R. Driver has kindly drawn my attention to the passage under discussion.

³ For the passive used impersonally, see Gesenius, *Hebr. Grammar* (Kautzsch-Cowley), 121 a.

⁴ Op. cit., loc. cit.

⁵ *Die Bücher Samuelis*, 2nd ed., p. 25.

⁶ See the present writer in *J.T.S.*, N.S., vii. 69 f.

⁷ For other examples of $\mathfrak{Y}^T = \mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{D}$, see *J.T.S.* xxxv, pp. 30 ff.; xxxvi, p. 411; xxxvii, p. 59; xxxix, pp. 273 f.; l, p. 177; N.S. iv, pp. 23 f.; v, pp. 56 f.; vi, p. 226; vii, pp. 69 f.

NOTES AND STUDIES

51

They tore me without ceasing.
When I limped,¹ mockers jeered (at me),
Gnashing their teeth against me.

D. WINTON THOMAS

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON THE ROOT ידע IN HEBREW

THE Hebrew root ידע = Arabic وَدَعَ with the meaning 'was still, quiet, at rest, calm, submissive' is now well established.¹ Job ix. 5 provides a further example. The Hebrew text runs as follows:

הַמַּעֲתִיק הָרִים וְלֹא יָדְעוּ אֲשֶׁר הִפָּקְם בְּאַפּוֹ;

which is translated in the R.V.:

Which removeth the mountains, and they know it not,
When he overturneth them in his anger.

The phrase וְלֹא יָדְעוּ, translated 'and they know not', has been variously interpreted by commentators. Some see in it a reference to the speed with which God acts—'they (the mountains) know it not', so quickly is it done.² Others read וְלֹא יָדַע (with Pesh.),³ with God as subject—'He perceives it not', so easily and without effort does he dislodge masses of rock from a mountain.⁴ Others again emend the text more drastically. Suggestions are וְלֹא יָרַעוּ 'without their being broken',⁵ or, with omission of לֹא, וְיָנַעוּ (or, וְיָרַדוּ) 'and they shake (quake)',⁶ or וְלֹא יִדְגַע 'without letting Himself be seen',⁷ or וְלֹא יִדְעוּ (יָדְעוּ) 'and they are no more perceived', i.e. they disappear.⁸ Even more drastic is the proposal to read הַמַּעֲתִיק הָרִים בְּאַפּוֹ וְעָרֵי שִׁדִּים הִפָּךְ 'who removeth mountains in his wrath and hath destroyed the cities of Siddim'.⁹ No emendation is called

¹ See J. T. S. xxxv. 30 ff.; xxxvi. 411; xxxvii. 59; xxxix. 273 f.; l. 177; N.S. iv. 23 f.; v. 56 f.; vi. 226; vii. 69 f.; xi. 52.

² So S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *The Book of Job*, p. 85, and p. 55 (of philological notes); K. Budde, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 40; G. Hölscher, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 26; F. Horst, *Hiob*, p. 137.

³ Also Arabic version (لَا يَعْلَم).

⁴ B. Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob*, pp. 50 f.; objection was taken later to the anthropomorphism, and so ידע was toned down to ידעו; *contra* Budde, *op. cit.*, loc. cit. W. B. Stevenson holds that neither mountains nor God is a suitable grammatical subject of the verb; the subject is general and indefinite, 'men' in English (*Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Poem of Job*, p. 34).

⁵ A. Merx, *Das Gedicht von Hiob*, p. 38; *contra* Budde, *op. cit.*, loc. cit.

⁶ H. Torczyner, *Das Buch Hiob*, pp. 45 f.; יָנַעוּ was first misread as יִדְעוּ and then corrected to יָנַעוּ.

⁷ C. J. Ball, *The Book of Job*, p. 180.

⁸ *Ibid.*, loc. cit. For Symmachus' ἀδηλοποιῶν αὐτά, see J. F. Schleusner, *Novus Thes. Philolog.-Criticus*, i, p. 39.

⁹ G. Richter, *Textstudien zum Buche Hiob*, p. 17. The misreading of עָרֵי led to the introduction of וְלֹא, and before שָׁר, a misreading of שָׁד, an א has been added, and the מ attached to הִפָּךְ.

NOTES AND STUDIES

55

for, however, and good sense is obtained, if וְלֹא יִדְעוּ , which has the support of LXX, Targ., and Vulg., is translated 'so that they are no longer still'. God, through earthquake, or by lightning, or by some other means, dislodges great boulders from the mountains, which are thus disturbed out of their usual static state.¹ It is in this sense that Ibn Ezra interprets וְלֹא יִדְעוּ (עַד שְׁנוּפְכוּ 'until they are overturned').

Reference may now be made to four passages in which, in the ancient versions, more particularly the LXX, and in some Hebrew manuscripts, ד has been read in place of ר in a way that suggests that in these passages further evidence of $\text{ידע} = \text{ודע}$ may be seen.² First, in Isa. xv. 4 יִרְעָה (ירע 'quivered') is translated in the LXX $\gamma\gamma\omega\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (= יִרְעָה).³ The phrase $\text{נַפְשׁוֹ יִדְעָה לוֹ}$ 'his soul shall be quiet, subdued, unto him' would provide suitable sense in a context of terror and distress. Secondly, in Jer. xv. 12, in the phrase $\text{הֲיִרַע בְּרִזָּל בְּרִזָּל}$ 'can iron break (רעע) iron?', הֲיִרַע is read הֲיִדַע by Old Latin (*cognoscet*) and in some ten Hebrew manuscripts—LXX הֲיִדַע —all with the meaning 'know' for ידע . The word הֲיִדַע could, however, be vocalized הֲיִדַע (Hiph. imperf.) and the translation would then be 'can iron make submissive, subdue, iron?'

The third passage is Prov. x. 21, where יִרְעוּ רַבִּים is translated in the LXX $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\iota \acute{\upsilon}\psi\eta\lambda\acute{\alpha}$, i.e. יִדְעוּ רַבִּים 'know high (sublime) things'.⁴ The Vulg. (*erudiunt*) and Arabic (تعرف)⁵ also point to ידעו (so too a few Hebrew manuscripts), read as יִדְעוּ 'instruct, teach'. 'The lips of the righteous instruct many' would indeed give a suitable contrast to the death of fools through lack of understanding,⁶ and recalls x. 32, where it has been suggested that יִדְעוֹן might be vocalized יִדְעוֹן 'the lips of the righteous declare good will'.⁷ The reading יִדְעוּ could, however, be Hiph. imperf. of $\text{ידע} = \text{ודע}$, with the meaning 'make calm, at ease, tranquil'⁸—'the lips of the righteous bring tranquillity to many'. And lastly, in Prov. xiii. 20 $\text{וְיִרְעָה כְּסִילִים יִרְעֵה}$ is usually translated 'and he

¹ Duhm, op. cit., p. 51, deletes the word אֲשֶׁר and reads וְהִפְכָּם . This is as unnecessary as it is to read וְאֲשֶׁר (with Pesh.), as some do (e.g. Driver and Gray, op. cit., p. 55 of philological notes). The word אֲשֶׁר , which refers to God, is emphatic, as in verses 15 and 17 (see Stevenson, op. cit., loc. cit.).

² Other examples may be seen in Ecclus. vii. 20 (J.T.S. xxxv. 305), Isa. viii. 9, Jer. ii. 16, Job xx. 26 (on these three passages, see $\text{J.T.S. xxxvi. 410 f.}$).

³ So also the Arabic version (تعلم).

⁴ See P. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griech. Übersetzung der Proverbien*, p. 35, and C. H. Toy, *The Book of Proverbs*, p. 215.

⁵ With object العليات 'high things', as LXX.

⁶ Read חֲסֵר for M.T.'s חָסֵר , with LXX ($> \text{לב}$), Aq., Pesh., Targ., Vulg. *Suppl. to Vetus Testamentum*, iii, p. 285.

⁷ A meaning which יִרְעוֹן perhaps has here; cf. Targ. רַעִין *placant*, and M. Jastrow, *A Dict. of the Targumim*, &c., p. 1486. In Syr. ܕܢܝܢ Pa. Aph. means 'appease, pacify' (Payne Smith, *Thes. Syr.* 3943 ff.).

who associates with fools shall suffer' (רעע). For ירוע the LXX reads γνωσθήσεται, i.e. יִרְעַע (cf. x. 9), which could be translated 'shall be made submissive, be subdued'. It is not claimed, of course, that these variant readings represent necessarily the original text. They are adduced only for the indirect support they provide for a root ידע = ودع in Hebrew.

In Arabic ودع has also the sense 'laid down, deposited', and several examples of ידע in this sense have already been noted.² It may be convenient to refer here to two further examples in Job to which F. Wutz has drawn attention. He is almost certainly right in seeing this meaning in יִדְעֶנָּה (תְּשִׁים ||) xxxviii. 33—'Legst du (die Gesetze des Himmels) fest?'³ His emendation of תּוֹרִישֵׁנִי (xiii. 26) to תּוֹדִיעֵנִי ('und meine Jugendsünden) als Depot anlegst'⁴ seems, however, unnecessary, for 'make me to inherit, bring home to me' (תּוֹרִישֵׁנִי) makes perfectly good sense.

Another meaning ودع has in Arabic is 'left alone, said nothing of, had nothing to do with, neglected, forgot'.⁵ Traces of this meaning may perhaps be seen in two O.T. passages. In Exod. iii. 7 יָדַעְתִּי אֶת־מַכְאָבָיו 'for I know his pains' reads somewhat strangely after the preceding words of this verse. May they mean something like 'for I have left his pains alone, have had nothing to do with them', that is, 'I have let them go on, continue'? And in Prov. xiv. 7 no emendation of וְכָל־יָדַעְתָּ is necessary⁶ if we translate 'betake thyself from the presence of a foolish man, but leave not alone (do not neglect) lips of knowledge'.

Two renderings in the Pesh. seem to point to the equation ידע = ودع = Syr. ܡܕܥ.⁷ In Ezra iv. 13 וְאַפְתָּם מְלָכִים תִּהְיוּן is translated ܐܢܝܢܐ ܡܠܟܝܢܐ ܠܐ ܬܝܪܝܢܐ, 'moreover this will not quieten, subdue, kings'. In the text of Walton's Polyglot the vocalization is ܐܢܝܢܐ (agnosce) but ܐܢܝܢܐ (Aph. ܡܕܥ) is to be preferred as a translation of the Aramaic Hiph. of נזק 'damage'. The second passage is Ps. cxix. 158. Professor G. R. Driver,⁸ following the lead of I. Eitan,⁹ has shown that קטט—for this is the verb in question, not קוט, as is generally supposed—means 'cut', and that the meaning which קטט bears here and in Ps. cxxxix. 21 is 'was

¹ So too the Arabic version (سيعرف بهم).

² See *J.T.S.*, n.s. iii. 55.

³ *Das Buch Job*, p. 138.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 54. C. J. Ball, *op. cit.*, p. 227, also suggests תּוֹדִיעֵנִי, but in the usual sense 'thou makest me know'.

⁵ Lane, *Arab.-Engl. Lex.*, 3051; Kazimirski, *Dict. arabe-français*, ii, p. 1568.

⁶ For suggested emendations, see G. Beer, in *BH*³, ad loc. The M.T. is supported by Aq., Theod., καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῶς.

⁷ I am indebted to Professor Driver for these references.

⁸ *J.R.A.S.* (1944), pp. 169 ff.

⁹ *A Contribution to Hebrew Lexicography*, pp. 24 f.

NOTES AND STUDIES

57

vexed', a meaning analogous to the English 'to be cut up' in the sense of being grieved at something. The rendering of וְאָתָּקוּטָטָה in Ps. cxix. 158 in the Pesh., namely וְאָתָּקוּטָטָה ,¹ is indeed striking. It can hardly mean 'and I knew', but rather perhaps 'and I was still, quiet, submissive' (through vexation, grief).

D. WINTON THOMAS

A CONSIDERATION OF ISAIAH LIII IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT TEXTUAL AND PHILOLOGICAL STUDY

I offer here a translation into English of Isa. LIII¹, together with some brief remarks by way of commentary upon the Hebrew text underlying it.

TRANSLATION

1. *Who hath believed what we have heard,
and over whom hath Yahweh's might been revealed ?*
2. *He shot straight up like a tender plant,
and like a root out of the dry ground ;
He had no presence nor dignity that we should regard him,
no attractiveness that we should be drawn to him.*
3. *Despised and so shunning the company of men,
a man in the grip of pain and brought low by sickness,
As a man who hid his face from us ---
we despised him and held him of no account !*

* * *

The following abbreviations are used : -Box=G. H. BOX, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1908 ; Du=B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1902 ; Houb=C.-F. HOUBIGANT, *Biblia Hebraica cum notis criticis et versione latina*, 1753 ; Kiss=E. J. KISSANE, *The Book of Isaiah*, vol. II, 1943 ; Kitt=R. KITTEL, in *Biblia Hebraica*, third edition ; Klo=A. KLOSTERMANN, *Deuterojesaja*, 1893 ; Kön=E. KÖNIG, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1926 ; Low=R. LOWTH, *Isaiah*, 1839 ; Mar=K. MARTI, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1900 ; Morg=J. MORGENSTERN, *Vetus Testamentum* XI, 1961, 292-320, 406-431 ; North=C. R. NORTH, *The Second Isaiah*, 1964 ; Tor=C. C. TORREY, *The Second Isaiah*, 1928 ; Volz=P. VOLZ, *Jesaja II übersetzt und erklärt*, 1932.

1. As is generally agreed and well known, chapter LII.13-15 belong with chapter LIII to form a single poem. The earlier verses have been excluded from consideration here so that the discussion might be kept within the required limits.

120

D. WINTON THOMAS

4. *Yet it was our sicknesses that he bore,
and our pains that he endured ;
Though we for our part thought of him as stricken,
terribly smitten and afflicted.*
5. *But he was grievously injured because of our transgressions,
crushed because of our iniquities ;
The punishment which made us whole fell upon him,
at the cost of his wounds healing has come to us.*
6. *We all like sheep had gone astray,
each one of us had followed his own path ;
While Yahweh laid upon him
the punishment due to us all.*

* * *

7. *Harshly treated he was, but he meekly submitted,
and would not open his mouth,
As a sheep that is led to the slaughter
and as a ewe before her shearers is dumb.
He would not open his mouth !*
8. *From prison and law-court he was taken,
but who gave a thought to his fate,
That he had been cut off from the land of the living,
fearfully stricken because of the transgression of my people ?*
9. *And they assigned his grave with criminals,
and his tomb with demons,
Though he had committed no violence,
nor was there any deceit in his mouth.*

* * *

10. *Yet it was Yahweh's will to crush him through sickness.
Though his own life be made an offering for sin,
He shall see offspring, he shall have length of days,
and Yahweh's purpose will be advanced through him.*
11. *When he shall have drunk deep of his anguish,
when the righteous one shall have received his full measure of
[humiliation,
My servant will make many righteous,
and their punishment he will bear.*
12. *Therefore will I give him the mighty as his portion,
and the powerful shall he divide as spoil ;
Because he gave of himself to the uttermost,
and let himself be numbered with the transgressors,
Though it was he who had borne the punishment of many,
and had interposed on behalf of the transgressors.*

ISAIAH LIII

121

COMMENTARY

Verse 1. *Who hath believed what we have heard?* A rhetorical question introduced by *mi* and expecting the answer 'no one' (cfr verse 8, XLIII, 9, XLVIII, 14, L, 19). The proposed translation 'who could (would) have believed?'² must be considered doubtful at least³. It is usually supported by an appeal to *Gen.*, XXI, 7, but *mi millel* in this passage could equally well mean 'who has said?'⁴. Since *š'mu'ah* is of passive formation⁵, it means literally 'what has been heard', in this case 'by us'. The suffix is objective, not subjective, and so the meaning is 'report made to us', not 'report made by us'. If the speakers are the nations and kings of LII, 15, the passive *lo' suppar* in that verse may be noted⁶.

Over whom. The Isaiah scroll (IsA) has 'el for 'al', but 'al *mi* may well suggest a picture of Yahweh's arm(might) extending over⁷.

Verse 2. *Shot straight up.* It has long been customary to read *l'phanenu* in place of *l'phanaw*, though other emendations too have been proposed from time to time⁸. The chief ancient versions, however, support M.T., and the true meaning of *l'phanaw* may be illustrated from 1 *Sam.*, V. 4, where *nophel l'phanaw*, descriptive of the god Dagon, must mean 'fallen forwards, headlong, straight in front of him'⁹.

That we should regard him. The translation *regard* brings out the two-fold meaning of *ra'ah* — 'looked at' and 'looked at with pleasure or approval' (for the latter sense, cfr *Ps.*, CXXXVIII, 6, with Yahweh as subject and accusative of person). In M.T. the '*athnah*' is wrongly placed — it should be transferred from *hadar* to *w'nir'ehu*¹¹, as Symmachus, alone of the ancient translators, rightly saw¹². The *apparatus criticus* in *Biblia Hebraica*, third edition, affords a good example of how one error in the understanding of the Hebrew text can lead to another. Because *w'nir'ehu* is regarded as possibly an addition, *nehm'-dehu* is emended to a noun *hemdah*, parallel with *to'ar* and *hadar*¹³.

Verse 3. *Despised* (10). Since *nibzeh* is vocalised as a participle, it must form part of a long *casus pendens*, which is resumed by *nibzehu* (which

2. So Mar 346, Box 268, Kiss 181, North 64.

3. Impossible according to Kōn 428.

4. *Ibid.*, 428f.

5. H. BAUER and P. LEANDER, *Histor. Gramm. d. hebr. Sprache des A.T.*, 1922, 472 Xa.

6. Cfr Kiss 184.

7. Preferred by Morg 315.

8. Cfr Du 356, North 229.

9. See, e.g., Mar 347, Volz 170.

10. See G.R. DRIVER, *J.T.S.* XXXVIII, 1937, 48, and the Akkadian parallel there.

11. As most commentators since Low (362).

12. F. FIELD, *Orig. Hexapl.* II, 533.

13. The deletion of *lo' hadar* (so Mar 347) is unnecessary. The line *lo' to' ar to w'nir'ehu* can be read as three beats; cfr North 229.

read for *nibzeh* (2^o), see below). While *nibzeh hu*¹⁴ would normally be expected, there appear to be instances of the omission of the personal pronoun as subject of a participial clause¹⁵.

Shunning the company of men. A comparison of the Hebrew verb *ḥadal* with Arabic *ḥadala* shows that its basic meaning is 'abstain from, hold back from, leave, forsake', and these meanings are found in a variety of words employed in the ancient versions to translate *ḥadal*. The meaning 'cease', commonly associated with *ḥadal*, is indeed rare in the Old Testament, and is not among the meanings borne by the Arabic verb. The basic meaning of *ḥadal* may be clearly seen, for example, in *Jud.*, IX, 9, 11, 13 ('leave, forsake'), *Isa.*, II, 22 ('be far from'), and *Job*, XIX, 14 ('desert, abandon')¹⁶. The Servant thus forsakes the company of men, he stands aloof from human society¹⁷. The Hebrew verb is active in sense, not passive.

In the grip of pain. The plural *mak'oboth* has an intensive force, which the translation is intended to reflect. The word means, not 'sorrows' (as the Authorised and Revised Versions), not mental agony, but physical pain. Likewise *ḥoli* properly means, not 'grief' (as AV. and R.V.), but 'sickness'.

Brought low by sickness. There is no known parallel in Hebrew to the use of the passive form *yadu'a* in the sense 'acquainted with' (as A.V. and R.V.). The passive participle properly means 'known for, well known', as may be seen from *Deut.*, I, 13. IsA has the simpler active participle (*ywd'*), as too have the LXX, Pesh. and Vulg. A passive participle is used also in the Targ., not, however, of *yada'*, but of *z'man*, in the sense 'destined for, exposed to'. The passive participle of M.T. is best explained, it may be suggested, not by reference to *yada'* 'knew', but to a second root *yada'*, of which there are numerous examples in the Old Testament¹⁸. The basic meaning of this second root is, as is known from Arabic, 'was still, quiet, at rest, submissive', from which develop such meanings as 'was humiliated, disciplined, punished'. A good example of this second *yada'* may be seen in *Jud.*, XVI, 9, where *w'lo' noda' koho* is usually translated 'and his strength was not known'. But, of course, by Samson's very exploit, his strength *was* known! To translate *koho* 'the secret of his strength'¹⁹ is to read too much into the Hebrew word, which can only mean 'his strength' and nothing more. Everything becomes clear if *noda'* here is referred to the

14. So read by K10 60.

15. See Ges.-Kautzsch, *Hebr. Gramm.*, 2nd. ed., rev. A. E. COWLEY, 116 s.

16. For a discussion of the root *ḥadal*, see the present writer in *Volume du Congrès Strasbourg 1956* (Suppl. to Vet. Test. IV), 1957, 8-16.

17. Cfr Kiss 181, North 64, 237. According to Volz (170), the phrase *ḥadal 'išim* is meaningless!

18. See the present writer in *J.T.S.* XXXV, 1934, 298ff., and in succeeding issues.

19. So, e.g., M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Le livre des Juges*, 1903, 248.

ISAIAH LIII

123

second *yada'* — 'his strength was not made submissive', that is, it was not overcome. This meaning finds support in the Pesh., which translates *lo' noda'* by *la' 'elhti'a* 'was not shaken, disturbed'. It is of some interest that the Rabbis sometimes translate *yadu'a* by such words as *nišbar* 'broken', and *m'yussar um'dukka* 'disciplined and crushed'²⁰ (for *m'dukka*, cfr verse 5). See further the remarks on *da'to* in verse 11 below.

