

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

# JOURNAL

OF

## BIBLICAL LITERATURE

Volume XXIX

Part II

1910

### Micah's Capucinade

PAUL HAUPT

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

IN the notes to his translation of the Minor Prophets<sup>1</sup> Wellhausen calls Micah 1 9-16 a *capucinade*. He seems to think that this term denotes a discourse with numerous paronomasias;<sup>2</sup> but this view is erroneous. A *capucinade* is a weak sermon; so this designation is not applicable to Micah's spirited poems. Wellhausen may have been under the impression that the term *capucinade* is derived from the *Kapuzinerpredigt* in Schiller's *Wallenstein's Lager*; but the word was used long before the appearance (1798) of *Wallensteins Lager*, by Lesage in his *Gil Blas*, which was published 1715-1735, and T. G. Smollett retained the term in his English translation of this romance, which appeared in 1761.

In Becherelle's *Nouveau Dictionnaire National* (Paris) *capucinade* is explained as follows: *Discours de capucin. Instruction morale et religieuse plate et triviale, comme les capucins avaient coutume d'en faire à la populace.* The *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* gives the phrase: *Ce sermon n'est qu'une capucinade.* The passage in *Gil Blas* (book 7, chapter 4) is: *L'homélie de l'archevêque de Grenade était un discours diffus, une rhétorique de régent usé, une capucinade.* The word may mean also *sermon hors de propos, manifestation*

*religieuse instantanée dont on a lieu de suspecter la sincérité.* Littré's *Dictionnaire* gives the following definition of *capucinade*: *Plate tirade de morale ou de dévotion. Affectation de dévotion*, and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* states: *Il se dit d'un plat discours de morale ou d'une dévotion outrée.* In the sixth edition of Meyer's *Grosses Konversations-Lexikon*, vol. 10 (Leipzig, 1905), *Kapuzinade* is explained as *possenhafte, derbe Strafpredigt*. Grimm's *Wörterbuch*, s.v. *Kapuzinerpredigt-capucinade* says: *sprichwörtlich von einer derben, halb launig, drollig gehaltenen Strafpredigt*. There is nothing of this sort in Micah's elegy on the invasion of Sennacherib.

The *Kapuzinerpredigt* in Schiller's *Wallensteins Lager* is a subsequent insertion. Goethe wanted *Wallensteins Lager* for the inauguration (October, 1798) of the renovated Weimar theatre. For this purpose this dramatic poem was somewhat expanded. Schiller's *Kapuzinerpredigt* is based on the sermon *Auf, auf ihr Christen!* which Abraham a Sancta Clara preached, in 1683, against the Turks threatening Vienna, just as the Assyrians blockaded Jerusalem in 701 B.C. In this respect there is a certain similarity between Micah's elegy and the prototype of Schiller's *Kapuzinerpredigt*. Abraham a Sancta Clara, however, was not a capuchin, but an Augustinian; nor is Schiller's *Kapuzinerpredigt* characterized by constant paronomasia: in the 132 lines there are but a dozen puns, less than 10 per cent.

In Mic. 1 9-16, which Wellhausen calls a *capucinade*, there are but four cases of paronomasia,<sup>3</sup> and one of them is a gloss. The clause *lo-yaç'dh yošévth Ça'nán* in v. 11 is a misplaced gloss on v. 9 in which only the following words are genuine: <sup>4</sup>

*Anušóth makkóthehén*                      'adh-šd'r 'ammí.  
Their deadly wounds extend    to the gates of my people.

*Their* refers to the daughters of Jerusalem, i.e. the Judean cities<sup>5</sup> in the *Shephelah*.<sup>6</sup> Sennacherib states in the cuneiform account<sup>7</sup> of his campaign against Hezekiah of Judah that he besieged and captured forty-six fortified cities, castles, and smaller towns belonging to Hezekiah, whereupon

Hezekiah was shut up in Jerusalem like a bird in a cage. Zion was blockaded by the Assyrians, all ingress and egress was stopped, and the Egyptian allies<sup>8</sup> of Hezekiah could not relieve Jerusalem. Zaanan is a by-form of Zion.<sup>9</sup> Both Zion and Zaanan mean Protection, Security, Stronghold.<sup>10</sup> *Lo-yaç'dh yošévth Ça'nán*, the inhabitants of Zaanan could not go out, means that Zaanan, the well-guarded city of Zion, was blockaded by the Assyrians, so that the inhabitants of Jerusalem could not go out. We might imitate the paronomasia by translating: The guarded place was placed under guard.