As a man who hid his face from us. If *master* is a noun, the phrase *master panim* is obscure — 'a hiding of face'? A second difficulty is the ambiguity of *mimmennu* — 'from him' or 'from us'? Now IsA, together with some other Hebrew manuscripts, has *mastir* (which could be read defectively without *yodh*)²¹, and two Hebrew manuscripts, as well as the LXX and Vulg., have *panaw*. The resulting phrase *k'mastir panaw* accordingly means 'as a man who hid his face', and *mimmennu* must then mean 'from us'. In favour of this translation are the LXX, Vulg., Rashi, Houbigant, and commentators since his time²². The phrase thus becomes a near parallel to *h'dal 'išim* in verse 3. The alternative translation 'as a man from whom men hide their faces' — *mimmennu* in this case meaning 'from him' — is, however, adopted by many commentators²³.

We despised him. The reading *nibzehu* for *nibzeh* (haplography of *waw*), parallel with *hašabnuhu*, is attractive²⁴, and finds support in the Pesh. and IsA (*nbwzhu*).

Verse 4. Terribly smitten. There are numerous examples in Hebrew of the use of the divine names — *'el*, *'elohim*, *yhwh* — to express the superlative. Other Semitic languages too supply examples²⁵. It is then possible that *mukkeh 'elohim* here, literally 'smitten of God', has a superlative force. The LXX omits *'elohim*.

Verse 7. Harshly treated he was, but he meekly submitted. Perhaps *niggaš w'hu' na'aneh* should be read²⁶ (or *na'annah* Perf.?).

He would not open his mouth. Commentators generally delete the second *w'lo' yiphtah piw*, either as a marginal gloss, or as disturbing to the metre²⁷. L. Köhler, however, regards the phrase as 'the most beautiful and expressive *Nachklang* in the whole writing'²⁸. While the argument

20. See the present writer in *J.T.S.* XXXVIII, 1937, 404; *J.Q.R.* XXXVII, 1946-47, 177f.

21. Cfr Du 358.

22. Houb 149; cfr Low 101, 362, Kiss 181, Morg 299.

23. K10 60, Du 358, Mar 347, Torr 253, North 64, Kōn 433, Volz 169.

24. Cfr Morg 315.

25. For a discussion of these uses, see the present writer in *Vet. Test.* III, 1953, 209ff.

26. So Box 27, Morg 316.

27. See, e.g., Morg 316, Volz 171.

28. *Deuterofesaja* (*Jesaja 40-55*) stilhritisch untersucht (B.Z.A.W. 37), 1923, 94 f.

from metre is cogent, repetition of this kind is not alien to the style of Second Isaiah, and the phrase may accordingly perhaps be retained ²⁹.

Verse 8. *From prison and law-court.* On the much debated meaning of *me'osher umimmišpat*, it must suffice here to note, first, that the verb *'ašar* is used of 'shutting up' in prison (cfr 2 Kings XVII, 4; Jer., XXXIII, 1, XXXIX, 15), and so *'osher* may perhaps mean 'prison' (cfr Pesh.); and secondly, that *mišpat* has the meaning 'seat of judgment' in Deut., XXV, 1, 1 Kings, VII, 7, and Isa., XXVIII, 6.

Who gave a thought? Again a rhetorical question expecting a negative answer ('no one'). Perhaps the *yodh* of *y^{so}heah* is dittography, and *soheah* (Perf.) should be read ³⁰.

His fate. M.T.'s *doro* is sometimes emended to *darko* 'his fate' ³¹. The ancient versions, however, support M.T. A comparison with Akkadian *durum* 'lasting state, permanent condition' (especially of a man's state, rank, in life), and with Arabic *daur^{un}* 'turn, time, change' (of fortune; cfr Ps., XXIV, 6, *zeh dor dor^{sa}aw* 'this is the fate, condition, of those who seek him'), reveals the true meaning of *doro* here, and emendation is accordingly not necessary ³².

Grievously stricken. For M.T.'s *nega' lamo* the LXX has ἡχθῆ ἐῖς θάνατον 'that is, *nugga*' ³³ *lammaweth* (cfr Isa *nwg*'), *lamo* being read as *lammaweth* ³⁴. There are many examples in Hebrew of the use of *maweth* 'death' with superlative force, possibly as a colloquialism, for example, Jud., XVI, 16, 1 Sam., V, 11 (cfr verse 9), and Jonah IV, 9. In the New Testament (Mt., XXVI, 38 = Mk., XIV, 34) θάνατος is found with the same force, and similar uses exist in Syriac and Arabic ³⁵. A further example of *maweth* used superlatively may perhaps be seen in verse 12 (see below).

Verse 9. *And they assigned.* The emendation of *wayyitten* to the passive *wayyuttan* ³⁶ is unnecessary, for the subject of *wayyitten* is indefinite (= plural) ³⁷. IsA has the somewhat easier plural *wytneu* 'and they assigned'.

His tomb with demons. M.T.'s *w^eeth 'ašir* is, of course, a well-known *crux interpretum*. Despite the support of the ancient versions, *'ašir* 'rich' remains a poor parallel to *r^{sa}im* 'wicked' both in form (sing-

29. Cfr North 229.

30. As Mar 350, Box 272.

31. *Ibid.*

32. See G. R. DRIVER, *J. T. S.* XXXVI, 1935, 403.

33. So Vitringa, *Comment. in Jesaiam, pars II*, 1724, 674.

34. Perhaps *lamo* is an abbreviation of *lammaweth*.

35. For a discussion, see the present writer in *Vet. Test.* III, 1953, 29 ff.; *J. S. S.* VII, 1962, 191-203. Not all the examples adduced by S. Rin (*Vet. Test.* IX, 1959, 324 f.) need necessarily be explained by reference to Mot, the god of death and the underworld.

36. So, e.g., Mar 350, Morg 317.

37. Cfr Torr 420.

ISAIAH LIII

125

ular) and meaning. It is sometimes emended to 'ose *ra*' 'doers of evil' ³⁸, though the reading *š'irim* 'goats' receives mention in *Biblia Hebraica* (Kittel), third edition ³⁹. The word *b'mothaw* too has been variously emended, so as to obtain the meaning 'tomb, grave' ⁴⁰. A new turn to the discussion has been given recently by W. F. Albright, who argues that *bamah*, originally 'height, hill, mound', can mean open air sanctuary, primarily a mortuary shrine. He points to the importance of IsA's *b'mtaw*, and concludes that probably *bomah* is the more correct spelling. 2 Kings, XXIII, 8 is illuminating here, for M.T.'s *bamoth hašš'irim* must clearly be read *bamoth hašš'irim*. The *š'irim* were rustic gods, originally goat demons, and we have to think of a kind of burial place where a pious man could not properly be buried ⁴¹.

Verse 10. *Through sickness*. Many emendations have been proposed for *heh'li*, unnecessarily as it now appears. Duhm ⁴² had already suggested that *hah'le(y)* (Infin. Absol., for *hah'leh*), literally, 'causing to be sick', be read, but there is no need to substitute the form with *-eh* for the form with *-e(y)*, since there are several instances in IsA of the representation of an *e*-sound at the end of a word by *yodh* instead of by *h*, for example, *wy'ny* (XXI, 9), *m'sy* (XXXVII, 19), and *nwy* (LXV, 10), and examples occur in other scrolls also ⁴³.

Though his own life be made an offering for sin. The subject is *naphšo* and the passive *tušam* is read for *tašim* ⁴⁴.

Verse 11. *He shall have drunk deep*. M.T.'s *yir'eh* is usually taken to mean 'he shall see', which then lacks an object, which is supplied by the LXX (φῶς) and IsA ('or) 'light', 'to see light' meaning 'to enjoy prosperity' (cfr *Ps.*, XXXVI, 10). There is, however, no need to postulate a missing object if *yir'eh* is regarded as an orthographic variation of *yirweh* ⁴⁵. Examples of *ra'ah* = *rawah* 'drank one's fill' may be seen in *Job*, X, 15, where *r'eh* is parallel with *š'ba*; in *Ps.*, LX, 5, where *her'ah* is parallel with *hišqah*; and in *Ps.*, XCI, 16, where *'ar'ehu* is parallel with *'ašbi'ehu*. A particularly interesting example of *ra'ah* = *rawah* is probably to be seen in *I Macc.*, VI, 34, where it is said that the enemies of Judas Maccabaeus 'showed' the elephants the blood of grapes and mulberries that they might prepare them for battle.

38. E. g. Kitt, Torr 420, Kiss 182, Morg 317.

39. Volz, p. 171, is hardly justified in regarding this reading as far-fetched in view of 2 Kings, XXIII, 8.

40. Suggestions are *betho* (Kitt), *mištalho* (Du 363), *beth 'olamo* (Box 272), *boro* or *'rematho* (Volz 171).

41. *Volume du Congrès Strasbourg 1956* (Suppl. to Vet. Test. IV), 1957, 242-258.

42. P. 364.

43. Cfr M. H. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN, *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran*, 1960, 86 f.

44. Cfr Houb 150, Low 367, Torr 421.

45. Thought to be the original reading by Houb 150.

126

D. WINTON THOMAS

The Semitic original of Maccabees does not, of course, exist, but the LXX's *ἐδεΐξαν* suggests that the original may have had *her'u*, the equivalent of *hirvu* 'they made (the elephants) drink deeply' ⁴⁶.

Humiliation. The word *da'to*, which must be read with *yisba'* (so Aq., Symm., Theod.), is frequently emended to *ra'atho* 'his evil plight' ⁴⁷. But if *da'ath* here is referred to the second root *yada'* (see on verse 3 above), it can bear the meaning 'humiliation', which is entirely suitable in the context ⁴⁸.

The first two lines of the English translation of verse 11 are based upon the following re-ordered Hebrew text:

me'mal naphto yir'eh
yašdiq 'abdi larabbim

yisba' b'da'to šaddiq ⁴⁹
wa'wonoatham hu' yisbol.

Verse 12. *He gave of himself to the uttermost.* Perhaps another example of the superlative force of *maweth* (cfr verse 8) ⁵⁰. With the idea of giving oneself entirely for the sake of another, cfr LVIII, 10 ⁵¹.

Let himself be numbered. Perhaps an example of *Niph. tolerativum* ⁵².

Cambridge, 4 Grantchester road.

D. WINTON THOMAS

46. See G. R. DRIVER, *Ephem. Theol. Lovan.* 1950, 351; *L'Ancien Testament et l'Orient* (Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia 1), 1957, 134; and in *J. T. S.* XXXVI, 1935, 152; further, the present writer in *Vet. Test.* XII, 1962, 499 f.

47. E. g., by Du 366, Kitt, Kiss 182, Morg 319.

48. See the present writer in *J. T. S.* XXXVIII, 1937, 404 f.

49. For the transference of *šaddiq*, see Torr 421 f., and G. R. DRIVER, *J. T. S.* XXXVI, 1935, 152.

50. Cfr Torr 254, 423; *lamaweth* is deleted as a gloss by Du 367 and Mar 352.

51. Cfr Torr 423.

52. Cfr Morg 320; Ges.-Kautzsch, *op. cit.*, 51 c.

A NOTE ON נִדַּע IN 1 SAMUEL XXII. 6

1 Sam. xxii. 5 f. runs as follows in the R.S.V.—‘Then the prophet Gad said to David, “Do not remain in the stronghold; depart, and go into the land of Judah”. So David departed, and went into the forest of Hereth’ (v. 5). ‘Now Saul heard that David was discovered, and the men who were with him’ (v. 6).

The meaning ‘was discovered’ for נִדַּע in this passage has the support of the chief ancient versions,¹ and also of some commentators,² but if the verb is interpreted to mean that David’s whereabouts were known to those at court,³ this would seem to read too much into the phrase נִדַּע דָּוִד.⁴ Moreover, it is doubtful, to say the least, whether נִדַּע Niph. ever means ‘be discovered’.⁵ It is not surprising, therefore, that some scholars reject this interpretation and read נִדַּע דָּוִד ‘David had met’.⁶ It may be suggested, however, that נִדַּע here should be referred to II נִדַּע = Arabic وَدَعَ which basically means ‘become still, quiet, at rest’, of which numerous examples occur in the O.T.⁷ The Po’el of this verb, with the meaning ‘say farewell to, take leave of’—a sense which وَدَعَ bears in the second, third, and sixth forms⁸—has already been detected in יִדַּעְתִּי (1 Sam. xxi. 3)⁹ in a pregnant construction—‘and I said farewell to the young men (bidding them meet me) at so and so’s place’. May it not be that נִדַּע here has a similar meaning, and that it was David’s departure, referred to in v. 5, about which Saul had heard? If so, וַיִּלֶּךְ דָּוִד (v. 5)

¹ LXX ἐγνωσται, Pesh. ܠܝܕܥܐ, Targ. אֶתִּידַע, Vulg. apparuisset (cf. Symm. ἐφάνη); also A.V., R.V.

² e.g. W. Nowack, *Die Bücher Samuelis*, 1902, p. 113; S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, 1913, p. 180; W. Caspari, *Die Samuelbücher*, 1926, p. 282.

³ So O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuelis*, 2nd ed., 1864, p. 104; cf. A. B. Ehrlich, *Randgl. z. hebr. Bibel*, 3 (1910), p. 245.

⁴ H. P. Smith writes—‘the author does not tell us how they [i.e. David and his men] were made known, and Saul in his speech betrays no knowledge of David’s whereabouts’ (*The Books of Samuel*, 1904, p. 205).

⁵ Cf. Ehrlich, op. cit., loc. cit. He translates—‘for David and his followers were already well known’, these words being parenthetical.

⁶ e.g. R. Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, 3rd ed., ad loc.

⁷ See *J.T.S. N.S.* xv (1964), p. 54 n. 1. I am indebted to Sir Godfrey Driver for drawing my attention to the passage under discussion.

⁸ See Lane, *Arab.-Engl. Lex.*, p. 3051; J. Hava, *Arab.-Engl. Dict.*, p. 589, where a substantive وَدَاع ‘farewell’ is given.

⁹ I. Eitan, *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography*, 1924, pp. 48 ff.

and נִדַּע קִיָּד (v. 6) will be parallel phrases used to indicate the fact that David had gone away. We may accordingly translate—‘Now Saul heard that David, with the men who were with him,¹ had taken leave’ (of the king of Moab; perhaps literally, since נִדַּע is passive in form, ‘had been said farewell to’, cf. the use of the passive of the fifth form of وَدَعَ).² If this interpretation of נִדַּע should be correct, the verb may be retained without alteration.

D. WINTON THOMAS

JOB XXXVII 22

The Hebrew text of Job xxxvii 22 runs as follows :

מִצָּפוֹן זָהָב יֵאָחֵז עַל-אֱלֹהִים נֹרָא הוֹר

which is translated in the Authorised Version : " Fair weather cometh out of the north : with God is terrible majesty " ; while the Revised Version has :

" Out of the north cometh golden splendour :

God hath upon him terrible majesty."

It has frequently been remarked that " terrible majesty " would require נֹרָא הוֹר in place of נֹרָא הוֹר of the M.T., and the text is emended accordingly by some commentators;¹ while others² prefer to read נֹרָא for נֹרָא, with הוֹר as subject—" majesty is seen." Such emendations are, however, quite unnecessary if על here be regarded, not as the common preposition " upon,"

¹ E.g., K. BUDDE, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 226 ; cp. S. R. DRIVER and G. B. GRAY, *The Book of Job*, p. 296 (of philological notes).

² E.g., G. BEER, in KITTEL, *Bibl. Hebr.*, 3rd ed., *ad loc.*

NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

but as a verb, which stands in parallelism with יֵאָחֵז " comes."³ The word על here is, I suggest, to be explained by reference to the root עלל, which occurs commonly in Biblical Aramaic in the sense of " go in, come in " (cp. the Perfect על in Dan. ii 16, 24 ; vi 11).⁴ The phrase על אֱלֹהִים (with omission of the maqqeph) will thus mean " God enters " ; and הוֹר נֹרָא will mean " terrible in majesty," just as נֹרָא תְהִלָּת (Ex. xv 11) means " awe-inspiring in praises," and נֹרָא עֲלִילָה (Ps. lxi 5) means " terrible in deed."

Adopting the emendation הוֹר " splendour " (cp. Ezek. viii 2 ; Dan. xii 3) in place of the difficult זָהָב " gold " in the first half of the verse, we may translate :

" Out of the north splendour cometh,
God enters, terrible in majesty."

או IN PROVERBS XXXI 4

The word או in Prov. xxxi 4 can hardly mean 'or' (או, so Kethibh), or 'where' (א, so Qere; Vulg. *ubi*)¹. What is required is a verb parallel in form and meaning with שתו 'drink'. Several emendations have accordingly been proposed, such as אזה 'desire'², מִסֵּךְ 'mix', and קִבֵּא 'drink'³. It may be suggested, however, that או is rather a scribal error for ראו, that is, רָאוּ = רָוָה. The verb ראה = רוה 'drank deeply' has been detected in a number of passages in the O.T.⁴, and the proposal to restore it here provides just the parallel to שתו which is needed. The comparative rarity of ראה in the sense of רוה could easily account for the corruption of ראו into או. We may recall here Ecclus. xxxiv 28 יין נשתה בעת וראי 'wine drunk at the right time and to satiety'⁵.

If the Massoretic vocalisation is retained, שתו may be regarded as the inf. construct of שתה for the more usual שתות, in which case ראו, as suggested, may be read. It is possible, however, to read both verbs as inf. absolutes—שתו, ראו (= רָוָה⁶). Examples of the inf. absolute of *lamedh he* verbs with ו־ for ה־ — are not infrequent⁷.

Omitting, with some commentators⁸, the words למואל אל למלכים, we may believe that the verse ran originally as follows—

¹) Cf. BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *A Heb. and Eng. Lex.*, p. 32.

²) G. BEER BH³; B. GEMSER, *Sprüche Salomos*, p. 82; KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER, *Lex. in Vet. Test. Libros*, p. 18. F. ZORELL, *Lex. Heb. et Aram. Vet. Test.*, p. 20, suggests אֶזְ (= אֶזְה, אֶזְה) 'desire'. Cf. G. R. DRIVER, *Biblica*, 32, 1951, p. 195, who raises the question whether אֶזְ may not be a permissible Aramaizing form comparable with רָעַז 'purpose' (Ps. cxxxix 2, 17) and מִזְ 'midst' (Job xxx 5).

³) C. H. TOY, *The Book of Proverbs* (I.C.C.), p. 541.

⁴) See G. R. DRIVER, *Ephem. Theol. Lovanienses*, 1950, p. 351. An example in Proverbs can be seen in xxiii 31.

⁵) R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Hebr. u. Deutsch), p. 26 (of Hebrew text). SMEND's 'zur Sättigung' (p. 54 of the translation) is preferable to 'selon les regles' of I. LÉVI, *L'Ecclesiastique*, II, p. 149. Cf. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, p. 290.

⁶) The form רָאוּ (inf. absol. רָאוּ 'saw') occurs in Gen. xxvi 28 and Isa. vi 9.

⁷) Cf. GESENIUS, *Heb. Gramm.* (KAUTZSCH-COWLEY), 75n.

⁸) E.g. BEER, TOY, GEMSER, *ad loc.*

500

SHORT NOTES

אַל לְמַלְכִּים שְׁתוּ-יַיִן
(י) וְלְרוֹזְנוֹת רֵאשׁוֹ שֶׁכָּר

'It is not for kings to drink wine,
Nor for rulers to imbibe strong drink'.

Cambridge, U.K.

D. WINTON THOMAS

**'Until the day break, and the
shadows flee away.'**

DR. BUCHANAN BLAKE'S interpretation of these words in the Song of Songs 2¹⁷ and 4⁶, which appears

* * *

in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, October, 1935, p. 45, is unquestionably correct, but it hardly goes beyond what the writings of Hitzig, Graetz, Rothstein, Feilchenfeld, and others have already made familiar.

That the passages in question have commonly, but erroneously, been thought to refer to the dawn is due, of course, to the A.V. translation of צֶהָרִי by 'break.' The rendering of the R.V. 'be cool' is far preferable, and clearly points the way to the correct interpretation of the passages. 'To be cool,' however, is not the original meaning of the Hebrew word; originally it meant 'breathe'¹ (so the Septuagint *διαπνεύσας* and Vulgate *aspiret* in both passages).² 'Until the day breathes' is then an Oriental poet's way of referring to the end of the day—to the time when the day, lifeless and heavy in its oppressive heat, begins to breathe, its cool breath heralding the approach of evening. A similar connexion in thought between breathing and growing cool is found not only in Hebrew, but also in the cognate roots in Syriac and Arabic. In Syriac the root, besides meaning *exhalare fecit, spiravit*, bears also the meaning *refrigeravit, recreavit*³; while in Arabic we have the phrase *faha al-karru*, 'the heat is allayed or assuaged,'⁴ literally 'the heat breathes,' i.e. grows cool.⁵

A comparison of the three roots in Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic thus shows that the connexion in thought between breathing and growing cool was common to the Semitic mind, and not peculiar to the Hebrew mode of thinking. This fact lends additional and valuable support to the interpretation favoured by Dr. Blake and his predecessors. The poet is thinking of the close of the day when the refreshing evening breeze blows, and when the shadows cast by the setting sun gradually withdraw themselves and finally disappear. In similar language did Jeremiah write of the day's decline

when 'the shadows of the evening are stretched out' (6⁴).

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Durham.

¹ *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the O.T.*, ed. by Brown, Driver, and Briggs, 806; see R.V.m., which, however, retains 'break' as alternative.

² The Syriac version renders 'grow cool.'

³ R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, ii. 3053. In Neo-Syriac, too, the root means *frigidus fuit* or *factus est* (ib. 3054).

⁴ Lane, *Arabic and English Lexicon*, 2456.

⁵ The phrase צֶהָרִי מֵיָמִי, 'at the cool of the day' (Gn 3⁸), so often compared with the words of the song, means literally 'at the breath of the day.' For the original meaning of צָרָה, see Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *op. cit.*, 924; similarly in Syriac and Arabic (Payne Smith, 3851; Lane, 1181).

A NOTE ON ECCLUS. 51: 21a

IN the phrase *לה כחנור מעי יהמו* (Ecclus. 51: 21a) 'my inward parts are in commotion like an oven for her' (*sc.* Wisdom), the reading *כחנור* is supported by the Syriac version, which, however, reads *יחמו* 'are hot',⁴ a verb more in keeping with an oven (cf. Hos. 7: 7). The LXX's *ἐκκαίνωμαι* for *לה כחנור* may represent, according to Smend,⁵ *לחקר לה* 'to seek for her' (cf. 44: 5, and for *ל* Job 28: 3); following on an erroneously written *יחמו*, the word *לחקר* became corrupted to *כחנור*. On this view the original text would mean 'my inward parts are in commotion to explore her'.

¹ Or 'whilst the rams are hammering'.

² A. Halдар, *op. cit.*, pp. 113 and 128, does not accept that Nah. 1: 8 and 2: 7 contain allusions to a real inundation, but the only concrete argument offered against this view is the supposed incompatibility of flooding with the destruction by fire alluded to elsewhere in Nahum. If taken seriously, this argument would lead to the conclusion that ships never catch fire. In fact, the account of the sack of Babylon by Sennacherib (D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, vol. ii, p. 152, § 341) specifically mentions both flooding and destruction by fire.

³ For the classical references to the sack of Nineveh, and discussion of their credibility, see C. J. Gadd, *The Fall of Nineveh* (1923), pp. 17-19.

⁴ This reading is preferred by I. Lévi, *L'Ecclésiastique ou la sagesse de Jésus, Fils de Sira, Deuxième Partie*, p. 229. For the Syriac text, see P. A. de Lagarde, *Libri Vet. Test. Apocryph. Syriace*, p. 51.

⁵ *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, p. 508.

It is possible, however, that the original Hebrew text may have read differently. We may believe, with Smend, that it contained the phrase *מעי יהמו*, for *המה* is found with *מעי* as subject in several O.T. passages, for example, Jer. 31: 20, Song of Songs 5: 4, and Isa. 16: 11. The last is especially interesting in connection with this passage in Ecclesiasticus, for the phrase in Isaiah is *מְעֵי לְמוֹאָב בְּכִנּוֹר יְהֵמוּ* 'my inward parts sound like a lyre for Moab'. Two points here call for notice. In the first place, the verb *המה* is followed by *ל* (as also in Jer. 31: 30), and secondly, the figure of comparison is *כִּנּוֹר* 'lyre'. May it not be then that *כִּנּוֹר* stood originally in Ecclus. 51: 21a? If the original text was *מעי יהמו ככנור לה* 'my inward parts sound like a lyre for her' (that is, thrill to her), the first corruption may have been the writing of *יחמו* 'are hot' for *יהמו*, and this led to a further corruption, the writing of *תנור* 'oven' in place of an original *כנור* 'lyre'. It may be noted that *מעים* is never used in the O.T. with the verb *חמם* 'was hot'.

D. WINTON THOMAS

A NOTE ON THE HEBREW TEXT OF ISAIAH XLI. 27

THE Massoretic text of Isa. xli. 27 runs as follows:

ראשון לציון הנה הנם ולירושלם מבשר אמת :

It is generally agreed by commentators that the two words הנם הנה have arisen through corruption. Quite commonly they are emended into a verb in the first person singular, parallel with אמת in the second half of the verse, for example, into הנה הנה 'I declare it (first to Zion)', the speaker presumably being Yahweh.¹ Or again, they are emended into a participial form, parallel with מבשר, for example, into מנחם 'comforter'.² Most recently G. R. Driver has suggested that ראשון is a legal term meaning 'leading counsel', and for הנם הנה he proposes to read either הנה הנה or הנה הנה, both verbs having the meaning 'put up, provide'; מבשר is then given the meaning 'one who refutes' (after Syriac ܡܒܫܪ).³ In this note I suggest that underlying הנם הנה is a Hebrew word parallel to and synonymous with אמת.

It is necessary first to determine the meaning of ראשון in this verse, and, following Cheyne⁴ and Duhm,⁵ we may believe that it has the meaning 'forerunner' (lit. 'first one'). It is thus parallel to מבשר ('bearer of good tidings', 'herald of good news'—cf. xl. 9, lii. 7), and very near to it in sense. A further example of ראשון in the sense 'forerunner' may perhaps be seen in 2 Sam. xix. 21, where Shimei, who had come to meet David (verse 16) declares—'I am come the first (ראשון) this day of all the house of Joseph to go down to meet my lord the king.' Shimei is thus declaring that he is the forerunner of his kinsmen who will follow after him later.

Next to be considered is the verb which lies concealed in הנם הנה and which would provide a suitable parallel to אמת. I suggest that this verb may have been some form of מנה, which in the Pi. means 'appoint,

¹ See R. Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, 3rd ed., ad loc.; cf. K. Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 284.

² See Kittel, *op. cit.* Further proposed emendations may be found in B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 276, and E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, ii, p. 28; cf. further C. C. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah*, p. 320.

³ *Alttestamentl. Studien F. Nötscher x. sechzigsten Geburtstag*, pp. 46 f. He is followed by C. R. North, *The Second Isaiah*, pp. 37, 103 f.

⁴ *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, i, pp. 261 f., following Luzzatto; cf. ii, p. 261.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 277—'Einen Vorboten hat Zion'; cf. G. H. Box, *The Book of Isaiah*, p. 193.

ordain' (with officer as object, Dan. i. 11; cf. Pu. participle **מְמָנִים** 'appointed', also of officers, 1 Chron. ix. 29). If a precise parallel to **אָמַן** is desiderated, then **אֶמְנֶה** 'I appoint' may be suggested as the original reading, which became corrupted in the M.T. to **הִנֵּה הָנָם** and in the Isaiah scroll (Is^A) to **הִנֵּה הַנּוֹמָה**.¹ Alternatively, if a Hoph. of **מָנָה** may be postulated—it does not occur in the O.T.—a form **הִמְנֶה** (**הוֹמְנֶה**) 'is appointed' becomes possible, and would be nearer still to the *ductus litterarum* of the Massoretic and scroll texts. It would not be surprising that such an unusual form should have become corrupted.

It is of some interest to note that the LXX translates **הִנֵּה הָנָם** by **δῶσω**, the verb used to render **וַיִּמֶן** 'and he ordained, assigned' (object food) in Dan. i. 5 (**δίδωσθαι**).

The whole verse may then be translated:

'A forerunner for Zion I appoint,
And to Jerusalem I give a herald of joy.'

D. WINTON THOMAS

D. WINTON THOMAS, TEXT 81

Zechariah x. 11a

MAY I offer a comment or two on Mr. F. J. Botha's suggestion (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxvi. [March 1955] 177), that in Zechariah x. 11a יום 'day' should be read in place of ים 'sea,' a suggestion

which has already been made by B. Duhm (*Anmerkungen zu den zwölf Propheten* [1911], 104) ?

First, nowhere in the Hebrew Bible is יום written ים (in Jer 17¹¹ the Qeri is to be preferred). It would be strange indeed if it were so written only here, and in a phrase יום צרה 'a day of

* * *

trouble') which is fairly common. And secondly, not only is it evident from the Septuagint's *θάλασσα* 'sea' that the Greek translators found ים in the Hebrew text which lay before them (cf. Old Latin, Peshitta, Vulgate and Targum), but the parallel phrase כל סְעֵלוֹת יָאֵר 'all the depths of the river' strongly supports the meaning 'sea' for ים in this passage. In view of these considerations, the proposed emendation יום 'day' seems unlikely, to say the least. Verse 11 is admittedly not free from difficulty, but any exegesis of it must, I believe, proceed on the basis that ים of the Massoretic Text is the correct reading and that it means 'sea.'

D. WINTON THOMAS

Cambridge

נָצַב IN PSALM XXXIX, 6

by

D. WINTON THOMAS

The words אֵךְ כָּל-הָבָל כָּל-אָדָם נָצַב in Ps. xxxix, 6 are translated in the A.V. as follows —

Verily every man at his best estate (marg. Heb. *settled*) is altogether vanity”.

In place of ‘state’ the R.V. has ‘estate’¹ (marg. Heb. *standing firm*), while the R.S.V. renders ... “Surely every man stands as a mere breath”. Jerome (*stans*)², Aquila (ἐστηλωμένος) and Symmachus (ἐστώς) all presuppose the Niph. participle נָצַב and the LXX (ἔων) and Vulg. (*vivens*) presumably do also. The Pesh. and the Targ. render by participles in the plural (קיימין). Rashi’s comment on כָּל-אָדָם נָצַב is — וְטַעַם נָצַב כֵּן, כָּל אָדָם חַי הָבָל הֵם חַיִּי וּמִצְבּוֹ, and Ibn Ezra’s — הוּא לַעֲוֹלָם לֹא יִשְׁתַּנָּה שִׁסּוּר מִמַּעַל הַהֶבֶל.

That נָצַב in this verse is something of a puzzle is shown by the variety of ways in which scholars have explained it. Duhm³, for ex-

1. Likewise *The Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic Text: a New Translation* (Jewish Public. Soc. of America), 1917, p. 803.
2. H. de Sainte-Marie, *Sancti Hieronymi Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* (Collect. Bibl. Latina, vol. ix), 1954, p. 58. Variants *subsistens* and *vivens* are noted. The Old Latin has *vivens* (P. Sabatier, *Bibl. Sacr. Lat. Versiones Antiquae*, II, p. 79), and the Arabic and Ethiopic versions likewise render by ‘living’ (see Walton’s *Polygot*, *ad loc.*). for Aquila and Symmachus, see f. Field, *Origenis Hexapl.*, II, p. 148.
3. P. 165. Commentaries to which frequent reference is made are cited according to the name of the author. Thus, Briggs—C.A. Briggs, *The Book of Psalms* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), 1906; Buhl—F. Buhl, in Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.* 3; Duhm—B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen* (2nd. ed.), 1922; Gunkel—H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen*, 1926; Kissane—E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Psalms*, 2 vols., 1953–54; Kittel—

נָצַב IN PSALM XXXIX, 6

ample, omitting **כל-אדם**, which he thinks comes into the verse from verse 12, and reading **על** for the first **כל** — thus **אך על-הבל נָצַב** — takes the phrase **על-הבל נָצַב** as a second predicate to **חלדי** — [“Und mein zeitliches Dasein ist wie nichts vor dir], Nur auf's Eitle gestellt”. Wellhausen, again, suggests the possibility that **נָצַב** is a kind of copula between subject and predicate (= *comparabilis*, **נמשל**, xlix, 13, 21) — “every man is become like a breath”⁴. Some commentators surmount the difficulty they find in **נָצַב** by reading the preceding **נודך** as the first word of the sentence — “In thy sight surely altogether vapour every man doth stand”⁵. F. Wutz⁶, believing that the LXX's ζῶν stands for an earlier κλών ‘twig, spray, shoot’, vocalises **נָצַב** and gives the word the meaning it has in Aramaic — “every man is a mere young plant” (*Setzling*). **נָצַב** or something similar, is, he thinks, the original reading here. There are not wanting scholars who seek a solution by means of emendation. F. Perles⁷, for example, proposes to read **אך כְּלִהְבֵּל כל אדם נָצַר** “only as for nothingness is every man formed” (root **יצר**). Most commentators, however, give to **נָצַב** the meaning of the R.V. margin, namely, “standing firm” (= “enduring”). Man, however firmly he may appear to stand, has in reality no substantial exist-

R. Kittel, *Die Psalmen*, 1914; Kraus-Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalmen* 1 (Bibl. Komm. A.T. XV/1, ed. M. Noth), 1960; Podechard-E. Podechard, *Le Psautier* 1 (*Psaumes* 1-75), II (*Psaumes* 76-100 et 110), 1949-54; Schmidt—H. Schmidt, *Die Psalmen* (Handb. zum A.T., ed., O. Eissfeldt), 1934; Weiser—A. Weiser, *Die Psalmen* (Das A.T. Deutsch), 1950; Wellhausen—J. Wellhausen, *The Book of Psalms* (Sacred Books of the O. T.), 1895.

4. P. 83 (of notes). In the edition of 1898, p. 39, “all men are but a breath”, i.e., “stand * on a parity with *”. For the reading **אך להבל**, v. *infra*.
5. See, e.g., Briggs, I, p. 349, where **נָצַב** is regarded as Niph. Perf. Also C. Lattey, *The First Book of Psalms* (The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures), 1939, pp. 136, 138.
6. *Die Psalmen textkritisch untersucht*, 1925, pp. 97 f.; Kraus, p. 300, justly regards Wutz's translation as ‘problematisch’.
7. *Analekten zur Textkritik des A.T.*, II, 1922, p. 18, comparing Job v, 7 and Isa. xlix, 4.

D. WINTON THOMAS

ence⁸. Lexicographers too generally assign a similar meaning to the word⁹.

Brown-Driver-Briggs, while giving to נָצַב the meaning "the firm standing", add "but expression strange and text dub.", and J. Reider¹⁰ remarks that the verse "is admittedly a monstrosity". L. Kopf¹¹ too thinks that a translation based upon the meaning "standing firm" yields no plausible sense¹², and he offers his own explanation of נָצַב. His suggestion is that we have here, not נָצַב "stood" (=Arabic نَصَب) but another root נָצַב "failed, disappeared" (=Arabic نَفَس) ¹³. The meaning of the verse is then — "all is nothing, every man disappears (dies)". The Niph. participle נֹצֵב must accordingly be replaced by the Qal participle נָצַב.

The judgments pronounced upon this verse by Brown-Driver-Briggs, Reider and Kopf are, we believe, justified, but we are unable to follow the latter in the solution he offers. For he, like the majority of scholars, supposes that נָצַב has a meaning in its own right in the verse, and this, as we shall see in a moment, we do not think to be the case. We return to Reider's contribution to the problem below.

8. See, e.g., Gunkel, p. 163; Kissane, I, p. 173; Briggs, I, p. 345; Kittel, p. 135; Podechard, I, p. 176; Kraus, pp. 301 f.; Weiser, pp. 211 f. Similarly *The O.T.: an American Translation* (ed. J.M. Powis Smith), 1927, p. 918. Luther translates — "Wie gar nichts sind alle Menschen die doch so sicher leben."
9. So Brown-Driver-Briggs, *A Heb. and Eng. Lex.*, p. 662; F. Buhl, *Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterb. über das A.T.*, p. 516; L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lex. in Vet. Test. Libros*, p. 629; F. Zorell, *Lex. Hebr. et Aram. Vet. Test.*, p. 527. J. F. Schleusner, *Novus Thes. Phil.-Crit.; sive Lex. in LXX, etc.*, II p. 2, remarks on נָצַב — "proprie is dicitur, qui erectus seu firmiter stat, deinde autem homo felix et in florentissimo rerum statu collocatus, i.q., LXX voce ζῶν h. l. exprimere voluerunt".
10. *HUCA* XXIV (1952-53), p. 100.
11. *VT* IX (1959), p. 265.
12. Cf. Duhm, *loc. cit.* — "was soll das "steht da"?"
13. See Lane, *Arab.-Engl. Lex.* 2085; Kazimirski, *Dict. Arabe-Français*, II, 1277.

נצב IN PSALM XXXIX, 6

Any study of this verse must, it should be emphasized, start from the recognition that the original form of the text is to be found in verse 12¹⁴, where we read simply אַךְ הָבֵל כָּל-אָדָם. In verse 6 the first כָּל and the word נצב are thus intrusive, as has been observed by some older commentators¹⁵, and their presence in the verse accordingly calls for explanation. The origin of the first כָּל, which is wanting in some eighteen manuscripts, is not difficult to account for. It could have arisen through anticipation of the following כָּל. Or it could have arisen from a reading אַךְ-כֹּהֵב¹⁶, or אַךְ לִהְבֵּל¹⁷, or from a combination of the two readings¹⁸.

Duhm, who regards the deletion of the first כָּל and נצב as somewhat arbitrary, asks—"Woher kam denn das נצב?"¹⁹ We believe that an answer to this question can be found. But first let us note Reider's attempt, already referred to, to find a reason for the presence of נצב. He sees in it a musical or choral direction, meaning 'in a standing position', that is, it is an indication to the sacred choir that they are to stand up at this point. Reider is one of the very few scholars who

14. So Wellhausen, *loc. cit.* (as one alternative), and Reider, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.* Briggs, I, p. 347, holds the reverse view, namely, that verse 12 contains an abbreviated form of verse 6 owing to carelessness on the part of the scribe.

15. נצב is regarded as unnecessary by J. Olshausen, *Die Psalmen*, 1853, p. 180, and H. Ewald, *Comment. on the Psalms*, I, 1881, p. 207; cp. T.K. Cheyne, *The Book of Psalms*, 1888, p. 107. Among those who reject כָּל are Ewald, Cheyne, Kissane, and F. Baethgen, *Die Psalmen*, 1892, p. 113.

16. So W.O.E. Oesterley, *The Psalms I*, 1939, p. 230. The Pesh. has אַךְ כֹּהֵב (=כֹּהֵבִיל).

17. See Baethgen, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*, who compares לִשְׁתֵּן in Num. xxii, 22; Gunkel, p. 396; Pöschke, I, p. 162 (of notes); Kittel, p. 154; cp. Buhl, *ad loc.* M. Lambert (*Rev. des études juives*, XXVIII (1894), p. 281) is inclined to think that אַךְ הָבֵל in verse 7 is the correction of כָּל הָבֵל אַךְ, but the correction found its way into verse 7 instead of replacing כָּל הָבֵל in verse 6.

18. See Schmidt, p. 74.

19. *Loc. cit.*

D. WINTON THOMAS

has attempted to explain נִצַּב on the supposition that it does not form part of the original text. His explanation assumes, however, once more that נִצַּב has in fact a meaning of its own to be discovered. If the suggestion for its presence in verse 6 which I now put forward is correct, it has no meaning, and it is accordingly unnecessary and unavailing to try to discover one.

My suggestion is that נִצַּב in this verse owes its origin to anterior vertical dittography, that is, the scribe's eye has wandered from the line he is copying to another line lower down. In other words, he has erroneously anticipated letters, not a word, which occur later on in the text. It is to be noted that in verse 6 the sentence we are considering begins with הָבֵל (כל-) אֵךְ, and that later, in verse 7, another sentence begins similarly with אֵךְ-הָבֵל. It seems quite possible that, when the scribe had written the words הָבֵל כל-אָדָם (verse 6), his eye then strayed to verse 7, with its similar beginning, and alighted on the *mem* of יֵהֱמִיךְ, he having just written the *mem* of אָדָם. If the letters יֵהֱמִיךְ יִצְבֹּר (verse 7) are written together thus — הַמְוִיִּצְבֹּר or יֵהֱמִיִּצְבֹּר, if, as some commentators think, הֶמֶךְ should be read for יֵהֱמִיךְ²⁰, it is not difficult to see how the letters נִצַּב have been copied erroneously and meaninglessly into verse 6²¹.

Examples of anterior vertical, as well as horizontal, dittography, both in the case of letters and words, have been assembled by F. De-

20. See, e.g., Buhl, *ad loc.*

21. This article was almost completed when I discovered that M. Lambert (for the reference, see n. 17), who worked from a Letteris text in which נִצַּב stands just above יִצְבֹּר, suggested that נִצַּב which, as he rightly says, makes no sense, arose through dittography of יִצְבֹּר. His explanation differs from mine, however, for he supposes that the word יִצְבֹּר was introduced as a complete word by mistake into verse 6, and was later modified in such a way as to harmonize more or less with אָדָם. References to other examples of vertical dittography proposed by Lambert in the same journal can be found in Perles, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

נב IN PSALM XXXIX, 6

litzsch²² and others²³. Some further examples in the book of Psalms have been noted here and there in commentaries — for example, in Ps. xii, 3 שָׁמַת probably comes into this verse from verse 4²⁴; in Ps. xviii, 5 חֲבִלִי is an error for מִשְׁבְּרִי (cp. 2 Sam. xxii, 5) which has come in from verse 6²⁵; in Ps. xviii, 26 נָבַר has come in from נָבַר in verse 27²⁶; תַּחַת-אֶהְיֶה in Ps. cix, 4 owes its origin to the same phrase in verse 5²⁷, and similarly in Ps. cxx, 2 מִלְשֹׁן רִמְיָה (cp. verse 3)²⁸. A few more may be added which I have not found in any of the commentaries which I have consulted. It should be observed that in each case the word, or words, which, it is suggested, has arisen through anterior vertical dittography, has been regarded as suspect by some scholars and recommended for deletion. If our explanation of them is correct, the case for their deletion is thereby strengthened. In the examples which follow, the dittography is given first, and the word, or words, to which the eye of the scribe strayed, and which in consequence influenced his copying, is given in brackets.