In *lě'aphráh 'aphar hithpalláši*, at the end of v. 11, we have no paronomasia, but an undeleted corrigendum:<sup>11</sup> *'aphár* is a correction of the preceding *'aphráh*, in which the final *h* is due to dittography. The original text was simply *lě'aphár*<sup>12</sup> *hithpalláši*, hide<sup>13</sup> in the dust! We must read in v. 10:<sup>14</sup> *Bakhó békhá*<sup>15</sup> *běnotháikh*<sup>16</sup> | *lě'aphár*<sup>12</sup> *hithpalláši*,<sup>13</sup> For thy daughters<sup>17</sup> bitterly weep | and hide<sup>13</sup> in the dust!<sup>13</sup> The sequel of v. 10 is the last verse of this chapter.<sup>19</sup> This couplet, consisting of vv. 10 and 16, must be inserted between vv. 8 and 9, and the second line to v. 9 appears in the received text at the end of the second chapter. The whole stanza, which is composed of three couplets with 3 + 2 beats in each line,<sup>20</sup> may be translated as follows:

- |      |   |   |
|------|---|---|
| 1 8  | Therefor <sup>21</sup> I wail and howl,<br>I make a wail like jackals     | unclad <sup>22</sup> and barefoot; <sup>23</sup><br>and daughters of deserts. <sup>24</sup> |
| 10   | For thy daughters <sup>17</sup> bitterly weep <sup>18</sup>               | and hide <sup>13</sup> in the dust! <sup>13</sup>   |
| 16   | For thy charming <sup>25</sup> daughters <sup>17</sup> poll <sup>26</sup> | thy head <sup>27</sup> like a griffin! <sup>28</sup>  |
| 9    | Their <sup>17</sup> deadly wounds extend <sup>4</sup>                     | to the gates of my people; <sup>29</sup>  |
| 2 18 | The batterer <sup>30</sup> came up before them, <sup>17</sup>             | their <sup>31</sup> king <sup>32</sup> at their <sup>31</sup> head.                         |

In the second stanza, which also consists of three couplets with 3 + 2 beats in each line,<sup>20</sup> the poet apostrophizes five cities in the *Shephelah*,<sup>6</sup> viz. Saphir, Lachish, Gath, Achzib, and Mareshah.

Saphir (which means Beautiful<sup>33</sup>) is now represented by the three villages known as *Sawqir*,<sup>34</sup> northeast of Ashkelon, southeast of Ashdod, on the road from Ashkelon to Jerusalem.

Lachish seems to be the present *Tel el-Hesy*<sup>36</sup> on the road from Mareshah (Eleutheropolis) to Gaza, sixteen miles east of Gaza, a little to the north, and ten miles from Eleutheropolis. Sennacherib sent the Rabshakeh from Lachish to Jerusalem.<sup>38</sup> A cuneiform legend on an Assyrian relief,<sup>37</sup> now in the British Museum, reads: *Šin-axe-ri-ba*<sup>38</sup> *šar kiš-šati šar māt Aššūr ina kussi nīmēdi*<sup>39</sup> *ūšib-ma šallat dī Lakīšu mazarū ētiq*,<sup>40</sup> Sennacherib, king of the universe, king of Assyria, sat on a high throne<sup>39</sup> while the spoil of Lachish passed before him. Lachish is repeatedly mentioned in the Amarna tablets;<sup>41</sup> it was at the extreme southwest of Judah, and commanded the road to Gaza and to Egypt. *Tel el-Hesy* was excavated by Flinders Petrie in 1890, and his work was continued by Dr. Bliss.<sup>42</sup>