Ps. viii, 3 וַיִּנְקִים²⁹ (וּמְתַנְקִים verse 3); Ps. xxxiv, 9 וַיִּרְאוּ³⁰ (וַיִּרְאוּ verse 10); Ps. lxxviii, 9 מִסְפֵּי אֱלֹהִים³¹ (מִסְפֵּי אֱלֹהִים verse 9b); Ps. lxxix, 15 אֶצְעֶלָה³² (אֶצְעֶלָה verse 16); Ps. lxxvi, 12 לְמוֹרָא³³ (לְמוֹרָא verse 13); Ps.

22. *Die Lese- u. Schreibfehler im A.T.*, 1920. Examples of posterior vertical and horizontal dittography are also given. See pp. 97ff.

23. See Perles, *op. cit.*, pp. 54ff., and J. Kennedy, *An Aid to Textual Amendment of the O.T.*, 1928, pp. 154ff.

24. Gunkel, p. 44; Pödechard, I, p. 57 (of notes); Schmidt, p. 20; Buhl, *ad loc.*

25. Wutz, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

26. Schmidt, p. 14; Buhl, *ad loc.*

27. Duhm, p. 394; Buhl, *ad loc.*

28. Buhl, *ad loc.*

29. Del. Gunkel, p. 29; Buhl, *ad loc.*

30. Del. Pödechard, I, p. 144 (of notes); Buhl, *ad loc.*

31. Del. Gunkel, p. 288; Pödechard, I, p. 264 (of notes); Buhl, *ad loc.*

32. Del. Kittel, p. 257; Pödechard, I, p. 273 (of notes); Buhl, *ad loc.*; Kraus, p. 480; Weiser, p. 322. Gunkel, p. 298, sees in אֶצְעֶלָה a variant of אֶצְעֶלָה.

33. Del. Kittel, p. 280; Pödechard, II, pp. 29, 34; Buhl, *ad loc.*; Kraus, p. 525.

D. WINTON THOMAS

lxxviii, 24 לְאָכַל ³⁴ (לְאָכַל verse 25); Ps. cxix, 69 בְּכָל-לֵב ³⁵ (כָּחַל לֵב לֵבם verse 70).

The examples of anterior vertical dittography in the book of Psalms which have been given, whether previously noted or now suggested for the first time, are illustrations only and are in no way exhaustive. They are, however, sufficient in number, we may think, to encourage the belief that a systematic examination of the Massoretic Text along these lines might well lead to worth while results in the field of textual criticism. It is the present writer's hope that his attempt to explain the origin of, as it seems to him, the meaningless נַצַּח in Ps. xxxix, 6, and of words and phrases in some other Psalms, whether the explanation he offers be right or wrong, may prompt others to carry further this line of study.

This article is offered as a modest token of my sincere admiration and gratitude for Professor Segal's long and distinguished services to Hebrew and Biblical studies. It is both a pleasure and a privilege to participate in this volume which has been prepared in his honour.

The emendation לְאָכַל is commonly adopted (e.g., by Gunkel, p. 332, and Schmidt, p. 145), and Briggs, II, p. 170, thinks this is possibly original. Duhm, p. 294, regards it as superfluous, even if it is so emended.

34. Del. Briggs, II, p. 193; Schmidt, p. 149; Kraus, p. 538; Buhl *ad loc.*

35. Del. Briggs, II, p. 439; Schmidt, p. 218.

A NOTE ON זָרְמָתָם שֵׁנָה יְהִי IN PSALM XC 5.

Verses 4-6 of Ps. xc are, as is well known, extremely difficult, if not impossible, to translate as the text stands, and many attempts to rearrange the text so as to extract sense from them have been made. In this note I am concerned only with the phrase זָרְמָתָם שֵׁנָה יְהִי in verse 5, with particular reference to N.H. TUR-SINAI's remarks in *Vet. Test.* 1, 1951, p. 309.

In TUR-SINAI's view the psalmist's theme in this verse is the unclean origin of man in procreation and birth, and the phrase under discussion should, he thinks, be interpreted in this light. He accordingly sees in זָרְמָתָם not, as is commonly held, a verb, but a noun זָרְמָה meaning 'emission of seed' (the noun occurs in Ezek. xxiii 20)¹. He suggests further that the final מ of זָרְמָתָם should be transferred to שֵׁנָה, the resulting מִשְׁנָה, vocalised מִשְׁנָה, being the equivalent of the Arabic مَسَنَة 'bladder'. The whole phrase זָרְמָתָם מִשְׁנָה יְהִי is then to be translated 'an emission of the bladder are they'. The anatomical inexactness, TUR-SINAI believes, is not a matter of difficulty.

If some such meaning as TUR-SINAI proposes is required, it may

¹ Cf. GES.-BUHL, *Heb. u. Aram. Handwörterb. über d.A.T.*, 16th. ed., p. 207; cf. A. B. EHRLICH, cited in C. A. BRIGGS, *The Book of Psalms* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), ii, p. 277.

* * *

be suggested that it is unnecessary to postulate a new Hebrew word מִשְׁנָה meaning 'bladder'. All that is necessary is to transfer the final מ of זָרְמָתָם to the beginning of the word, thus מִזְרָמָת. The phrase זָרְמָתָם שֵׁנָה יְהִי will then mean 'from (as a result of) emission of seed in sleep (= *concubitus*) are they'¹. That שֵׁנָה 'sleep' can be used euphemistically for *concubitus* is clear from Ps. cxxvii 2, as has been convincingly shown by F. BUSSBY². In the LXX ὕπνος (so Ps. cxxvii 2) is similarly used, cf. Wisd. iv 6, vii 2. These two Psalm passages appear to be the only ones in the O.T. in which שֵׁנָה (in Ps. cxxvii 2 שֵׁנָה) bears this special meaning.

Cambridge

D. WINTON THOMAS

¹ For מִן, cf. קְרוּחָה מִמְּסָפָה 'from a fetid drop' cited by TUR-SINAI.

² *J.T.S.* xxxv, 1934, pp. 306f. A similar suggestion had been made earlier by HIRZIG, *Psalmen*, 1863, pp. 381f.

ISAIAH XLIV.9-20: A TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

This magnificently ironic passage, in which the target of the speaker's scorn is the senselessness of makers of idols who worship their own creation—the futility of their behaviour is emphasised by a detailed description of how idols are made¹—raises a number of questions which have been much debated, more particularly its authenticity, its form—whether it is prose or poetry (in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 1968, prepared by the present writer, it is printed as poetry)²—and its literary quality. In this article, which is offered as a token of the writer's deep admiration of Professor A. Dupont-Sommer, both as a scholar and as a man, such questions are left on one side, and attention concentrated on the translation of the passage, and on some points of textual and philological interest which arise from a study of the Hebrew text.

The following abbreviations are used: -Ba=J. Barth, *Etymologische Studien*, 1893; BHS=*Liber Jesaiae* (Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph), ed. D. Winton Thomas, 1968; Box=G. H. Box, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1908; Bu=K. Budde, *Das Buch Jesaja Kap. 40-66*, in E. Kautzsch, *Die Heilige Schrift*, 4th. ed., 1922; Chey=T. K. Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, ii, 1889; Chey (SBOT)=T. K. Cheyne, *The Book of Isaiah* (Sacred Books of the O.T.), 1899; CML=G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, 1956; Del=F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah*, ii, 1892; Du=B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1902; Ehr=A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen z.A.T.*, 4, 1912; Eit=I. Eitan, *Hebrew Union College Annual* 12-13, 1937-38; GK=Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd. ed. (Kautzsch-Cowley), 1910; Hitz=F. Hitzig, *Der Prophet Jesaja*, 1833; Houb=C. F. Houbigant, *Biblia Hebraica cum notis criticis et versione latina*, 1753; IsA=*The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, 1. *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*, ed. M. Burrows, 1950; Kiss=E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, ii, 1943; Klo=A. Klostermann, *Deuterojesaja*, 1893; Kön=E. König, *Lehrgebäude d. hebr. Sprache*, 1881-97; Levy=R. Levy, *Deutero-Isaiah; a commentary*, 1925; Low=R. Lowth, *Isaiah* 1839; Luzz=S. D. Luzzatto, *Il Profeta Isaia*, 1867; Mar=K. Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1900; Morg=J. Morgenstern, *Hebrew Union College Annual* 30, 1959; North=C. R. North, *The Second Isaiah*, 1964; Torr=C. C. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah*, 1928; Vitr.=Vitranga, *Comment. in Jesaiam, pars II*, 1724; Volz=P. Volz, *Jesaia II übersetzt und erklärt*, 1932; WUS=J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch d. ugaritischen Sprache* (herausgegeben von Otto Eissfeldt), 1963.

(1) Cf. the imitations in Wisd. xiii, 13-19, xv, 15-17, Baruch vi, and the oft quoted passage from Horace Sat. i. 8, 1 ff.; v. Low's remarks on the inferior quality of the apocryphal passages as compared with Isa. xliiv, 9-20, p. 330.

(2) So, e.g., Du Box Torr Kiss North.

Translation

9. All who fashion idols are senseless,
and their precious images are of no avail;
And their witnesses neither see,
nor perceive, else would they be disgraced.
10. Whoever fashioneth a god, hath cast an image
to be of no profit whatever.
11. Behold, all his workmates look foolish,
and his fellow-craftsmen are nought but human;
Let them all assemble, let them come forward;
they will shudder, be thrown into confusion together!
12. The iron-worker sharpeneth a cutting-tool—
he worketh what he is making in the coals,
And with hammers he shapeth it out,
and worketh at it with his strong arm.
Yea, he becometh hungry, so that he hath no strength;
he drinketh no water, so that he groweth faint.
13. The carpenter stretcheth a line—
he traceth it out with a stylus;
He worketh at it with planes,
and with a compass he marketh it out.
And he maketh it into a human figure,
like the shapeliness of a man, that it might dwell in a house.
14. He goeth to cut him down trees,
and he chooseth an ilex or oak,
And he letteth it grow strong for himself among the trees of the wood;
he planteth a fir, and the rain maketh it grow.
15. And so it becometh fuel for a man;
and he taketh some of it so that he may warm himself,
yea, he lighteth a fire and baketh bread;
He even maketh a god and worshippeth it,
he maketh it into an idol, and boweth down to it.
16. Half of it he burneth in the fire,
yea, over the half of it he roasteth meat;
he eateth the roast, and filleth himself full;
Yea, he warmeth himself, and he saith, "Ha!Ha!
I am warm, I am enjoying the flames!"
17. And the rest of it he maketh into a god, for his idol;
and he boweth down to it and worshippeth it,
And he prayeth of it, and saith, "Save me, for thou art my god!"
18. They know not, neither do they understand,

- for their eyes are daubed, so that they see not,
and their hearts, so that they understand not.
19. And he considereth not in his mind,
nor hath he the knowledge nor the understanding to say:
"Half of it I have burnt in the fire,
I have even baked bread on the embers thereof,
I have roasted meat and eaten;
Shall I now make the rest of it into a loathsome thing,
shall I bow down to a piece of dead wood?"
20. He that feedeth on ashes, a deluded heart hath led him astray,
so that he cannot save himself;
nor doth the say, "Is there not a lie in my right hand?"

Commentary

Verse 9. *fashion*. יִצַּר, IsA sing. יוֹצֵר. Cf. Ugar. *yṣr* li 'design, fashion'¹ (a grave), *yṣr*, 'potter', pl. *yṣrm*², Bab.-Ugar. pl. *ia-ṣt-ru-ma* 'potters'³; further יוֹצֵר of a human potter (Sir. xxvii.5), of divine activity li (4) הַיּוֹצֵר הַכֹּל⁴, and the Hymn Scroll l. 8, 15; 4.31; 15.22; 16.8⁵. *are senseless*. תָּהוּ. LXX μάταιοι. In xli.9 it is the images that are called תָּהוּ, but this word is used again of men in xl.17,23. Arabic *tih* 'waterless desert' and *layha* 'wayless land' may be compared⁶. The proposed emendation תָּהוּ 'wandered in mind' (cf. Arabic *lāha* in this sense)⁷ is mainly valuable for the recovery of a lost Hebrew root (תָּהוּ). *their precious images*. חֲמוּדֵיהֶם pass. ptc. used as a noun⁸, lit. 'their desired objects'; cf. Ugar. *ḥmd* 'covet, desire'⁹. In the Amarna letters *ḥa-mu-du* (the only example of a Hebrew pass. ptc. in the letters¹⁰ = חֲמוּד), is a gloss on *ia-pu* = Hebrew יָפָה; cf. i.29 and Dan. xi.37¹¹. *And their witnesses*. וְעֵדֵיהֶם. Just as Israel are Yahweh's witnesses (verse 8, cf.

(1) CML 165.

(2) WUS 135.

(3) W. von Soden, *Akkad. Handwörterb.*, 1965, 412.

(4) R. Smend, *Die Weisheit d. Jesus Sirach hebr. u. deutsch*, 23, 60.

(5) E. L. Sukenik, 'Oṣar ham-megilloth hag-genuzoth.

(6) Ba 14.

(7) Eit 78.

(8) Kōn II, § 66.

(9) CML 139, WUS 104.

(10) F. M. Th. Böhl, *Die Sprache d. Amarnabriefe*, 82.

(11) See A. A. Bevan, *The Book of Daniel*, 196 f.; R. H. Charles, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the book of Daniel*, 315 f.

xliii.10,12), so the idols have theirs, namely, their devotees¹. The *puncta extraordinaria* over הָמָה mark the word as suspicious².

It could easily have arisen through dittography on עֲדִיָּהֶם³. If it is retained (cf. verse 11), it serves to emphasise the suffix in עֲדִיָּהֶם⁴. In IsA it is inserted above the line. *nor perceive*. יָדַעַי used absolutely, as in xlv.20. *feel themselves disgraced*. Only יָבֹשׁ in 9b is preserved in LXX, where it is joined with verse 10. Probably the translator's eye wandered from בָּל-יִעֲשִׂילוּ to בָּל-יִרְאֶיךָ⁵.

The language of this verse finds interesting parallels in the Qur'an. For example, "Do you worship what you hew out?" (37, 95); "Why do you worship what neither hears nor sees, nor does it avail you in the least?" (19.42); "Do they (idols) hear you when you call? or do they profit you or cause you harm?" (26.72 f.; cf. 21.66; 25.55).

Verse 10. Whoever fashioneth. מִי מִי־יָצַר, is preferably taken as an indefinite pronoun, and יָצַר given an iterative sense⁶, rather than as introducing a rhetorical question⁷. *hath cast an image.* וַפָּסַל נִסָּךְ. For the apodosis introduced by *wāw*, v. GK 143d; cf. verse 7.

Verse 11. his workmates. חֲבֵרָיו, IsA חֻבְרָיו; cf. Ugar. *hbr* 'companion'⁸. The suffix refers to the makers of the idols⁹, rather than to the idols themselves (in which case 'devotees')¹⁰. The חֲבֵרִים are members of a חֶבֶר 'a union, guild, company, association'. Such guilds are known to have existed in ancient Israel, and similar associations were to be found in Babylon and at Ugarit¹¹. The reference, frequently made, to Hos. iv.17

(1) So Mar 302, Box 213, Torr 348, North 141. Others 'their own witnesses', that is, the idols (e.g., Del 157), or the makers of idols (Luzz 486, Ehr 161) are witnesses against themselves. עֲבָדֵיהֶם is read by Kittel *Bibl. Hebr.*, 3rd. ed., *ad. loc.*; עֲבָדֵיהֶם by L. Blau *op. C. D. Ginsburg, Introd. to the Hebrew Bible*, 332; עֲדִיָּהֶם (from עָדַד, cf. Arabic 'āda 'frequent', cf. Ugar. 'd=sbb 'be turned', Ethiopic 'āda 'go round') by G. R. Driver, *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* 68, 1949, 58 f.; cf. BHS.

(2) See Kōn 1, § 14, 2; GK 5n.

(3) Cf. Mar 302.

(4) Cf. Klo 22, Ehr 161.

(5) Cf. Torr 348.

(6) So Houb 2, 395, Du 299, Mar 302, Ehr 161, North 44, Volz 50, cf. LXX.

(7) So Hitz 509, Klo 22, Del 157, Chey 1.286, Box 213, Torr 348; cf. Vulg., A.V., R.V.

(8) CML 139, WUS 99.

(9) So Luzz 487, Low 83, Torr 348, North 44.

(10) So Vitr 2.243, Hitz 510, Del 158.

(11) For ancient Israel, v. I. Mendelsohn, *Bull. of the Amer. Schools of Oriental Research* 80, 1940, 17 ff.; S. A. Cook, *Encycl. Bibl.* 1955; B. Mazar, *Archaeology and O. T. Study* (ed. D. Winton Thomas), 1967, 225 (of perfumers at En-gedi); for Babylonia, v. Mendelsohn, *Journ. of the Amer. Oriental Society* 60, 1940, 68 ff., and G. R. Driver

Verse 12. A comparison with verse 13 shows that **חָרֶשׁ בְּרוֹזֶל** and **חָרֶשׁ עֲצִים** are parallel phrases¹, and that **חָרֶשׁ** is construct of **חָרַשׁ**², and not a verb, so that the phrases mean 'iron-worker' and 'carpenter' respectively³. The phrase **חָרֶשׁ בְּרוֹזֶל מַעְצָד** 'the iron-worker a cutting-tool', if it is to be clothed with meaning, requires a verb, which seems to have fallen out, either before or after **חָרֶשׁ בְּרוֹזֶל**⁴. Thus **עָשָׂה** 'makes' has been suggested to follow **חָרֶשׁ בְּרוֹזֶל**⁵, and again **חָרַשׁ** 'cuts'⁶, or **חָצַב** 'cleaves' (reading **בְּמַעְצָד**)⁷. A merit of such an approach is that it provides a text which conforms to the pattern of verse 13. And yet it seems less satisfactory than the insertion of a verb before **חָרֶשׁ בְּרוֹזֶל**, such as may be recovered from LXX, whose **ᾠξυεν** points to **יָחַד** (Hiph. impf. **חָדַד**; cf. Pesh.)⁸—'the iron-worker sharpeneth a cutting-tool', for the purpose of cutting a piece of iron, which he works at in the coals, and which will eventually emerge as an idol⁹. The word **מַעְצָד** is usually translated 'axe', but this meaning is hardly suitable¹⁰ to the context. Basically it means 'cutting-tool', which by usage seems to have become especially associated with the idea of lopping trees, reaping¹¹. If it is given the meaning 'cutting-tool', there is no need to regard the word as a gloss on **בְּרוֹזֶל**, with the resulting translation 'the iron-worker worketh in the coals'¹² nor to emend the word (e.g. to **מַעְצָב** 'cuts'¹³ or **מַעְצָד**¹⁴ with similar meaning). *he worketh at what he is making*. Insert **פָּעַל** after **יָפַעַל**¹⁵. *coals*. To the etymology to be found in the dictionaries, add Nabataean **חמא** and Safaitic **fhmn**¹⁶. *he shapeth it out*. **יָצְרָהוּ**, IsA **יְצוּרָהוּ**. The proposed emendation **יָצְרָהוּ** 'he fixes it'¹⁷ once again points the way to the recovery of a lost Hebrew verb (**יָצַד** = Arabic *waṣada* 'be fast', v. on

(1) For these phrases, cf. 2 Kings xii. 12, 1 Chr. xiv. 1, 2 Chr. xxiv. 12; cf. **חָרֶשֶׁת עֵץ**. Exod. xxxi. 5, xxxv. 33, and **עָשָׂה חָרֶשׁ** Sir. xxxviii. 27.

(2) So Hitz 510, Klo 23, Del 2.208, North 44; v. especially Kōn *Expos. Times* 9, 1898, 563 ff.

(3) See I. Benzinger, *Hebr. Archäol.*, 3rd. ed., 1927, 150, n. 2.

(4) See S. R. Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, 3rd. ed., 1892, 151 f.

(5) Ben Iehuda, *Thes. totius hebraeae* 6.3190, cf. Luzz 487.

(6) So Vitr 2.483.

(7) So Chey (SBOT) 136; cf. Kōn iii. § 368 f.

(8) Cf. Levy 174, BHS; Del 2.208 **חָדַד** (pf. as **נָטָה**, verse 13), Chey 2. 162.

(9) Cf. Del 2. 159.

(10) 'Axe' is suitable in Jer. x. 3.

(11) For the etymology, v. Brown-Driver-Briggs 781; Koehler-Baumgartner 550.

(12) So Du 299, Levy 174, Box 213 f., cf. Mar 303.

(13) So Torr 349, cf. Morg 50.

(14) So Low 329.

(15) Bu. 1.668, cf. BHS. The suffixes to the verbs here and in verse 13 refer to the idol.