Mareshah, the birthplace of the prophet Micah, appears to be the present *Tel Sandahanna*, i. e. the southeastern hill of the three hills between which the modern village of *Bēt Jibrīn*, northeast of Lachish, is situated. *Bēt Jibrīn*, i. e. *House of Gabriel*, is on the road from Hebron to Gaza, 4 hours from Hebron, and 8½ from Jerusalem. Mareshah was the capital<sup>44</sup> of the *Shephelah*.<sup>6</sup> Instead of Micah the Morasthite<sup>48</sup> we must read Micah of Mareshah (Heb. *Mikhāh ham-Mārēšatī*).<sup>44</sup> There is no city of Moresheth. In *mōrēsth Gāth* (Mic. 1 14) *Gāth* is an appositional genitive like Zion in *Bāth Āiyōn*, the maiden Zion, or *nēhār Pērāth*, the river Euphrates.<sup>46</sup> *Mōrēsth* (or rather *mōrēsth*, with *Sin*; cf. my remarks in ZDMG, 34. 763) is not a proper name, but a common noun meaning *betrothed*, *affianced* or *bride-elect* (= *mē'ōrasāh*).<sup>46</sup> *Mōrēsth* (or *mōrasāth*) *Gāth* means *Gāth, the bride* (elect).<sup>47</sup> Similarly we must read instead of the following *bāttē*<sup>48</sup> *Akhziv*, the houses of Achzib, *bāth Akhziv*, the maiden Achzib.<sup>49</sup> This is not the Phenician city, 9 miles north of Accho, near the promontory of *Rās-an-nāḫūrah*, but the city which is mentioned in conjunction with Mareshah and Keilah in Josh. 15 44. It cannot be *'Ain el-Kezbe*, northeast of *Shuwēke*, the ancient Socoh; or *Kuweizib*, 2½ miles northeast of *Halhāl* toward Hebron; or *Kussābe*, southeast of *Tel el-Hesy*. It must have been a

place between Mareshah (Eleutheropolis) and Keilah (*i.e.* *Khirbet Kila*, 7 miles east of Eleutheropolis and about 7 miles northeast of *Halhal*). There were no doubt a number of places known as *Achziḅ*, *i.e.* channel of a watercourse which is dry except in the rainy season. In the story of Judah and Tamar (Gen. 38 5) this *Achziḅ* appears as *Chezib* (cf. ZDMG, 68. 518, note 26).

Gath was one of the five royal cities of the Philistines; but (according to 1 Chr. 18 1) David took Gath and her *daughters* out of the hand of the Philistines, and his grandson Rehoboam fortified Gath as well as Mareshah and Lachish (2 Chr. 11 7-9). According to St. Jerome (*ad Mic.* 1 10) Gath was situated on the road from Eleutheropolis (Mareshah) to Gaza. It may be the modern '*Arāk al-Munṣīye* between Eleutheropolis and Lachish, less than two hours from *Tel el-Hesi*. Hezekiah had been victorious over the Philistines, but Sennacherib deprived him of the cities he had conquered in the *Shephelah*,<sup>6</sup> and attached them to the territories of three Philistine kings, viz. Mitint of Ashdod, Padi of Ekron, and Ḳil-Bel of Gaza.<sup>7</sup>

In the statement 2 K. 18 8: *Hezekiah smote the Philistines even unto Gaza and the borders thereof, from the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city*, the last clause means, of course, both the detached forts (or castles) and the fortified cities.<sup>60</sup> Heb. *mighdāl nōḡērim* corresponds to Assyr. *dūru*,<sup>61</sup> and '*ir miḡḡār* to Assyr. *ālu dannu* (KB, 2. 94, l. 13). Sennacherib besieged and captured the Judean strongholds in the *Shephelah*,<sup>6</sup> in order to prevent the Egyptian allies<sup>8</sup> of Hezekiah from bringing efficient help to Jerusalem.

Micah's patriotic poem, which Wellhausen styles a *capucinade*, was written prior to the capture of those cities. The poet addresses in the first place the inhabitants of Saphir in the north, saying, Pass ye<sup>62</sup> away from<sup>63</sup> Saphir; this<sup>64</sup> post will be taken.<sup>65</sup> Saphir will be the first to succumb to the Assyrians; it will be impossible to hold this position; therefore the poet advises the inhabitants of that place to evacuate it.