(16) See J. Cantineau, *Le Nabatéen*, 1932, 2.136.

(17) Eit 78, cf. LXX, Pesh.

ISAIAH XLIX. 9-20 : A TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

323

(חֲבוֹר עֲצָבִים אֶפְרַיִם) and 1 Cor.x.20 (οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι) is thus beside the point. The suggestion that the verse is concerned with sorcery (חֲבִרָיו to be read חֲבִרָיו, and חֲרָשִׁים, for חֲרָשִׁים)¹ is unacceptable², for not only is a personal subject required³, but a reference to sorcery would interrupt the course of denunciation in verses 9 f., 12-17, which is directed against makers of idols and the worship of idols, and not against the practice of magic⁴. For חֲרָשִׁים read חֲרָשָׁיו⁵; cf. Ugar. *hrš* 'craftsman'⁶. The adoption of LXX's *καφοί* (cf. Pesh., Vulg.) = חֲרָשִׁים 'deaf'⁷ cannot be defended⁸. *nought but human*. מֵאָדָם, lit. 'of man'—how can a human craftsman make a god?—has been a stumbling block to many, and various emendations have been proposed, for example, מֵאָדָם⁹, מֵאָדָם¹⁰, מֵאָדָם¹¹, מֵאָדָם¹². This last is said to mean 'put to the blush'¹³ on the strength of post-biblical Hebrew הָאָדָם 'be, grow red, cause to blush, put to shame'¹⁴. Possibly מֵאָדָם could be an abbreviation of מֵאָדָמִים. But F. Perles is probably correct in asserting that such a reading is 'hochst geistreich'¹⁵. The suggestion that מ means 'far from, without, avoided by', so that מֵאָדָם is equivalent to 'despised by man' derives little support from Isa.liii.3 to which appeal is made¹⁶. The difficulty in מֵאָדָם, if such exists, can be exaggerated, and it seems best to retain M.T., and to translate as suggested. *shudder*. The inappropriateness of פִּתְחוּ¹⁷ makes the suggested reading יִפְתְּרוּ¹⁷ attractive. *together*. יַחַד, IsA יַחַדִּי; possibly 'all together, altogether'¹⁸. LXX ἀμα.

and J. Miles, *The Babylonian Laws: Legal Commentary*, 394 f.; and at Ras Shamra, J. W. Jack, *Expos. Times* 52, 1940-41, 356 f.; further R. de Langhe, *Les Textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit*, 2.378 ff.

- (1) As Du 299, Mar 203, Chey (SBOT) 136, Box 213.
- (2) Cf. Torr 348.
- (3) Cf. Kōn iii, § 402 ε.
- (4) See O. C. Whitehouse, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* (Century Bible), II, 109.
- (5) So Bu 1.668, Morg 52, cf. BHS.
- (6) WUS 108; 'craftsmanship', CML 138.
- (7) So Klo 22.
- (8) See Kōn iii. § 402 ε.
- (9) Cf. Chey (SBOT), 136.
- (10) Du 299.
- (11) *Ibid.*, cf. Bu 1. 668.
- (12) Volz 50.
- (13) So Vit 2.483, Low 329, Morg 52.
- (14) M. Jastrow, *A Dict. of the Targ., etc.*, 17.
- (15) *Anal. z. Textkritik*, 1922, 8.
- (16) See Kōn iii. § 402 ε.
- (17) Eit 78.
- (18) See J. Mauchline, *Trans. of the Glasgow Orient. Soc.* 13, 1951, 52.

הוּהוּ, verse 9 *supra*). *he hath no strength*. Perhaps insert לוֹ after כָּח (cf. LXX), a case of haplography of sound or form with the following לֹא¹. *he drinketh*. שָׁתָה, IsA שוּתָה.

Verse 13. stretcheth a line. נָטָה קוֹ, IsA נטְהוּ קוֹ—to take dimensions². *He marketh it out with a stylus*. For the different vocalisation of יתְאָרְהוּ in this verse, v. Kön.i. 102, 279, ii.564, cf. GK 61i. Emendations proposed are יתְכַנְּהוּ³, 'he determines it' for the first יתְאָרְהוּ, and יתְאָהוּ⁴ (Pi. תָּאָה, a by-form of תָּהָה, cf. Num. xxxiv.7) for the second. In the translation M.T. is retained. שָׂרָד 'stylus', cf. Arabic *sarada* 'perforate', *sirād* and *sarīd* 'awl', *misrad* 'an instrument for perforating, or with which leather is sown'⁵. Perhaps שָׂרַט (Lev. xxi.5, Zech. xii.3, and Syriac *sraṭ*, *sreṭ* 'scratch', hence 'write' (= Greek χράσσω) may be compared⁶. שָׂרָד is thus some kind of sharp instrument, a stylus, or such like (cf. Aquila's παρὰγραφίς), with which the carpenter pricked out the line along which the wood was to be cut. The rendering 'red earth, chalk' (cf. R.V. marg. 'red ochre', Kimḥi חוּט הַצָּבֵעַ, cf. Targ.) has been generally abandoned, though it is still occasionally found⁷. Saadya too connected the word with colour—he renders by *riqān* 'saffron, henna'; *larqīn* means 'the designation of a house for demolition by a red colour'⁸, so the carpenter traces out the figure with a thread dyed with red. Wisdom xiii.14 contains an interesting reference, but for a different purpose, to the use of red paint by carpenters. The skilled wood cutter shapes a wooden stick and 'forms it like the image of a man', making it 'like some worthless animal, giving it a coat of red paint and colouring its surface red and covering every blemish with paint'. A derivation from Greek σαρδίων⁹, so that this precious stone was used as a stylus, is not without difficulty¹⁰. *He shapeth it with planes*. The repetition of יַעֲשֶׂהוּ is inelegant, and perhaps יַעֲשֶׂהוּ should be read יַשְׁעֶהוּ 'he maketh it smooth'¹¹ (from שָׁעַע, cf. Syriac ša' Pa. Aph. 'make smooth')¹². For מְקַצְעוֹת (Saadya

(1) So Morg 68.

(2) For a study of קָנָה and derivatives, see P. A. H. de Boer, *Oudtest. Stud.* 10, 1954, 225 ff.

(3) Cf. Klo 23, Chey (SBOT) 45, Mar 303.

(4) Ehr 162; approved by Eit 78.

(5) E. W. Lane, *Arab.-Engl. Lex.* 1346 f.; Brown-Driver-Briggs 976.

(6) *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

(7) E. g. Koehler-Baumgartner 930, North 141; on this meaning, v. R. Gradwohl, *Die Farben im A.T.* (Beih. 83, *Zeitschr. für d. alttest. Wiss.* 1963), 85 f.

(8) Ibn Janāḥ, *The Book of Hebrew Roots*, ed. A. Neubauer, 1875, 749.

(9) H. Lewy, *Fremdwörter in Griech.* 57.

(10) See Kön *Hebr. u. aram. Wörterb.* 471.

(11) Eit 78, cf. LXX ἐπόμειπεν, Targum מְנִי 'cutting (it) to shape'; cf. Aram שָׂעַע Pa. 'make smooth'.

(12) Payne Smith *Thes. Syr.* 2, 4246.

רנדג 'plane') Aquila has περιγωνίους 'set-squares' (α ἀπ. λεγ. in Greek)¹, which is a possible translation². a compass. מחנה, IsA מחנה. and he maketh it. For רעשהו read רעשהו³. like a human figure. כתבנית אדם, lit. 'like the figure of a man'; the same phrase occurs in the War Scroll (10.14)—'the shape of a man'⁴, as created by God (cf. Wisd. xiii. 13; further Ezek. viii.3, 10, x.8, Ps. cvi.20). like the shapeliness of a man. כתפארת אדם. The translation is intended to bring out both the idea of beauty (cf. English 'shapely'), which is contained in תפארת and to provide an approximately parallel meaning ('shape') to תבנית. תפארת תבנית could well be an intentional intensification of תבנית—the idol has not only the form of a man, but it possesses also the splendour of a man! dwell in a house. לשבת בית. Either a private house, or a private chapel or sanctuary⁵, cf. Wisd. xiii.15, Acts xix.24. Possibly בית is dittography on לשבת, in which case לשבת should be read, with the implication that the idol is inactive, does nothing⁶.

Verse 14. He goeth to cut him down cedars. לְכַרֵּת לוֹ אֲרָזִים (IsA לכרות). The form לְכַרֵּת has been taken as a periphrastic future⁷, or as a perfect with emphatic ל (לְכַרֵּת)⁸, or as arising under the influence of the preceding לְשַׁבֵּת⁹. Most commonly it is emended to לְכַרֵּת¹⁰ (cf. LXX, Vulg.), or לְכַרֵּת¹¹, but perhaps לְכַרֵּת לוֹ is best read, on the assumption that לְכַרֵּת has fallen out through haplography. The mention of cutting down before planting is strangely premature. Possibly some words, even some lines, are missing¹². He chooseth. For וַיִּקַּח read וַיִּקַּח¹³, and for this meaning of לָקַח, cf. Deut. i.15.23, Jos. iii.12, 1 Kings xi.37. an ilex. The identity of תְּרִיז is uncertain¹⁴, but it is evidently

(1) Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lex.* 2. 1371.

(2) Cf. Torr 351, North 141; cf. Arabic *maq* 'instrument of iron for cutting wood', H. Torczyner, *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morgenländ. Gesell.* 70, 1916, 559.

(3) Cf. BHS.

(4) So A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, 185; 'the shape of Adam', G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Pelican Books), 1962, 137.

(5) Vitr 2. 484, Mar 303, Volz 53.

(6) So Ehr 162, cf. Exod. xxi. 19. בית is read בֵּית-אֵל 'shrine' by Kiss 65.

(7) S. R. Driver, *op. cit.*, 276.

(8) Eit 78, cf. LXX, Vulg.

(9) So Levy 175.

(10) So Houb 2. 395, Low 330, Du 300, Torr 351, North 138, Morg 68.

(11) Mar 303, Box 214, Volz 51, cf. BHS.

(12) Cf. Whitehouse, *op. cit.*, 111.

(13) Cf. BHS.

(14) See H. B. Tristram, *The Natural History of the Bible*, 10th. ed., 1911, 348; J. Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, 2nd. ed., 1963, sub 'cypress', and Hebrew dictionaries. It is unnecessary to emend to תְּרִיז, as Chey (SBOT) 138, Mar 303, Box 214, Morg 68.

Aquila, Pesh. With יִצְלָה צָלִי may be compared Arabic *ṣalāhu fī 'al-nāri* 'he roasted, broiled, fried it (meat) in the fire' (*ṣalā'u* is 'roasted, broiled, and fried meat'; cf. Ethiopic *ṣalawa* 'roast')¹. *I am enjoying*. רָאִיתִי, IsA נִד 'before'. רָאָה denotes much more than ocular perception; here enjoyment of the fire's warmth is intended.

Verse 17. *for an idol, and he boweth down*. For לְפָסְלוֹ יִסְגֹּד read לְפָסְלוֹ וְיִסְגֹּד², cf. LXX, Pesh. For לְפָסְלוֹ IsA has לְבָלוֹ עֵץ (see on verse 19 *infra*). *and worshippeth it*. For וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה read וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה³.

Verse 18. The subject of the verbs is the makers of idols. *daubed* (so R.V. margin). The sing. טָח (from טָחַח⁴, not טָחַח⁵, which would require טָח) is often emended to plur. טָחוּ⁶, but the sing. may stand, since the verb precedes the subject⁷. טָח by zeugma does service for both eyes and hearts⁸. The metaphor of eyes that are covered, used in connection with disbelievers, is found in the Qur'an, e.g., 2.7, 15.15. The heart also is covered, e.g., 2.88, 17.46, 41.5.

Verse 19. Insert לוֹ after רָעַח⁹, or read לוֹ לֹא רָעַח¹⁰. *I have roasted*. וְאֶצְלָה, IsA וְאֶצְלָה, which perhaps read (וְאֶצְלָה); וְאֶכֶל, IsA וְאוֹכֶלָה, perhaps read וְאֶכֶל¹¹. *a loathsome thing*. תּוֹעֵבָה, IsA תּוֹעֵבוֹת; a favourite word for idol since Deut. (vii.26, xxxii.16. etc.). Pesh *ptakrā*, Vulg. *idolum*¹². *a piece of dead wood*. בּוֹל עֵץ. Any explanation of בּוֹל by reference to יָבוֹל¹³ presents difficulties. Illumination here comes from IsA's בְּלוֹי עֵץ 'a decayed piece of wood, dead wood' (from בָּלָה 'wear out', cf. Akkadian *belū* 'to be extinguished, vanish', *bulū* 'dead wood' (*bulū* is glossed *iṣ-ṣu la-bi-ru* 'old wood')¹⁴. If בְּלוֹי is original,

(1) Lane, *op. cit.*, 1721 f.; A. Dillmann, *Lex. Ling. Aeth.* 1262.

(2) So Hitz 512, Du 301, Mar 304, Chey (SBOT) 138, Ehr 162, Torr 352, Morg 69, cf. BHS. לְפָסְלוֹ is retained by North 141, Volz 51, and is regarded as a gloss by Levy 177.

(3) Cf. BHS.

(4) So Brown-Driver-Briggs 377, Ben Iehuda 4. 1865, GK 145, 7a.

(5) As Ibn Barūn, v. P. Wechter, *Ibn Barūn's Arabic works on Hebrew grammar and lexicography*, 1964, 93.

(6) So Low 330, Houb. 2. 396, Du 301, Chey (SBOT) 138.

(7) See GK 145o, cf. Mar 304.

(8) Cf. Levy 177.

(9) Cf. BHS.

(10) So Bu. 1. 669.

(11) *Ibid.*

(12) Reading some word like פָּסְלוֹ? Perhaps תּוֹעֵבָה is a substitute for אֱלֹהִים, cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 13, v. Torr 353.

(13) As Mar 304, Chey 1. 288, Levy 177, Box 215.

(14) See B. Landsberger, *Mater. z. Sumer. Lex.* 6. 56, 61. 63; Targum אֵץ בְּלִי 'useless (or rotten) wood'. Akk. *bālu* has suggested 'a wooden animal' (?), cf. Job xl.

it was glossed by עץ and then misread בול. In verse 17 בלוי עץ (so IsA, see *supra*) could have been altered to פסלו when the old word was forgotten.

*Verse 20. He that feedeth on ashes*¹. רִעָה אֶפֶר. *A casus pendens*². רִוּחַ קָדִים (Hos. xiii.2) 'pursueth the east wind' is explained by Ibn Barun by Arabic *rā'i 'al-riḥ* 'feeding on wind', which he regards as a synonym of the phrase in Hosea³. There is doubtless here a proverbial expression for expending labour to no purpose⁴. Cf. Qur'an 14.18—'their actions are like ashes on which the wind blows hard', *a deluded heart*. לֵב הִתַּל is a short relative (for לֵב אֶפֶר הִתַּל). *Is there not...* הֲלוֹא is omitted in IsA. *a lie*. In the Qur'an (29.17) idols and lie are parallels (cf. 37.86—'a lie—gods beside Allah—do you desire?').

Apart from its sardonic temper, this passage is remarkable on two other grounds. In the first place, it sheds light on a field of ancient Israelite activity about which all too little is known, namely, the world of handicrafts and those who plied them. It brings us indeed right on to the workshop floor. C.C. Torrey has written of the Second Isaiah—'It is in the *dramatic* quality of the writer's imagination, however, that his individuality is most strikingly revealed... In poem after poem we can see the instinct of the dramatist as the varied material is presented in the form of suggested scenes (often kept on the stage for a moment only) with action, dialogue, and soliloquy'⁵. The verses under consideration provide a fine example of the poet's dramatic power. In them is presented to our gaze in the most vivid way a scene of craftsmen at their work, busily concentrating all their energy upon the futile task of making a god, and employing tools suitable to their trade.

This passage is also remarkable for the vocabulary utilised in it. In addition to two kinds of tree (תְּרִיָּה and אֶרֶךְ, verse 14), and the verb קָחָה (verse 18), three other ἀπ. λεγ. occur—all types of tool—namely, שִׁרְד, מְקַצְעוֹת, and מְחוּגָה (all in verse 13). It is now widely recognised that the Old Testament, which represents only a very small part of the literature of the ancient Hebrews, preserves only a fraction of the ancient Hebrew language. This passage from Second Isaiah serves strongly

20, M. Seidel, *Journ. of the Amer. Orient. Soc.* 47, 1927, 368. I am indebted to Sir Godfrey Driver for a private communication on this point.

(1) Or rather 'dust', v. Ba 20 f. and Koehler-Baumgartner 79.

(2) The phrase is taken as exclamatory by Klo 25 and Torr 237, 353.

(3) *Op. cit.*, 120.

(4) Cf. Kimḥi יועיל לא יועיל 'busying himself in something that brings no benefit'.

(5) P. 121.

330

D. WINTON THOMAS

to remind us of this fact, and, taken together with references to tools elsewhere in the Old Testament, it leaves no doubt that there existed in ancient Israel an extensive Hebrew technical vocabulary, which was current among craftsmen in their several callings, but of which only comparatively few traces survive in the Hebrew Bible¹.

† D. WINTON THOMAS.

(1) See Benzinger, *op. cit.*, 154; W. Nowack, *Lehrb. d. hebr. Archäol.* 244; R. H. Kennett, *Hebrew Social Life and Customs* (Schweich Lectures 1931), 1933, 82 ff.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerman, S., *Under Every Green Tree* (HSM, 46; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992; repr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001).
- Ackroyd, P.R., 'The Meaning of Hebrew דָּוָר Considered', *JSS* 13 (1968), pp. 3-10.
- Ackroyd, P.R., and B. Lindars (eds.), *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968).
- Albright, W.F., 'The Oracles of Balaam', *JBL* 63 (1944), pp. 207-33.
- Allen, L.C., *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah* (NICOT; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1976).
- *Psalms 101–150* (WBC, 21; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983).
- Alonso Schökel, L., and J. Vilchez, *Proverbios* (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1984).
- Andersen, F.I., and D.N. Freedman, *Micah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 24E; New York: Doubleday, 2000).
- Anderson, A.A., *Psalms* (2 vols.; NCB; Oliphants [Marshall, Morgan & Scott], 1972).
- Ashley, T.R., *The Book of Numbers* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993).
- Auvray, P., *Isaïe 1–39* (Sources bibliques; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1972).
- Baltzer, K., *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (trans. M. Kohl; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001).
- Barr, J., *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).
- 'Philology and Exegesis: Some General Remarks, with Illustrations from Job 3', in C. Brekelmans (ed.), *Questions disputées d'Ancien Testament* (Leuven: Leuven University Press; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1974), pp. 39-61.
- Barré, M.L., 'My Strength and my Song in Exodus 15:2', *CBQ* 54 (1992), pp. 623-37.
- Baudissin, W., 'The Original Meaning of "Belial"', *ExpTim* 9 (1897–98), pp. 40-45.
- Bauer, H., and P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*, I (Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1922).
- Ben-Yehuda, E., *Thesaurus totius hebraeae et veteris et recentioris* (17 vols.; Berlin-Schöneberg: Langescheitsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1908–59).
- Ben Zvi, E., *A Historical-Critical Study of the Book of Zephaniah* (BZAW, 198; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1991).
- Biella, J.C., *Dictionary of Old South Arabic, Sabaean Dialect* (HSS, 25; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982).
- Binns, L.E., *The Book of Numbers: With Introduction and Notes* (Westminster Commentaries; London: Methuen Books, 1927).
- Black, M., and G. Fohrer (eds.), *In Memoriam Paul Kahle* (BZAW, 103; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1968).
- Blenkinsopp, J., *Isaiah 1–39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 19; New York: Doubleday, 2000).

- Isaiah 40–55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 19A; New York: Doubleday, 2002).
- Boehmer, J., ‘Vom präformierten ל locale’, *ZAW* 47 (1929), p. 79–80.
- Boer, P.A.H. de, ‘ ל as Epithet Expressing the Superlative’, *VT* 24 (1974), pp. 233–35.
- Boling, R.G., *Judges: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (AB, 6A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975).
- Borowski, O., *Agriculture in Iron Age Israel* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987).
- Brin, G., ‘The Superlative in the Hebrew Bible: Additional Cases’, *VT* 42 (1992), pp. 115–18.
- Brunet, G., ‘L’hébreu *kèlèb*’, *VT* 35 (1985), pp. 485–88.
- Burney, C.F., *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903).
- Calderone, P.J., ‘Hdl-II in Poetic Texts’, *CBQ* 23 (1961), pp. 451–60.
- ‘Supplementary Note on HDL-II’, *CBQ* 24 (1962), pp. 412–19.
- Chaney, M.L., ‘HDL-II and the “Song of Deborah”’: Textual, Philological, and Sociological Studies in Judges 5, with Special Reference to the Verbal Occurrences of *HDL* in Biblical Hebrew’ (unpublished PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1976).
- Cheyne, T.K., ‘The Origin and Meaning of “Belial”’, *ExpTim* 8 (1896–97), pp. 423–24.
- Childs, B.S., *Exodus* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1974).
- Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2001).
- Clements, R.E., *Isaiah 1–39* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980).
- Clifford, R.J., *Proverbs* (OTL; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1999).
- Clines, D.J.A., *Job 1–20* (WBC, 17; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989).
- Job 21–37* (WBC, 18A; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2006).
- Clines, D.J.A. (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (8 vols.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press and Sheffield Phoenix Press, 1993–2011).
- Cohen, A., ‘Studies in Hebrew Lexicography’, *AJSL* 40 (1924), pp. 153–85.
- Cohen, H.R.(C.), *Biblical Hapax Legomena in the Light of Akkadian and Ugaritic* (SBLDS, 37; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978).
- ‘The Meaning of צלמורה “Darkness”: A Study in Philological Method’, in Fox *et al.* (eds.), *Texts, Temples, and Traditions*, pp. 287–309.
- Collins, J.J., *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).
- Cooke, G.A., ‘Tabor’, in T.K. Cheyne and J.S. Black (eds.), *Encyclopaedia biblica* (London: A. & C. Black, one-volume edn, 1914), cols. 4881–86.
- Cooper, A.M., ‘The Life and Times of King David according to the Book of Psalms’, in R.E. Friedman (ed.), *The Poet and the Historian: Essays in Literary and Historical Biblical Criticism* (HSM; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), pp. 117–31.
- Cowley, A., *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923).
- Coxon, P.W., ‘The Great Tree of Daniel 4’, in Martin and Davies (eds.), *A Word in Season*, pp. 91–111.
- Cross, F.M., and D.N. Freedman, ‘The Song of Miriam’, *JNES* 14 (1956), pp. 237–50.
- Cross, F.M., D.W. Parry, R.J. Saley and E. Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4, XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD, 17; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).
- Dahood, M.J., *Psalms III: 101–150* (AB, 17A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970).
- Dawes, S., ‘Walking Humbly: Micah 6:8 Revisited’, *SJT* 41 (1988), pp. 331–39.

- Day, J., 'Da'at "Humiliation" in Isaiah liii in the Light of Isaiah liii 3 and Daniel xii 4, and the Oldest Known Interpretation of the Suffering Servant', *VT* 30 (1980), pp. 97-104.
- 'Does the Old Testament Refer to Sacred Prostitution and Did it Actually Exist in Ancient Israel?', in C.M. McCarthy and J.F. Healey (eds.), *Biblical and Near Eastern Essays: Studies in Honour of Kevin J. Cathcart* (JSOTSup, 375; London: T. & T. Clark, 2004), pp. 2-21.
- God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (UCOP, 35; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- Molech: A God of Human Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (UCOP, 41; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan* (JSOTSup, 265; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).
- Delitzsch, Franz, *Das salomonische Spruchbuch* (Biblischer Commentar über die poetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments, 3; Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1873), ET *Biblical Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon* (trans. M.G. Easton; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1875).
- Delitzsch, Friedrich, *Assyrische Lesestücke* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 4th edn, 1900).
- Assyrische Studien*, I (Leipzig, 1874).
- Dhorme, E., *Le Livre de Job* (Etudes bibliques; Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1926), ET *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (trans. H. Knight; London: Thomas Nelson, 1967).
- Dillmann, A., *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua* (KHAT; Leipzig: Hirzel, 2nd edn, 1886).
- Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae* (Leipzig: T.O. Weigall, 1865).
- Dossin, G., *Archives Royales de Mari. I. Lettres* (Textes cunéiformes, 22; Paris: P. Geuthner, 1946).
- Dozy, R., *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes* (2 vols.; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2nd edn, 1927).
- Driver, G.R., *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Old Testament Studies, 3; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956).
- 'Confused Hebrew Roots', in B. Schindler and A. Marmorstein (eds.), *Occident and Orient (Gaster Anniversary Volume)* (London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1936), pp. 73-83.
- 'David Winton Thomas', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 57, 1971 (London: Oxford University Press on behalf of the British Academy, 1973), pp. 463-76.
- 'Ecclesiasticus: A New Fragment of the Hebrew Text', *ExpTim* 49 (1937), pp. 37-39.
- 'Glosses in the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament', *Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia* 1 (1957), pp. 123-61.
- 'Hebrew Notes', *ZAW* 52 (1934), pp. 51-56.
- 'Hebrew Notes on Prophets and Proverbs', *JTS* 41 (1940), pp. 162-75.
- 'Isaiah 52:13-53:12: The Servant of the Lord', in Black and Fohrer (eds.), *In Memoriam Paul Kahle*, pp. 90-105.
- 'Linguistic and Textual Problems: Isaiah xl-lxvi', *JTS* 36 (1935), pp. 396-406.
- 'Problems in the Hebrew Text of Proverbs', *Bib* 32 (1951), pp. 173-97.
- 'Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament. IV', *JTS* 33 (1932), pp. 38-47.
- Driver, S.R., *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890).

- The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah: A Revised Translation, with Introductions and Short Explanations* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1906).
- Driver, S.R., and G.B. Gray, *Job* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921).
- Duhm, B., *Die Psalmen* (KHAT, 14; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1922).
- Durham, J.I., *Exodus* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987).
- Ebach, J., and U. Rüterwörden, 'Unterweltsbeschwörung im Alten Testament I', *UF* 9 (1977), pp. 57-60.
- Ebeling, E., 'Belili', in E. Ebeling and B. Meissner (eds.), *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1932), I, p. 479.
- Ehrlich, A.B., *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel* (7 vols.; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1908–14).
- Eissfeldt, O., 'Der Gott des Tabor und seine Verbreitung', *ARW* (1934), pp. 14-41, reprinted in his *Kleine Schriften* (6 vols.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1962–79 [1963]), II, pp. 29-54.
- Eitan, I., *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography* (Contributions to Oriental History and Philology, 10; New York: Columbia University Press, 1924).
- Elliger, K., *Deuterosejaja*. I. *Jesaja 40,1–45,7* (BKAT, 11/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd edn, 1989).
- Emerton, J.A., 'A Consideration of Some Alleged Meanings of עֶדֶן in Hebrew', *JSS* 15 (1970), pp. 145-80.
- 'A Further Consideration of D.W. Thomas's Theories about *yāda*', *VT* 41 (1991), pp. 145-63.
- 'The Meaning of *šēnā*' in Psalm cxxvii 2', *VT* 24 (1974), pp. 15-31.
- 'The "Mountain of God" in Psalm 68:16', in A. Lemaire and B. Otzen (eds.), *History and Traditions of Early Israel: Studies Presented to Eduard Nielsen* (VTSup, 50; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), pp. 24-37.
- 'Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs', *JTS* NS 20 (1969), pp. 202-20.
- 'The "Second Bull" on Judges 6:25-28', in M. Haran (ed.), *Eretz-Israel* 14 (H.L. Ginsberg Volume) (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in Cooperation with the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978), pp. 52*-55*.
- 'Sheol and the Sons of Belial', *VT* 37 (1987), pp. 214-18.
- 'The Work of David Winton Thomas as a Hebrew Scholar', *VT* 41 (1991), pp. 287-303.
- Epstein, I. (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Mo'ed: Shabbath I* (London: Soncino Press, 1938).
- Fohrer, G., *Das Buch Hiob* (KAT, 16; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1963).
- Fox, M.V., *Proverbs 10–31* (AB, 18B; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).
- Fox, M.V., V.A. Hurowitz, A. Hurvitz, M.L. Klein, B.J. Schwartz and N. Shupak (eds.), *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996).
- Frankel, R., 'Tabor, Mount', *ABD*, VI, pp. 304-305.
- Frankenberg, W., *Die Sprüche* (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898).
- Franzmann, M., 'The Wheel in Proverbs xx 26 and Ode of Solomon xxiii 11-16', *VT* 41 (1991), pp. 121-23.
- Freytag, G.W., *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum* (4 vols.; Halle: C.A. Schwetschke, 1830–37).
- Fürst, J., *Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Bernard Tauchnitz, 1857–61).

- Galán, J.M., 'What Is He, the Dog?', *UF* 25 (1993), pp. 173-80.
- Gaster, T.H., 'Exodus xv.2: עָנִי הַיָּמִינִי', *ExpTim* 49 (1938), p. 189.
- 'Jeremiah v. 28', *ExpTim* 56 (1944), p. 54.
- 'Notes on the "Song of the Sea" (Exodus xv.)', *ExpTim* 48 (1936), p. 45.
- Gelston, A., 'Isaiah 52:13–53:12: An Eclectic Text and a Supplementary Note on the Hebrew Manuscript Kennicott 96', *JSS* 35 (1990), pp. 187-211.
- 'Knowledge, Humiliation or Suffering: A Lexical, Textual and Exegetical Problem in Isaiah 53', in H.A. McKay and D.J.A. Clines (eds.), *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom of Sages: Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on his Seventieth Birthday* (JSOTSup, 162; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 126-41.
- 'Some Notes on Second Isaiah', *VT* 21 (1971), pp. 517-27.
- Gemser, B., *Sprüche Salomos* (HAT, Erste Reihe, 16; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2nd edn, 1963).
- Ginsberg, H.L., 'Lexicographical Notes', *ZAW* 51 (1933), pp. 308-309.
- 'The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant', *VT* 3 (1953), pp. 400-404.
- Goldingay, J., and D. Payne, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (2 vols.; London: T. & T. Clark, 2007).
- Good, E.M., 'Exodus xv 2', *VT* 20 (1970), pp. 358-59.
- Gordis, R., *The Book of Job* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978).
- 'Job xl 29—an Additional Note', *VT* 14 (1964), pp. 491-94.
- 'Studies in the Relationship of Biblical and Rabbinical Hebrew', in *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (English section; New York: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1945), pp. 173-99.
- Gordon, C.H., 'Belt-Wrestling in the Bible', *HUCA* 23 (1950–51), pp. 131-36.
- Gordon, R.P., *1 and 2 Samuel: A Commentary* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1986).
- Gottwald, N.K., *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250–1050 B.C.E.* (London: SCM Press, 1979).
- Grabbe, L.L., *Comparative Philology and the Text of Job: A Study in Methodology* (SBLDS, 34; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977).
- Gray, G.B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).
- Gray, J., *The Book of Job* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010).
- Greenfield, J.C., 'Etymological Semantics', *ZAH* 6 (1993), pp. 26-37 (32-33), reprinted in S.M. Paul, M.E. Stone and A. Pinnick (eds.), *'Al kanfei yonah: Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2001), II, pp. 821-32.
- 'Lexicographical Notes I', *HUCA* 29 (1958), pp. 203-28, reprinted in S.M. Paul, M.E. Stone and A. Pinnick (eds.), *'Al kanfei yonah: Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2001), II, pp. 653-78.
- Guillaume, A., 'A Note on Numbers xxiii 10', *VT* 12 (1962), pp. 335-37.
- Harper, W.R., *Amos and Hosea* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905).
- Hartley, J.E., *The Book of Job* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988).
- Hatch, E., and H.A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897).
- Haupt, P., 'Die "Eselstadt" Damaskus', *ZDMG* 69 (1915), pp. 168-72.
- Hava, J.G., *Arabic-English Dictionary* (Beirut: Catholic Press, 1899/1921).
- Hehn, J., 'צלמור', in *Orientalische Studien Fritz Hommel zum siebzigsten Geburtstag* (2 vols.; MVAG, 22; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1917–18 [1918]), II, pp. 79-90.

- Hertz, J.H., Numbers xxiii.9b, 10', *ExpTim* 45 (1934), p. 324.
- Hill, G.F., *Catalogue of Greek Coins of Cyprus* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1904).
- Hillers, D.R., *Micah* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
- Hirschberg, H.H., 'Some Additional Arabic Etymologies in Old Testament Lexicography', *VT* 11 (1961), pp. 373-85.
- Holladay, W.L., *Jeremiah* (Hermeneia; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986-89).
- Hoonacker, A. Van, *Les douze petits prophètes* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1908).
- Hönig, H.W., 'Die Bekleidung des Hebräers' (unpublished PhD dissertation, Zürich, 1957).
- Houtman, C., *Exodus* (4 vols.; HCOT; Kampen: Kok, 1993-2002).
- Huffman, H.B., *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1965).
- Hutton, J.M., "'Abdi-Aširta, the Slave, the Dog": Self-Abasement and Invective in the Amarna Letters, and 2 Sam 3:8', *ZAH* 15 (2002), pp. 2-17.
- Hyatt, J.P., *Exodus* (NCB; London: Oliphants [Marshall, Morgan & Scott], 1971).
- 'On the Meaning and Origin of Micah 6:8', *ATHR* 34 (1952-53), pp. 232-39.
- Jacob, B., 'Das hebräische Sprachgut im Christlich-Palästinischen', *ZAW* 22 (1902), pp. 83-113.
- Jastrow, Marcus, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (2 vols.; New York: Pardes, 1950).
- Jensen, P., 'On "Belial"', *ExpTim* 9 (1897-98), pp. 283-84.
- Jeremias, Jörg, *Die Propheten Joel, Obadja, Jona, Micha* (ATD, 24/3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007).
- Johnstone, W., 'Yd' II, "Be Humbled, Humiliated?"', *VT* 41 (1991), pp. 49-62.
- Jones, B.C., *Howling over Moab: Irony and Rhetoric in Isaiah 15-16* (SBLDS, 157; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).
- Jones, D.R., *Jeremiah* (NCB; London: Marshall Pickering; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992).
- Joüon, P., 'Notes de lexicographie hébraïque', *Bib* 7 (1926), pp. 162-70.
- 'Le sens du mot hébreu פֶּשַׁע', *JA* 7, series 10 (1906), pp. 137-42.
- Kaltner, J., *The Use of Arabic in Biblical Hebrew Lexicography* (CBQMS, 28; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1996).
- Kassis, R.A., 'A Note on שָׁקַל (Prov. xxxi 11b)', *VT* 50 (2000), pp. 258-59.
- Kazimirski, A. de Biberstein, *Dictionnaire arabe-français* (2 vols.; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1860).
- Kimhi, David, סֵפֶר הַשְׁרָשִׁים (ed. J.H.R. Biesenthal and F. Lebrecht; Berlin: G. Bethge, 1847).
- Kissane, E.J., *The Book of Job: Translated from a Critically Revised Hebrew Text with Commentary* (Dublin: Brown & Nolan, 1939).
- Koole, J.L., *Isaiah III. I. Isaiah 40-48* (HCOT; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1997).
- Kopf, L., 'Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch', *VT* 9 (1959), pp. 247-87.
- Kottsieper, I., *Die Sprache der Aḥiqarsprüche* (BZAW, 194; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1990).
- Kugel, J.L., 'Qohelet and Money', *CBQ* 51 (1989), pp. 32-49.
- Kuhn, G., *Beiträge zur Erläuterung des salomonischen Spruchbuches* (BWANT, 3/16 [57]; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1931).

- Lane, E.W., *An Arabic-English Lexicon* (8 vols.; London: Williams & Norgate, 1863–93).
- Langdon, S.H. (ed.), *The H. Weld-Blundell Collection in the Ashmolean Museum. I. Sumerian and Semitic Religious and Historical Texts* (Oxford editions of Cuneiform Inscriptions, 1; London: Oxford University Press, 1923).
- Lescow, T., *Micha 6,6-8: Studien zu Sprache, Form und Auslegung* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1966).
- Levine, B.A., *Numbers 21–36* (AB, 4A; New York: Doubleday, 2000).
- Lewis, T.J., *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit* (HSM, 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).
- ‘The Songs of Hannah and Deborah: *hdl*-II (“growing plump”)', *JBL* 104 (1985), pp. 105–108.
- Lewy, J., ‘Tabor, Tibar, Atabyros’, *HUCA* 23 (1950–51), pp. 357–86.
- Lindars, B., *Judges 1–5: A New Translation and Commentary* (ed. A.D.H. Mayes; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995).
- Lindenberger, J.M., *The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar* (The Johns Hopkins Near Eastern Studies; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983).
- Loewenstamm, S.E., ‘“The Lord Is my Strength and my Glory”’, *VT* 19 (1969), pp. 464–70.
- ‘Notes on the History of Biblical Phraseology’, in *idem*, *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures* (AOAT, 204; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1980), pp. 210–21.
- Ludolf, H., *Lexicon aethiopicum-latinum* (Frankfurt a.M.: J.D. Zunnerus and N.W. Helwig, 2nd edn, 1699).
- Macintosh, A.A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997).
- Margalith, O., ‘Concerning the Dogs of Ahab’ (Hebrew), in B.Z. Luria (ed.), *Sefer Dr. Baruch Ben-Yehudah* (Tel Aviv: Hahevra leḥeqer hammiqrā’ b’yiśrā’el b’ešitūp haggimnasyā “Ḥersliyyā” ū“bēt hatt’nāk” b’tel-’ābīb, 1980), pp. 248–58.
- ‘Dor and En-dor’, *ZAW* 97 (1985), pp. 109–11.
- ‘The *kēlābīm* of Ahab’, *VT* 34 (1984), pp. 228–32.
- ‘*Keleb*: Homonym or Metaphor?’, *VT* 33 (1983), pp. 491–95.
- Margoliouth, G., ‘Abner’s Answer to Ishbosheth (2 Sam. iii.8–11)’, *The Expositor* (8th series) 10 (1915), pp. 155–62.
- Martin, J.D., and P.R. Davies (eds.), *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane* (JSOTSup, 42; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986).
- McCarter, P.K., *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (AB, 8; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980).
- McCarter, P.K., *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (AB, 9; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984).
- McKane, W., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986–96).
- Micah: Introduction and Commentary* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998).
- Proverbs* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1970).
- McNeile, A.H., *The Book of Numbers in the Revised Version* (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911).
- Mettinger, T.N.D., ‘“The Last Words of David”: A Study of the Structure and Meaning in II Samuel 23:1–7’, *SEA* 41–42 (1976–77), pp. 147–56.

- Meyers, C.L., and E.M., *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8* (AB, 25B; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987).
- Michel, W.L., ‘SLMT, “Deep Darkness” or “Shadow of Death”?’ *Biblical Research* 29 (1984), pp. 5–20.
- Milgrom, J., *Numbers* (JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia and New York: Jewish Publication Society, 1990).
- Miller, G.D., ‘Attitudes towards Dogs in Ancient Israel: A Reassessment’, *JSOT* 32 (2008), pp. 487–500.
- Moffatt, J., *The Old Testament: A New Translation* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1924).
- Morag, S., ‘מִתְעַרְרָה בְּאֶרְצָהּ רַעֲנָן’ (Ps. 37.35), *Tarbiz* 41 (1971–72), pp. 17–23 (Hebrew).
- Murphy, R.E., *Proverbs* (WBC, 22; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1998).
- Neuberg, F.J., ‘An Unrecognized Meaning of Hebrew *DÔR*’, *JNES* 9 (1950), pp. 215–17.
- Nicholson, E.W., ‘Israelite Religion in the Pre-Exilic Period: A Debate Renewed’, in Martin and Davies (eds.), *A Word in Season*, pp. 3–34.
- Nöldeke, T., ‘צֶלֶם und צֶלְמֹת’, *ZAW* 17 (1897), pp. 183–87.
- ‘Review of A. von Kramer, *Altarabische Gedichte über die Volksage von Jemen...*’, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 1 (1867), pp. 447–65.
- Noth, M., *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (BWANT, 3/10; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928).
- Noth, M., and D.W. Thomas (eds.), *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley* (VTSup, 3; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955).
- Parker, S.B., ‘Exodus xv 2 Again’, *VT* 21 (1971), pp. 373–79.
- Paul, S.M., *Amos* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).
- Pearson, A.C. (ed.), *The Fragments of Sophocles* (3 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917).
- Perles, F., *Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments* (Munich: Ackermann, 1895).
- Phillips, A., ‘Additional Bibliography of the Writings of David Winton Thomas’, *VT* 22 (1972), pp. 105–106.
- ‘Bibliography of the Writings of David Winton Thomas’, in Ackroyd and Lindars (eds.), *Words and Meanings*, pp. 217–28.
- Plöger, O., *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia)* (BKAT, 17; Neukirchen-Vluyn; Neukirchener Verlag, 1984).
- Pope, M.H., *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (VTSup, 2; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955).
- Job: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 15; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1973).
- Porter, J.R., ‘The Revised Psalter’, *Theology* 66 (1963), pp. 359–66.
- Propp, W.H., *Exodus 1–18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 2; New York: Doubleday, 1999).
- Renaud, B., *La formation du livre de Michée: tradition et actualisation* (EBib; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1977).
- Reymond, P., *L’eau, sa vie et sa signification dans l’Ancien Testament* (VTSup, 6; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958).
- Richardson, H.N., ‘The Last Words of David: Some Notes on II Samuel 23:1–7’, *JBL* 90 (1971), pp. 257–66.
- Rignell, L.G., *A Study of Isaiah ch. 40–55* (Lunds universitets årsskrift, NF 1.52.5; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1956).
- Rin, S., ‘The מִוֶּתֶם of Grandeur’, *VT* 9 (1959), pp. 324–25.