In the same way he says to the inhabitants of Lachish, south of Saphir, between Gaza and Hebron: *Bind<sup>58</sup> the chariot to the swift beast<sup>57</sup> or Attach the cart to the steed,<sup>58</sup> that is, Pack up your goods, load them on carts, if you desire to save them.<sup>59</sup> The city will fall into the hands of the Assyrians. Here we have a paronomasia in the word for *steed* (Heb. *rúchsh*)<sup>57</sup> and the name *Lachish*.<sup>60</sup> We might imitate this by translating: *Pack off with bag and baggage, | ye men of Lachish!* Dr. Furness, to whom I am indebted for a number of valuable suggestions, proposes: *In carts bestow what ye lack, ye dwellers of Lachish!**

The next couplet begins: *So<sup>61</sup> give now parting gifts to Gath, the bride.* After the fall of Saphir and Lachish it will be impossible to hold Gath, which has been *betroted* to Judah; Gath will swear allegiance to the Assyrian king, and Judah must part with her. The bridegroom paid for his bride;<sup>62</sup> but the bride received some parting gifts or farewell presents<sup>63</sup> from her parents. In an old German song of Prince Eugene and the City of Lille, entitled *Die vermeinte Jungfrau Lille*, this famous Austrian general, who captured Lille in 1708, says:<sup>64</sup>

Prinz Eugen bin ich genennet,  
Der zu dir in Liebe brennet,  
Lill', du allerschönste Braut.

Lille answers:

Lieber Herr, fort packet euch,  
Gehet in das deutsche Reich;  
Denn ich habe zum Galanten,  
Zum Gemahl und Caressanten,  
König Ludwig von Frankreich.

But Prince Eugene says in the last stanza but one:

Lill', mein Engel und mein Lamm,  
Ich weiss dir den Bräutigam,  
Kaiser Karl, der Weltbekannte,  
Ich bin nur sein Abgesandte  
Und des Kaisers General;

whereupon Lille concludes:

Ei wohlhan, so lass es sein,  
Karle sei der Liebste mein;

Denn der Ludewig veraltet,  
 Und die Lieb' ist ganz erkaltet,  
 Karl ist noch ein junger Held.<sup>65</sup>

A fortress that has never been taken is called a *maiden*,<sup>66</sup> and a virgin is regarded as a fortress. In the Biblical Love-songs the maiden says of her brothers :

Albeit a wall am I thus far,  
 my bosom is (now growing) like towers,  
 And to them I am verily seeming  
 ready to surrender (the fortress).<sup>67</sup>

In Goethe's *Faust* (897) we read: *Mädchen und Burgen müssen sich geben.*

The second half of Mic. 1 14 is: *Achzib is an achzab*<sup>68</sup> to the king of Judah.<sup>65</sup> An *achzab* is a deceitful brook, that is, a stream which is dry during the summer. The *achzab* deceives and disappoints the wanderer who expects to refresh himself with its water; Achzib will disappoint the king of Judah;<sup>68</sup> she will practice deception in love, and will jilt her former lover. In modern Palestinian songs a maiden is often called a well or a fountain.<sup>69</sup> Water-wheels and buckets symbolize the enjoyment of love. The beloved is said to have a water-wheel in her palate, because her kisses are so refreshing.<sup>70</sup> The bride is the fountain of pleasure, the source of delight, the wellspring of happiness, the cistern of bliss, the stream of enjoyment,<sup>69</sup> and we find similar hydraulic figures in the Old Testament. Ecclesiastes (12 1) says: *Remember thy well in thy youth*, i.e. Do not neglect your lawful wife.<sup>71</sup> In Prov. 5 15-20 we read :