- Ringgren, H., *Sprüche*, in H. Ringgren, A. Weiser and W. Zimmerli, *Sprüche, Prediger, das Hohe Lied, Klagelieder, das Buch Esther* (ATD, 16/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).
- Roberts, J.J.M., 'The Young Lions of Psalm 34:11', *Bib* 54 (1973), pp. 265-67, reprinted in *idem, The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Collected Essays* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), pp. 263-65.
- Rowley, H.H. *Job* (NCB; London: Thomas Nelson, 1970).
- Rudolph, W., *Jeremia* (HAT, 1.12; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1947).
—*Micha–Nahum–Habakuk–Zephania* (KAT, 13/3; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1975).
- Saydon, P., 'Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew and Maltese', *VT* 4 (1954), pp. 432-33.
- Scheidius, E., *Dissertatio philologico-exegetica ad Cantum Hiskiae, Ies. XXXVIII, 9-20* (Leiden: Le Mair, 1769).
- Schroeder, O., *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts* (Ausgrabungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft in Assur. E: Inschriften, 3; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1920).
- Schultens, A., *Liber Jobi* (Leiden: J. Luzac, 1737).
—*Proverbia Salomonis* (Leiden: J. Luzac, 1748).
- Schwally, F., *Das Leben nach dem Tode* (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1892).
- Schwarzenbach, A., *Die geographische Terminologie im Hebräischen des Alten Testaments* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1954).
- Scott, R.B.Y., *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes* (AB, 18; Garden City, NY: Doubleday).
- Seybold, K., *Die Psalmen* (HAT, 1/15; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996).
- Sمند, R., *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach: Hebräisch und Deutsch* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1906).
- Smith, M.S., 'Terms of Endearment: Dog (*klbt*) and Calf ('*gl*) in KTU 1.3 III 44-45', in M. Dietrich and I. Kottsieper (eds.), "*Und Mose schrieb dieses Lied auf*": *Studien zum Alten Testament und zum Alten Orient. Festschrift für Oswald Loretz zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1998), pp. 713-16.
- Snaith, N.H., *Leviticus and Numbers* (NCB; London: Thomas Nelson, 1967).
- Snell, D.C., 'The Wheel in Proverbs xx 26', *VT* 39 (1989), pp. 503-507.
- Speiser, E.A., 'The Verb *shr* in Genesis and Early Hebrew Movements', *BASOR* 164 (1961), pp. 23-28. Reprinted in E.A. Speiser, *Oriental and Biblical Studies: Collected Writings of E.A. Speiser* (ed. J.J. Finkelstein and M. Greenberg; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1967), pp. 96-105.
- Stager, L.E., *Ashkelon Discovered: From Canaanites and Philistines to Romans and Moslems* (Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991).
- Stoebe, H.J., 'Und demütig vor deinem Gott: Micha 6, 8', in C. Maurer (ed.), *Wort und Dienst NF 6, Jahrbuch der Theologischen Schule Bethel als Festschrift für P.D. Wilhelm Brandt zum 65. Geburtstag* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1959), pp. 180-94.
- Sturdy, J., *Numbers* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).
- Tallqvist, T., *Akkadische Götterepitheta* (StudOr, 7; Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1938).
- Thenius, O., *Die Bücher Samuels* (KHAT; Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 2nd edn, 1864).
The Revised Psalter (London: SPCK, 1963; amended edn 1964).

- Thomas, D.W., 'אָ in Proverbs xxxi 4', *VT* 12 (1962), pp. 499-500 [= pp. 452-53 above].
- 'בִּלְעָל in the Old Testament', in J.N. Birdsall and R.W. Thomson (eds.), *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), pp. 11-19 [= pp. 232-40 above].
- 'בִּלְאָ in Jeremiah iv. 5: A Military Term', *JJS* 3 (1952), pp. 47-52 [= pp. 352-57 above].
- 'נָצַב in Psalm xxxix, 6', in J.M. Grintz and J. Liver (eds.), *Studies in the Bible Presented to Professor M.H. Segal* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1964), pp. 10*-16* [= pp. 460-66 above].
- 'צִלְמִינָה in the Old Testament', *JSS* 7 (1962), pp. 191-200 [= pp. 222-31 above].
- 'Additional Notes on the Root יָדַע in Hebrew', *JTS* NS 15 (1964), pp. 54-57 [= pp. 437-40 above].
- 'A Consideration of Isaiah liii in the Light of Recent Textual and Philological Study', *ETL* 44 (1968), pp. 79-86. Also published in H. Cazelles (ed.), *De Mari à Qumran: L'Ancien Testament. Son milieu. Ses relectures juives. Hommage à Mgr J. Coppens* (Gembloux: J. Duculot; Paris: Lethielleux, 1968), pp. 119-26 [= pp. 441-48 above].
- 'A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew', *VT* 3 (1953), pp. 209-24 [= pp. 197-212 above].
- '"A Drop of a Bucket"? Some Observations on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah 40 15', in Black and Fohrer (eds.), *In Memoriam Paul Kahle*, pp. 214-21 [= pp. 256-63 above].
- 'En-dor: A Sacred Spring?', *PEFQS* 65 (1933), pp. 205-206 [= pp. 300-301 above].
- 'A Further Note on the Root נָכַר in Hebrew', *JTS* NS 3 (1952), p. 21 [= p. 351 above].
- 'HDL-II in Hebrew', *CBQ* 24 (1962), p. 154 [= p. 343 above].
- 'Hebrew עָנָ "Captivity"', *JTS* NS 16 (1965), pp. 444-45 [= pp. 271-72 above].
- 'The Interpretation of בָּסוֹד in Job 29 4', *JBL* 65 (1946), pp. 63-66 [= pp. 267-70 above].
- 'The Interpretation of Proverbs xxix. 5', *ExpTim* 59 (1948), p. 112 [= p. 344 above].
- 'Isaiah xlv.9-20: A Translation and Commentary', in A. Caquot and M. Philonenko (eds.), *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1971), pp. 319-30 [= pp. 468-78 above].
- 'Julius Fürst and the Hebrew Root יָדַע', *JTS* 42 (1941), pp. 64-65 [= p. 417 above].
- 'Jeremiah v. 28', *ExpTim* 57 (1945), pp. 54-55 [= p. 380 above].
- 'Job xl 29b: Text and Translation', *VT* 14 (1964), pp. 114-16 [= pp. 264-66 above].
- 'Job xxxvii 22', *JJS* 1 (1948), pp. 116-17 [= p. 451 above].
- 'Job's "Comforters"', *Durham University Journal* 28 (1933), pp. 276-77 [= pp. 360-61 above].
- 'Kelebh "Dog": Its Origin and Some Usages of It in the Old Testament', *VT* 10 (1960), pp. 410-27 [= pp. 308-25 above].
- 'The Language of the Old Testament', in H.W. Robinson (ed.), *Record and Revelation: Essays on the Old Testament by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), pp. 374-402 [= pp. 157-85 above].
- 'A Lost Hebrew Word in Isaiah ii. 6', *JTS* NS 13 (1962), pp. 323-24 [= pp. 371-72 above].
- 'The LXX's Rendering of שְׁנוֹת לִב טוֹב in Ecclus. xxxiii 13', *VT* 10 (1960), p. 456 [= p. 395 above].

- ‘The Meaning of נִיז in Psalm lxxx. 14’, *ExpTim* 86 (1965), p. 385 [= p. 249 above].
- ‘The Meaning of חֲטָאָה in Proverbs x. 16’, *JTS* NS 15 (1964), pp. 295-96 [= p. 251 above].
- ‘The Meaning of the Name Hammoth-dor’, *PEFQS* 66 (1934), pp. 147-48 [= pp. 302-303 above].
- ‘The Meaning of the Name Mishal’, *PEFQS* 68 (1936), pp. 39-40 [= pp. 298-99 above].
- ‘More Notes on the Root ידע in Hebrew’, *JTS* 38 (1937), pp. 404-405 [= pp. 411-14 above].
- ‘Mount Tabor: The Meaning of the Name’, *VT* 1 (1951), pp. 229-30 [= pp. 296-97 above].
- ‘Naphath-dor: A Hill Sanctuary?’, *PEFQS* 67 (1935), pp. 89-90 [= pp. 304-305 above].
- ‘A Note on בִּלְיָדָה in Proverbs 9¹³’, *JTS* NS 4 (1953), pp. 23-24 [= pp. 424-25 above].
- ‘A Note on בְּמִדְעָךְ in Eccles. x. 20’, *JTS* 50 (1949), p. 177 [= p. 422 above].
- ‘A Note on דָּעַת in Proverbs xxii. 12’, *JTS* NS 14 (1963), pp. 93-94. [= pp. 245-46 above]
- ‘A Note on דְּרָכִים in Isaiah xlix. 9b’, *JTS* NS 19 (1968), pp. 203-204 [= pp. 247-48 above].
- ‘Note on הִדְעָה in Daniel xii. 4’, *JTS* NS 6 (1955), p. 226 [= p. 431 above].
- ‘A Note on הַלְצוּתָם in Judges xiv 19’, *JTS* 34 (1933), p. 165 [= p. 234 above].
- ‘A Note on וַיִּדַּע אֱלֹהִים in Exod. ii. 25’, *JTS* 49 (1948), pp. 143-44 [= pp. 420-21 above].
- ‘A Note on וַיִּמְרָקוּם שְׂנֵה יִהְיוּ in Psalm xc 5’, *VT* 18 (1968), pp. 267-68 [= p. 467 above].
- ‘A Note on וְלֹא יִדְעוּ in Jeremiah xiv 18’, *JTS* 39 (1938), pp. 273-74 [= pp. 413-14 above].
- ‘A Note on לֹא חָדַע in Proverbs v 6’, *JTS* 37 (1936), pp. 59-60 [= pp. 409-10 above].
- ‘A Note on לְבִי סִחַחְתָּר in Psalm xxxviii 11’, *JTS* 40 (1939), pp. 390-91 [= pp. 369-70 above].
- ‘Note on לִדְעָה in Job 37⁷’, *JTS* NS 5 (1954), pp. 56-57 [= pp. 426-27 above].
- ‘A Note on לִיקָהָה in Proverbs xxx. 17’, *JTS* 42 (1941), pp. 154-55 [= p. 255 above].
- ‘A Note on לִנְדַּע in 1 Samuel vi. 3’, *JTS* NS 11 (1960), p. 52 [= p. 434 above].
- ‘A Note on מַהֲלִצוֹת in Zechariah iii 4’, *JTS* 33 (1932), pp. 279-80 [= pp. 252-53 above].
- ‘A Note on מוֹעֲדִים in Jeremiah 24, 1’, *JTS* NS 3 (1952), p. 55 [= p. 423 above].
- ‘A Note on נִדַּע in 1 Samuel xxii. 6’, *JTS* NS 21 (1970), pp. 401-402 [= pp. 449-50 above].
- ‘Note on נִדְעָה in Amos iii. 3’, *JTS* NS 7 (1956), pp. 69-70 [= pp. 432-33 above].
- ‘A Note on Ecclus. 51:21a’, *JTS* NS 20 (1969), pp. 225-26 [= pp. 455-56 above].
- ‘A Note on Exodus xv. 2’, *ExpTim* 48 (1937), p. 478 [= p. 250 above].
- ‘A Note on the Hebrew Root נָחַם’, *ExpTim* 44 (1933), pp. 191-92 [= pp. 358-59 above].
- ‘A Note on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah xli. 27’, *JTS* NS 18 (1967), pp. 127-28 [= pp. 457-58 above].
- ‘A Note on the Hebrew Text of Judges 16,20’, *AfO* 10 (1935), pp. 162-63 [= pp. 367-68 above].
- ‘A Note on the Meaning of יָדַע in Hosea ix. 7 and Isaiah ix. 8’, *JTS* 41 (1940), pp. 43-44 [= pp. 415-16 above].
- ‘A Note on the Meaning of מִתְנַחֵם in Genesis xxvii. 42’, *ExpTim* 51 (1940), p. 252 [= p. 362 above].

- ‘Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs’, *JTS* 38 (1937), pp. 400-403 [= pp. 241-44 above].
- ‘Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs’, *VT* 15 (1965), pp. 271-79 [= pp. 287-95 above].
- ‘Proverbs xx 26’, *JJS* 15 (1964), pp. 155-56 [= pp. 306-307 above].
- ‘Psalm xxxv. 15f.’, *JTS* NS 12 (1961), pp. 50-51 [= pp. 435-36 above].
- ‘A Pun on the Name Ashdod in Zephaniah ii. 4’, *ExpTim* 74 (1962), p. 63 [= p. 388 above].
- The Recovery of the Ancient Hebrew Language: An Inaugural Lecture* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1939) [= pp. 119-56 above].
- ‘The Revised Psalter’, *Theology* 66 (1963), pp. 504-507 [= pp. 345-48 above].
- ‘The Root אָהַב “Love” in Hebrew’, *ZAW* 57 (NF 16, 1939), pp. 57-64 [= pp. 326-33 above].
- ‘The Root יָדַע in Hebrew’, *JTS* 35 (1934), pp. 298-306 [= pp. 396-404 above].
- ‘The Root יָדַע in Hebrew, II’, *JTS* 36 (1935), pp. 409-12 [= pp. 405-408 above].
- ‘The Root מָכַר in Hebrew’, *JTS* 37 (1936), pp. 388-89 [= pp. 349-50 above].
- ‘The Root צָנַע in Hebrew and the Meaning of קִדְרָנִית in Malachi iii, 14’, *JJS* 1 (1949), pp. 182-88 [= pp. 381-87 above].
- ‘The Root שָׁנָה = سنى in Hebrew’, *ZAW* 52 (NF 11, 1934), pp. 236-38 [= pp. 389-91 above].
- ‘The Root שָׁנָה = سنى in Hebrew II’, *ZAW* 55 (NF 14, 1937), pp. 174-76 [= pp. 392-94 above].
- ‘Some Further Remarks on Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew’, *VT* 18 (1968), pp. 120-24 [= pp. 213-17 above].
- ‘Some Observations on the Hebrew Word יָדַעַן’, in B. Hartmann *et al.* (eds.), *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner* (VTSup, 16; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967), pp. 387-97 [= pp. 186-96 above].
- ‘Some Observations on the Hebrew Root חָדַל’, in *Volume du Congrès: Strasbourg 1956* (VTSup, 4; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1957), pp. 8-16 [= pp. 334-42 above].
- ‘Some Rabbinic Evidence for a Hebrew Root יָדַע = و ر ع’, *JQR* NS 37 (1946), pp. 177-78 [= pp. 418-19 above].
- ‘Some Remarks on the Hebrew Root יָדַע’, *JJS* 6 (1955), pp. 50-52 [= pp. 428-30 above].
- ‘A Study in Hebrew Synonyms: Verbs Signifying “To Breathe”’, *Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete* 10 (1935), pp. 311-14 [= pp. 363-66 above].
- ‘The Text of Jesaia ii 6 and the Word שָׁפַךְ’, *ZAW* 75 (NF 34, 1963), pp. 83-90 [= pp. 373-75 above].
- The Text of the Revised Psalter: Notes* (London: SPCK, 1963).
- ‘Textual and Philological Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs’, in Noth and Thomas (eds.), *Wisdom in Israel*, pp. 280-92 [= pp. 274-86 above].
- ‘Translating Hebrew ‘āsāh’, *BT* 17 (1966), pp. 190-93 [= pp. 376-79 above].
- ‘“Until the Day Break, and the Shadows Fly Away”’, *ExpTim* 47 (1936), pp. 431-32 [= p. 454 above].
- ‘The Use of מְצַח as a Superlative in Hebrew’, *JSS* 1 (1956), pp. 106-109 [= pp. 218-21 above].
- ‘The Word רָבַע in Numbers xxiii. 10’, *ExpTim* 46 (1935), p. 285 [= p. 273 above].
- ‘Zechariah x. 11a’, *ExpTim* 66 (1955), pp. 272-73 [= p. 459 above].

- Thomas, D.W. (ed.), *Archaeology and Old Testament Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967).
- Documents from Old Testament Times* (London: Thomas Nelson, 1958).
- Essays and Studies Presented to Stanley Arthur Cook* (London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1950).
- Thomas, D.W., and W.D. McHardy (eds.), *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963).
- Tiemeyer, L.-S., 'The Guilty Priesthood (Zech 3)', in C.M. Tuckett (ed.), *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 1-19.
- Torrey, C.C., *The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928).
- Toy, C.H., *Proverbs* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899).
- Tropper, J., *Nekromantie: Totenfragung im alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (AOAT, 223; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1989).
- Tur-Sinai, N.H., *The Book of Job: A New Commentary* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, rev. edn, 1967).
- Ullendorff, E., 'The Contribution of South Semitics to Hebrew Lexicography', *VT* 6 (1956), pp. 190-98.
- VanderKam, J.C., 'Joshua the High Priest and the Interpretation of Zechariah 3', *CBQ* 53 (1991), pp. 553-70.
- Vaulx, J. de, *Les Nombres* (Sources bibliques; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1972).
- Waltke, B.K., *The Book of Proverbs, Chapters 1-15* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004).
- The Book of Proverbs, Chapters 15-31* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans: 2005).
- A Commentary on Micah* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007).
- Wazana, N., 'Anzu and Ziz: Traces of a Mythological Bird in the Ancient Near East, the Bible and Rabbinical Traditions', *Shnaton* 14 (2004), pp. 161-91 (Hebrew), updated in her 'Anzu and Ziz: Great Mythological Birds in Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Rabbinic Traditions', *JANESCU* 31 (2009), pp. 111-35.
- Wellhausen, J., *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871).
- Whitekettle, R., 'Bugs, Bunny, or Boar? Identifying the Ziz Animals of Psalms 50 and 80', *CBQ* 67 (2005), pp. 250-64.
- Whybray, R.N., *Isaiah 40-66* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1975).
- Proverbs* (NCB; London: Marshall Pickering; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994).
- Thanksgiving for a Liberated Prophet: An Interpretation of Isaiah Chapter 53* (JSOTSup, 4; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978).
- Wildberger, H., *Jesaja Kapitel 1-12* (BKAT, 10/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd edn, 1980), pp. 143-44, ET *Isaiah 1-12* (trans. T.H. Trapp; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).
- Wilde, A. de, *Das Buch Hiob* (OTS, 22; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981).
- Wildeboer, G., *Die Sprüche* (KHAT, 15; Freiburg i.B.: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]), 1897).
- Williamson, H.G.M., *The Book Called Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 1-27. I. Commentary on Isaiah 1-5* (ICC; London: T. & T. Clark, 2006).
- 'Da *'at* in Isaiah liii 11', *VT* 28 (1978), pp. 118-22.

- Winckler, H., 'Zur phönisch-karthagischen geschichte [sic]', in *idem Altorientalische Forschungen* (Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1897–1902 [1897]), I, pp. 421–62.
- Wolff, H.W., *Dodekapropheten. I. Hosea* (BKAT, 14/1; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd edn, 1965), ET *Hosea* (trans. G. Stansell; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974).
- Dodekapropheten. IV. Micha* (BKAT, 14/4; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), ET *Micah: A Commentary* (trans. G. Stansell; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990).
- Woude, A.S. van der, *Micha* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament; Nijkerk: G.F. Callenbach, 1977).
- Wutz, F., *Das Buch Job* (Eichstätter Studien, 3; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1939).
- Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus* (ed. Paul Kahle; Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen, 2; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933).
- Xella, P., 'Le dieu B'l 'z dans une nouvelle inscription phénicienne de Kition (Chypre)', *SEL* 10 (1993), pp. 61–69.
- Zipor, M.A., 'What Are the *kēlābīm* in Fact?', *ZAW* 99 (1987), pp. 423–28.
- Zolli, I., 'Note esegetiche: Es. xv.2', *Giornalè della Società Asiatica Italiana* 48 (1935), pp. 290–92.