- 15 Drink water from thine own cistern,<sup>72</sup>  
 and the flow from thine own well !
- 16 Should<sup>73</sup> thy springs<sup>74</sup> be scattered abroad,<sup>76</sup>  
 thy streams<sup>74</sup> in the open places ?<sup>75</sup>
- 17 Let them<sup>74</sup> be for thyself alone,  
 and share them<sup>74</sup> not with strangers !<sup>77</sup>
- 18 Let thy fountain<sup>74</sup> be unpolluted !<sup>78</sup>  
 enjoy the wife of thy youth !
- 19<sup>79</sup> Let her breasts quench thy thirst<sup>80</sup> at all times !  
 drink in<sup>81</sup> her love for ever !
- 20 Why shouldst thou err<sup>82</sup> with a stranger,  
 and embrace a harlot's<sup>83</sup> bosom ?<sup>84</sup>



We may imitate the paronomasia in the line Mic. 1 14 b, *Achzib is an achzab to the king of Judah*<sup>85</sup> by translating: *Nevermore will Achzib accede | to Judah's wooing.* Dr. Furness suggests: *Deceitfully acts Achzib | toward the king of Judah.*<sup>85</sup>

The next line is: *The heir will go in to thee,*<sup>86</sup> *O maiden*<sup>87</sup> *Marešah*, that is, Sennacherib will inherit (or take possession of) this daughter of Judah. Among the ancient Hebrews the heir appropriated even the concubines of his father. A man's widow could be inherited like chattel. Sennacherib will go in to this daughter of the kingdom of Judah, just as Absalom went in unto David's concubines.<sup>88</sup> There is a paronomasia in the word for *heir* (Hebrew *yôréš*) and the name *Marešah*.<sup>89</sup> This may be imitated by rendering: *A new lord will be marshaled | into Marešah's borough.* Dr. Furness suggests: *To thy chamber marches the heir | O city*<sup>87</sup> *of Marešah.*

These are the three cases of paronomasia in Micah's elegy. They certainly do not justify the term *capucinade*.<sup>90</sup>

The Hebrew text of this poem (meter 3 + 2)<sup>90</sup> should be read as follows:

## MICAH 1 11-15

11	'Ivrû <sup>62</sup> lakhém <sup>91</sup> miš-Šaphir, <sup>63</sup>	iqqâh <sup>65</sup> 'emdathô ; <sup>92</sup>
12	Rathôm <sup>65</sup> ham-märkavâh la-râkhê <sup>60</sup>	yôševth Lakhîš ! <sup>93</sup>
14	La-khén <sup>61</sup> tittēni šilluhîm <sup>63</sup>	lê-môrcsêth <sup>46</sup> Gâth ;
	Bâth <sup>49</sup> Akhziv lê-akhzâv <sup>68</sup>	lê-malkhê Yêhudhâh. <sup>86</sup>
15	<sup>94</sup> Hal-yôrés yavô elâikh <sup>66</sup>	bâth <sup>67</sup> Marešâh ; <sup>95</sup>
	'Adhê <sup>66</sup> 'ôlâm <sup>96</sup> yôvédh <sup>67</sup>	kêvôdh <sup>68</sup> Yêhudhâh. <sup>96</sup>

This may be translated as follows :

- 11 Pass ye<sup>62</sup> away from<sup>63</sup> Saphir ;  
this<sup>64</sup> post will be taken !<sup>65</sup>
- 12 Pack off with bag and baggage,<sup>60</sup>  
ye dwellers of Lachish !<sup>62</sup>
- 14 So<sup>61</sup> give now parting gifts<sup>63</sup>  
to Gath, the bride.<sup>47</sup>  
Nevermore will Achzib accede  
to Judah's<sup>68</sup> wooing.<sup>100</sup>

- 15 A new lord will be marshaled  
 into Maresah's<sup>44</sup> borough.<sup>101</sup>  
 Forever and aye<sup>96</sup> will perish<sup>97</sup>  
 the glory of Judah.<sup>95</sup>

This is certainly not a burlesque *capucinade*, but a patriotic elegy.

It should be preceded by the denunciation of the oppressors of the poor in Jerusalem, which follows in the second chapter of the received text,<sup>21</sup> while the first patriotic poem of Micah, arraigning the unjust rulers and false prophets in Jerusalem, is preserved in the third chapter. This first poem consists of two stanzas, each stanza is composed of two couplets with 3 + 3 beats in each line.<sup>102</sup> The second poem in the second chapter, on the other hand, consists of six couplets, with 2 + 2 beats in each line, which must be grouped in three stanzas. This introduction to Micah's elegy may be translated as follows :

- |     |     |  |  |
|-----|-----|--|--|
| i   | 2 1 | Woe to them that plan mischief<br>In daylight they do it ;           | upon their beds!<br>for it is in their power.  |
|     | 2   | For fields they lust,<br>Oppressing men,                             | at homes they snatch,<br>their homes and heritage.                                       |
| ii  | 3   | Against my <sup>103</sup> people<br>From peaceful men <sup>104</sup> | ye rise as foes,<br>ye strip their mantles. <sup>105</sup>                               |
|     | 9   | Our <sup>106</sup> wives ye chase<br>From tender children            | from blissful homes, <sup>107</sup><br>ye take my <sup>108</sup> mothers. <sup>108</sup> |
| iii | 3   | Against this clan <sup>109</sup><br>Wherefrom they will              | He'll <sup>106</sup> plan some thing <sup>110</sup><br>not slip their necks.             |
|     | 4   | They'll utter verses<br>" We be utterly spoiled,                     | and mourning songs :<br>they divide our lands! " <sup>111</sup>                          |

This was originally followed by Micah's elegy,

Therefor<sup>21</sup> I wail and howl      unclad<sup>22</sup> and barefoot,<sup>22</sup>

with the apostrophe of the Judean cities in the *Shephelah*,<sup>6</sup> threatened by Sennacherib.<sup>7</sup>

The poem which precedes Micah's elegy in the received text is a Maccabean<sup>112</sup> psalm celebrating John Hyrcanus' destruction of Samaria in 107 B.C.<sup>113</sup> The introductory poem at the beginning of the Book of Micah was written about 107,<sup>10</sup> whereas the genuine poems of Micah were composed about 701. The three genuine poems of Micah exhibit three different meters, 3 + 3, 2 + 2, and 3 + 2.<sup>20</sup> Similarly we have a Maccabean<sup>112</sup> alphabetic psalm at the beginning of the Book of Nahum, and we find the same variety of meters in this festal liturgy for Nicanor's Day: <sup>114</sup> 3 + 3, 2 + 2, and 3 + 2.<sup>115</sup>

The Maccabean<sup>112</sup> psalm at the beginning of the Book of Micah consists of three couplets with 3 + 3 beats in each line, and may be translated as follows:

- i 1 a Hear ye, all ye peoples!  
       hearken, O earth, and her dwellers!  
 2 Lo, He came<sup>116</sup> out of His place,  
       and strode o'er the heights of the earth.
- ii 4 'Neath Him the mountains melted,  
       while vales were cleft (and fissured)  
 As wax before the fire,  
       as a waterfall over a slope.<sup>117</sup>
- iii 6 I made<sup>118</sup> Samaria a heap,  
       pouring down her stones to the valley.  
 7 All her images<sup>119</sup> shall be shattered,  
       and all her gifts<sup>120</sup> be burned.<sup>121</sup>

Samaria was so utterly destroyed and burned that there was a stream of stones flowing down from the crest of the hill like a stream of lava. Josephus (*Ant.* 13. 10. 3) says of John Hyrcanus' destruction of Samaria in 107 B.C. that the Maccabean conqueror captured the city after a siege of one year. He was not satisfied with the capture, but he destroyed the city utterly so that it was swept away in torrents. *He razed it in such a way that it fell into the rushing streams,*<sup>122</sup> and it looked as though there could never be a city again in that place. This passage seems to be based on the introductory hymn at the beginning of the Book of Micah. There was no destruction of Samaria in the pre-Grecian

period. Samaria was destroyed by Ptolemy Lagi in 312,<sup>122</sup> and by Demetrius Poliorcetes in 296;<sup>123</sup> but when Sargon captured Samaria in 721 he did not destroy the city.<sup>124</sup> Therefore Josephus says, Hyrcanus was not satisfied with the capture of Samaria, but destroyed it.<sup>125</sup> The long siege of Samaria reminded the Maccabean compiler of the festal liturgy for the celebration of Hyrcanus' destruction of Samaria of the ancient poet Micah's lines alluding to Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem and his capture of the Judean cities in the *Shephelah*,<sup>6</sup> especially as Hyrcanus besieged Samaria because the Samaritans had attacked the people of Micah's birthplace, Mareshah,<sup>43</sup> who were Jewish colonists and Hyrcanus' allies.<sup>126</sup> The city of Samaria was not inhabited by Samaritans at that time, but by descendants of the Macedonian colonists whom Alexander the Great had settled there in 331 B.C.<sup>126</sup> Both Samaria and Beth-shean, at that time known as Scythopolis, were Hellenistic cities.<sup>126</sup>