INDEXES

INDEX OF REFERENCES

HEBREW BIBLE/ OLD TESTAMENT	26.7	38	8.16	88, 110
<i>Genesis</i>	32.23	33	14.12	35
2.8	13		14.19	33-35, 103
4.12	30	<i>Deuteronomy</i>	16.5	64
6.14	67, 68	12.2	16.6	64, 65
18.21	81, 110	13.13 ET	16.9	81, 110
18.27	42	13.14	16.16	14, 102
22.9	66	14.15	16.19	64, 109
27.42	62-64, 109	15.4	16.20	64, 109
43.11	30, 104	15.5	19.22	23, 25
49.10	37	15.7	20.13	23, 25
		15.9	20.28	56
		15.11	55, 57, 108	
<i>Exodus</i>		18.10	<i>Ruth</i>	
2.14	98	18.14	2.19	67, 68
2.24	99	23.18 ET		
2.25	99, 111	23.19	<i>1 Samuel</i>	
3.7	98, 111	28.68	1.16	23
9.28	12		2.5	54-56, 66, 108
10.17	16	<i>Joshua</i>	2.12	23
15.1	29	12.23	4.20	16
15.2	28-30, 104	17.11	5.9	16
25.22	94	19.26	5.11	16, 18
30.6	94	21.30	5.12	16
30.36	94		6.3	95, 111
31.18	12	<i>Judges</i>	10.5	35
32.18	12	1.27	10.10	35
		5	10.27	23
<i>Leviticus</i>		5.7	14.32	67, 68
11.15 ET	39		19.20	35, 36
11.16	39	5.18	21.2 ET	97, 98, 111
		6.25-28		
<i>Numbers</i>		6.25	21.3	97, 98, 111
15.24	67, 68	6.26		
23.10	41, 42, 103	6.28	22.5	82
24.7	38	8.7	22.6	82, 97, 111

<i>1 Samuel</i> (cont.)		<i>1 Chronicles</i>		29.25	63
22.10	82	4.10	68	30.20	39
22.13	82			31.39	30
22.15	82	<i>2 Chronicles</i>		34.18	23
24.15	50	13.7	23	34.22	21, 22
25.17	23	28.4	9	35.8	92
25.25	23	28.12	55	35.10	30, 31, 104
28.7	47	<i>Nehemiah</i>		36.8	40, 106
30.22	23	5.7	61	36.20	54
<i>2 Samuel</i>				37.5	91
2.21	34, 35	<i>Job</i>		37.7	93, 110
3.8	51	1.10	40	38.4	97
9.8	51	1.16	12	38.17	21, 102
16.7	23	2.3	24	38.18	97
16.9	51	2.11	63, 108	38.33	96, 111
16.17	25	3.5	21	39.1	97
20.1	23	4.7-11	60, 108	39.2	97
22.5-6	18	7.2	54	40.29	38, 39, 106
22.5	23, 24	7.13	63		
23.1	30, 104	8.9	91	41.5 ET	38, 106
23.6	23	9.5	91, 92, 110	42.11	63
<i>1 Kings</i>		9.7	93	<i>Psalms</i>	
4.12	47	10.21-22	21, 102	1.4	49
13.34	33	10.21	21	1.6	100
14.23	9	10.22	21	2.9	89
16.9-20	32	12.22	21	7.4 ET	35
20.20	108	14.6	55	7.5	35
20.25	108	14.21	91	9.15 ET	68
20.40	68	15.8	40	9.16	68
21	61	15.27	68	9.18 ET	19
21.10	23	15.32	9	9.19	19
21.13	23	16.2	62, 63, 108	13.1 ET	19, 20
21.20	60			13.2	19, 20
21.25	60	16.10	61	17.12	59
<i>2 Kings</i>		16.16	21	18.4 ET	14, 16, 18, 23, 24
1	67	20.20	92, 110		
8.13	50, 52	20.26	89, 110	18.5	14, 16, 18, 23, 24
9.31	32	21.19	85, 110		
16.4	9	21.34	62, 63, 108, 109	18.48 ET	16
17.10	9	23.9	68	18.49	16
17.17	60, 108	24.17	21	22.21 ET	59
20.1	14	28.3	21	22.22	59
23.10	18	29.4	39, 105	23.4	21
				25.11 ET	40

25.12	40	68.15 ET	13	1.22	92
31.7 ET	100, 111	68.16	13	2.16	58, 108
31.8	100, 111	73.20	22	4.19	91
34.1	93, 110	74.1	20	5.6	91, 110
34.10 ET	58-60, 108	74.10	19, 20	5.9	73, 75, 76,
34.11	58-60, 108	74.19	20		107
35.8	91	77.8 ET	19	6.12	23
35.15	91, 110	77.9	19	6.33	76
35.17	58, 59,	79.5	19, 20	6.34-35	76
	108	80	28	7.5	58, 108
36.6 ET	12	80.10 ET	12	7.23	91
36.7	12	80.11	12	9.13	92, 110
37.18	100	80.13 ET	27, 28,	9.18	91
37.35	9		103	10-29	77
38.10 ET	65, 66,	80.14	27, 28,	10-15	76
	109		103	10.7-8	85
38.11	65, 66,	83.10 ET	47	10.9	85, 86,
	109	83.11	47		110
39.6 ET	22	84.10 ET	47, 107	10.10	85
39.7	22	84.11	47, 107	10.16	32, 105
41.8 ET	23, 24	89.46 ET	19, 20	10.21	95, 110
41.9	23, 24	89.47	19, 20	10.23	77
44.19 ET	21	92.10 ET	9, 10	105.18	40
44.20	21	92.11	9, 10	107.10	40
44.23-24 ET	20	92.14 ET	9	11.2	69-71, 107
44.24-25	20	92.15	9	11.15	86
50	28	94.23	50	12.2	76, 77
50.10	28	103.9	19	13.10	71
50.11	27, 28,	104.16	13	13.16	68
	103	105.18	64, 106	13.20	86, 89,
52.8	9	107.10	21, 106		110
52.10	9	107.14	21	14	76
55.4 ET	16, 18	118.14	28, 104	14.7	98, 111
55.5	16, 18	119.131	54	14.13	76
55.23 ET	16	119.162	43	14.17	76
55.24	16	127.2	78, 107	14.19	76
57.4 ET	59	138.6	85, 100,	14.26	76
57.5	59		110	14.33	86, 110
58.6 ET	58, 59,	139.15	68	16.27	23
	108			19.25	92
58.7	58, 59,	<i>Proverbs</i>		19.26	72, 109,
	108	1-9	91		110
59.6 ET	52	1.2	26, 106	19.27	55
59.7	52	1.4	92	19.28	23
59.14 ET	52	1.12	24	20.2	75
59.15	52	1.13	43	20.8	49, 50,
					104

<i>Proverbs</i> (cont.)		3.22	33, 34,	53.12	14, 15
20.26	48-50,		103	57.5	9
	104, 111	5.18	33	57.9	18
21.11	92	8.9	82, 110	57.16	19
21.27	77	9.1	21	59.8	92
22.12	25, 106	9.2 ET	21		
23.4	55	9.7-8	82	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
23.22	37	9.8-9 ET	82	2.6	21
24.8	76, 77	9.8	82, 84,	2.15	59
24.9	77		110	2.16	88, 110
24.14	25, 106	9.9 ET	82, 84,	2.20	9
24.15	73, 110		110	3.2	26, 106
24.21-22	73-75	9.11	67	3.5	19
24.21	74, 75,	9.12 ET	67	3.6	9
	107	11.11	77	3.13	9
24.22	74	11.14	67	4.5-6	62
26.28	58, 68	12.2	28, 104	4.5	61, 62,
27.3	37	13.20	19		107
27.27	32	15.4	94, 110	4.11	26, 106
28.23	58, 108	28.27-28	48, 104	5.28	68, 109
29.5	57, 108	31.4	61	7.29	26
29.7	25, 106	32.6	68	11.16	9
30.17	35, 36,	34.13	39	12.6	62
	104	38.11	55	13.16	21
31.10-31	43	38.12	47, 107	14.18	90, 91,
31.10-11	44, 105	40.15	37, 38,		110
31.11	43, 44,		106	15.2	90
	105	42.14	54	15.7	49
31.13-28	44, 105	43.20	39	15.12	89, 110
31.13	44, 105	45.14	65, 109	15.14	90
31.19	44	47.11	65, 66, 92	16.13	90
31.22	44	47.15	65, 66,	17.2	9
31.24	44		109	17.4	90
		49.9	26, 105,	17.8	9, 10
<i>Ecclesiastes</i>			106	22.28	90
1.17	26	49.22	77	24.1	96, 111
8.16	26	51.3	12	27.9	67
		52-53	87	31.19	83, 110
<i>Song of Songs</i>		52.1	64, 109	40.4	56
1.16	9	52.13	87	50.24	92
8.6-7	17	53.3	55, 83, 87,		
8.6	17, 18		110	<i>Lamentations</i>	
		53.8	14, 15	2.2	24
<i>Isaiah</i>		53.9	15	2.8	24
1.24	64	53.10	15	4.3	39, 106
2.6	66, 67,	53.11	15, 86, 87,	5.20	19, 20
	109		110		

<i>Ezekiel</i>		<i>Obadiah</i>		32.3 LXX	70
2.5	56	6	68	33.13	79
3.11	56			34.22	70, 71,
5.13	64	<i>Jonah</i>			107
6.13	9, 10	4.9	15	35.3	70
8.14	45			37.2	14, 102
17.17	68	<i>Micah</i>		42.8	70, 107
21.16 ET	96	6.8	69, 70, 72,	43.13	107
21.21	96		107	47.24	60, 61
26.10	41				
28.13	12, 13	<i>Nahum</i>		NEW TESTAMENT	
31	13	1.3	41	<i>Mark</i>	
31.8	13	1.11	23, 25	7.28	52
31.9	13	1.15 ET	23, 25		
31.16	13	2.1	23, 25	<i>Luke</i>	
31.18	13			14.31	71
		<i>Habakkuk</i>			
<i>Daniel</i>		3.14	57	<i>Romans</i>	
2.41	31			6.23	32
4.1	9	<i>Zephaniah</i>			
4.1 ET	9, 10, 101	2.4	73, 110	PSEUDEPIGRAPHA	
4.4	9, 10, 101			<i>Odes of Solomon</i>	
4.4 ET	9	<i>Zechariah</i>		23.11-16	49
8.25	68, 109	3.3-4	34		
9.24	33	3.4	33, 34,	QUMRAN	
11-12	87		103	1QS	
12.4	87, 110	3.5	34	4.3	71
		10.2	62, 63,	4.5	71
<i>Hosea</i>			108	5.3	71
5.1	46	11.12	56	5.4	71
7.9	30	14.18	33	6.9	93, 110
9.7	84, 110	14.19	33, 105	7.3	93, 110
9.8	84			7.5	93, 110
14.8 ET	9, 10	APOCRYPHA		8.2	71
14.9	9, 10	<i>Tobit</i>			
		6.1 ET	52	BABYLONIAN TALMUD	
<i>Joel</i>		6.2	52	'Abodah Zarah	
2.22	30	11.4	52	54b	52
<i>Amos</i>		<i>Ecclesiasticus</i>		Shabbat	
1.1	19	7.20	90, 110	10b	77
3.3	94, 110	10.20	93, 110		
5.8	21	16.25	70, 107	CLASSICAL WORKS	
8.12	87	30.25 LXX	79, 107	Philo	
8.14	48	31.22 LXX	70, 71,	<i>De praemiis et poenis</i>	
			107	89	52

Sophocles

Fragment 871.1-2 49

INSCRIPTIONS AND
TABLETS

El Amarna Letters

60.6-9 52

60.6-7 50

61.2-3 50

71.17-18 50

75.41-42 50

85.64 50

KAI

37 B10 51

KTU

1.3.II.13-15 30

1.4.VII.54-55 22

1.6.II.18 32

1.6.II.20 32

1.6.VI.17 32

1.78.2-4 17

1.8.II.7-8 22

1.16.VI.58 74

1.100.41 18

1.107.42 18

1.108.1-3 18

1.108.23-27 29

1.108.24 29, 104

1.161 18

4.75.II.5 32

Lashish Letters

2.3-4 50

5.3-4 50

6.2-3 50

PRU

3.262 32

RS

1986.2235.16-17 18

INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Ackerman, S. 10
Ackroyd, P.R. 1, 5, 6, 48
Albright, W.F. 42
Allen, L.C. 6, 69, 78
Alonso Schökel, L. 49
Andersen, F.I. 69
Anderson, A.A. 20
Ashley, T.R. 42
Auvray, P. 67
- Baltzer, K. 38, 65
Barr, J. 22, 29, 42, 82
Barré, M.L. 29, 30
Baudissin, W. 24
Bauer, H. 22
Baumgartner, W. 9
Beer, G. 37
Ben Zvi, E. 72
Ben-Yehuda, E. 29, 104, 111
Biella, J.C. 30
Binns, L.E. 41
Blenkinsopp, J. 38, 66, 67
Boehmer, J. 46
Boer, P.A.H. de 11
Boling, R.G. 56
Borowski, O. 48
Box, G.H. 1
Breasted, J.H. 3
Brin, G. 11
Brock, S. 6
Brunet, G. 51
Budde, K. 3
Bultmann, C. 69
Burney, C.F. 1, 9
- Calderone, P.J. 55
Cathcart, K. 72
Cazelles, H. 15, 83
Chajes, T. 59
Chaney, M.L. 55-57
Cheyne, T.K. 23
- Childs, B.S. 29, 67
Clements, R.E. 6, 7, 67
Clifford, R.J. 32, 37, 49, 76
Clines, D.J.A. 5, 6, 31, 40, 63, 89
Coggan, D. 1, 4
Cohen, A. 27
Cohen, H.R. 21, 41, 42
Collins, J.J. 87
Cook, S.A. 3
Cooke, G.A. 1, 46
Cooper, A.M. 30
Cowley, A. 75
Coxon, P.W. 10
Crawford, J. 53
Cross, F.M. 29, 30, 95, 97
- Dahood, M.J. 78, 112
Dalley, S. 6
Dalman, G. 62
Dawes, S. 69
Day, J. 13, 17, 18, 51, 74, 83, 87
Delitzsch, Franz 48, 49, 59
Delitzsch, Friedrich 42
Dhorme, E. 21, 31, 39, 40, 89
Dillmann, A. 7, 33, 38, 41, 72
Dossin, G. 50
Dozy, R. 58
Driver, G.R. 3-5, 15, 24, 26, 35, 41, 44, 49, 65, 74, 76, 83, 92, 106, 112
Driver, S.R. 9, 21, 96-98
Duhm, B. 59
Durham, J.I. 29
- Eaton, J. 6
Ebach, J. 48
Ebeling, E. 24
Edwards, I.E.S. 2
Ehrlich, A.B. 11, 37, 50, 76
Eissfeldt, O. 45
Eitan, I. 97
Eliot, T.S. 4

- Elliger, K. 38
 Emerton, J.A. 7, 13, 24, 61, 62, 72, 74, 76-79, 81, 83, 84, 86, 87, 104, 107, 111
 Epstein, I. 78

 Fohrer, G. 89
 Fox, M.V. 25, 32, 33, 49, 75, 76
 Frankel, R. 45
 Frankenberg, W. 49
 Franzmann, M. 49
 Freedman, D.N. 29, 30, 69
 Freytag, G.W. 10, 42
 Fürst, J. 46, 81

 Galán, J.M. 50
 Gaster, T.H. 29, 30, 68, 104, 109
 Gelston, A. 26, 83, 87
 Gemser, B. 44, 99
 Gesenius, W. 79
 Ginsberg, H.L. 42, 43, 87
 Glanville, S.R.K. 2
 Goldingay, J. 38, 65
 Good, E.M. 29
 Goodman, A.E. 2
 Gordis, R. 21, 31, 39, 59, 89
 Gordon, C.H. 35
 Gordon, R.P. 6, 31, 56
 Gottwald, N.K. 56
 Grabbe, L.L. 22, 31
 Gray, G.B. 21, 41
 Gray, J. 40
 Greenfield, J.C. 35-37, 61
 Guillaume, A. 43

 Hackett, J.A. 55
 Harper, W.R. 21
 Hartley, J.E. 31, 89
 Hartmann, B. 9
 Hatch, E. 84
 Haupt, P. 46
 Hava, J.G. 10, 66, 80
 Hehn, J. 21, 22
 Hertz, J.H. 42
 Hill, G.F. 31
 Hillers, D.R. 69
 Hirschberg, H.H. 54
 Holladay, W.L. 62, 84
 Hönig, H.W. 34

 Hoonacker, A. Van 84
 Horbury, W. 6
 Houtman, C. 29
 Hubbard, D. 35
 Huffmon, H.B. 32
 Hutton, J.M. 51
 Hyatt, J.P. 29, 69, 71

 Jacob, B. 42
 Jastrow, M. 27, 78
 Jenni, E. 9
 Jensen, P. 24
 Jeremias, J. 70, 72
 Jobling, D. 6
 Johnstone, W. 80, 81, 88, 110, 112
 Jones, B.C. 94
 Jones, D.R. 62
 Joüon, P. 20, 26

 Kaltner, J. 80
 Kassis, R.A. 44
 Kazimirski, A. de B. 10, 66
 Kennett, R.H. 1
 Kimhi, D. 36
 Kissane, E.J. 31
 Kittel, R. 87
 Koole, J.L. 38
 Kopf, L. 74
 Kottsieper, I. 75
 Kugel, J.L. 43
 Kuhn, G. 76
 Kutscher, E.Y. 9

 Lambert, W.G. 6
 Lane, E.W. 25, 34, 38-41, 56, 66, 79, 97, 99
 Langdon, S.H. 18
 Leander, P. 22
 Lescow, T. 69
 Levine, B.A. 43
 Lewis, C.S. 4
 Lewis, T.J. 47, 56, 108
 Lewy, J. 45
 Lindars, B. 1, 5, 6, 17
 Lindenberger, J.M. 75
 Lloyd-Jones, G. 6
 Loewenstamm, S.E. 29, 30, 42
 Lowe, A. 6
 Ludolf, H. 35

- Maag, V. 9
 Macintosh, A.A. 6, 84
 Margalith, O. 47, 51
 Margoliouth, G. 51
 McCarter, P.K. 31, 56
 McHardy, W.D. 4
 McKane, W. 32, 33, 36, 44, 49, 58, 62, 70, 76, 77, 84, 99
 McNeile, A.H. 41
 Mettinger, T.N.D. 31
 Meyers, C.L. 34
 Meyers, E.M. 34
 Michaelis, J.D. 79
 Michel, W.L. 22
 Milgrom, J. 42
 Miller, G.D. 52, 53
 Moffatt, J. 9
 Morag, S. 10
 Murphy, R.E. 32, 33, 37, 49, 76

 Neuberg, F.J. 48
 Nicholson, E.W. 57
 Nöldeke, T. 21, 22
 North, C.R. 65
 Noth, M. 4, 53

 Parker, S.B. 29
 Parry, D.W. 95, 97
 Paul, S.M. 94
 Payne, D. 38, 65
 Pearson, A.C. 49
 Perles, F. 93
 Phillips, A. 8
 Plöger, O. 32, 33, 37, 76
 Plumley, J.M. 2
 Pope, M.H. 31, 74, 89
 Porter, J.R. 59
 Propp, W.H. 99

 Redpath, H.A. 84
 Renaud, B. 69
 Revell, E.J. 6
 Reymond, P. 47
 Richardson, H.N. 31
 Rignell, L.G. 38
 Rin, S. 17
 Ringgren, H. 36
 Roberts, J.J.M. 60

 Rowley, H.H. 4, 5, 40
 Rudolph, W. 69, 96
 Rüterswörden, U. 48

 Saley, R.J. 95, 97
 Saydon, P. 19
 Scheidius, E. 55
 Schroeder, O. 18
 Schultens, A. 11, 54, 107
 Schwally, F. 21, 22
 Schwarzenbach, A. 45
 Scott, R.B.Y. 32, 36, 50
 Seeligmann, I.L. 9
 Seybold, K. 28, 103
 Smend, R. 9, 90
 Smith, J.P. 3
 Smith, M.S. 52
 Snaith, N.H. 42
 Snell, D.C. 49
 Speiser, E.A. 90
 Spencer, E. 1
 Stager, L.E. 51
 Stoebe, H.J. 69, 71
 Sturdy, J. 6, 42

 Tallqvist, T. 18
 Thenius, O. 96
 Tiemeyer, L.-S. 34
 Torrey, C.C. 15
 Toy, C.H. 32, 33, 37, 49, 76
 Tropper, J. 47
 Tur-Sinai, N.H. 31

 Ullendorff, E. 35, 36, 61
 Ulrich, E. 95, 97

 VanderKam, J.C. 34
 Vaulx, J. de 42
 Vilchez, J. 49

 Waltke, B.K. 33, 36, 43, 49, 69, 74, 76, 80, 99
 Wazana, N. 28
 Weitzman, M. 6
 Wellhausen, J. 96, 97
 Wenham, G.J. 6
 Whitekettle, R. 28, 103
 Whybray, R.N. 15, 33, 36, 76, 80, 83, 87

Wildberger, H. 34, 67

Wilde, A. de 31, 89

Wildeboer, G. 49

Williamson, H.G.M. 6, 66, 67, 77, 87

Winckler, H. 46

Wolff, H.W. 69, 84, 96

Woude, A.S. van der 69

Wutz, F. 26, 96

Xella, P. 31

Zipor, M.A. 51

Zolli, I. 29, 104

INDEX OF MAJOR HEBREW WORDS AND ROOTS DISCUSSED

- אהב 54, 326-33
 אל 11-14, 197-207, 213-15
 אפן 48-50, 306-307
 בליעל 23-25, 232-40
 דעה, דעת 25-26, 245-46
 דכבים 26, 247-48
 זיו 27-28, 249
 זמרת 28-32, 250
 חדל 54-57, 334-43
 חמאת 32-33, 251
 מחלצות, חליצות 33-35, 252-54
 חלק 57-58, 344
 חמת דאר 47-48, 302-303
 ידע 80-100, 396-450
 יהוה 12, 199, 214-15
 כלב 50-53, 308-25
 כפר 58-60, 347
 ליקחת, להקח, להיקח 35-37, 255
 מדלי 37-38, 256-63
 מות 14-18, 207-10, 215-16
 מישאל 46-47, 298-99
 מכר 60-61, 349-51
 מלא 61-62, 352-57
 מר 37-38, 256-66
 נחם 62-64, 358-62
 נער (verb) 64-65, 367-68
 נער (noun) 38-39, 264-66
 נפות דאר, נפת דור, נפת דור 47-48, 304-305
 נצח 19-20, 218-21
 סוד 39-40, 267-70
 סחר 65-66, 369-70
 עין דאר, עין דר, עין דור 47-48, 300-301
 ענה, עני 40-41, 271-72
 עקד 66-67, 371-72
 עשה 67-68, 376-79
 צלח 68-69, 380
 צלמות 20-22, 222-31
 צנע 69-72, 381-87
 רבע 41-43, 273
 רענן 9-11, 186-96
 שפק 66, 373-75
 שאול 18-19, 210-212
 שדד 72-73, 283, 388
 שלל 43-44, 293-94
 שנה 73-79, 389-95
 תבור 45-46, 296-97