The first three chapters of the Book of Micah, in which only 32½ lines are genuine, are more corrupt than any other Old Testament text I ever studied. I cannot discuss in the present paper all the corruptions, dittographies, haplographies, transpositions, displacements, expansions, glosses, etc.<sup>127</sup>

Some Hebraists may be inclined to say that I have practically rewritten the Book of Micah. The same criticism has been made with regard to my restoration of the Biblical Love-songs<sup>128</sup> and the Book of Ecclesiastes;<sup>129</sup> but the excision of later additions and excrescences is not tantamount to rewriting a book. The restoration of an old master merely restores the pristine beauty; and if I rejoin displaced and scattered lines, this restoration is as legitimate as the reconstruction of Hubert and Jan van Eyck's altar of Ghent,<sup>130</sup> parts of which are now preserved at Ghent, Berlin, and Brussels. The restoration of the original connection and the elimination of subsequent additions is not a radical destruction of the original, but a conservation. Many an old ceiling carved by the hand of a master has been daubed with plaster and cheap frescoing. If we remove this layer, we do not impair the beauty of the original.

## NOTES

(1) See J. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, part 5 (Berlin, 1892), p. 132, l. 5; third edition (1898), p. 134, below.

(2) Cf. Karl Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton* (Tübingen, 1904), p. 289, *ad* 10-15, l. 4, and Sievers' *Attestamentliche Miscellen*, X (cited below, note 115), p. 80.

(3) Cf. I. M. Casanowicz, *Paronomasia in the Old Testament* (Boston, 1894), and note 52 to my paper *Moses' Song of Triumph* in *AJSL*, 20. 169; also H. Reckendorf, *Über Paronomasie in den semitischen Sprachen* (Giessen, 1909).

(4) We must cancel *ki* at the beginning of this verse, and read the plural, *anšōth*, instead of *anšāh*, and the plural suffix, *makkōthēhēn*, instead of *makkōthēhā*. Both *naghā* (or, more correctly, *naghē'ū*) and *'adh-Yērūsālem* are glosses to *'adh-ša'r 'ammī*, and the clause *ki-vō'āh 'adh-Yēhōdāhā* is a tertiary gloss to the clause (*naghā* or *naghē'ū*) *'adh-ša'r 'ammī*. A late (theological) gloss to v. 9 is found in v. 12: *hālah lē-tōv | yōšēvth marōm || kī-yāradh rā' | me-'ēth Yahvēh*, lit., She who dwells on high writhed for good, evil came down from JHVH; i.e. it was a good thing for the inhabitants of Jerusalem that they were in anguish; the calamity was sent by JHVH Himself: whom the Lord loveth, He correcteth. *Kī* before *hālah* (cf. Mic. 4 10) is an erroneous repetition of the *ki* at the beginning of the second half of this verse; also *lē-ša'r Yērūsālem*, at the end of the verse, is a tertiary addition. It is possible, however, that the second half of v. 12 is a prosaic gloss to *'adh-ša'r 'ammī* in v. 9. For *lē-tōv* (or *lē-tōvāh*) cf. Deut. 30 9, Ps. 119 122, Gen. 50 20, Jer. 24 5; it means lit. *for a good thing, for a good purpose, as a benefit*. It was a wholesome fright inspired by JHVH. For the religious effect of the blockade and deliverance of Jerusalem in 701 B.C. cf. EB, 2244, § 35. Instead of *marōth* we must read *marōm*; cf. Is. 26 5. The glossator read in v. 9 *makkōthēhā*, her wounds (Jerusalem's) instead of *makkōthēhēn*, their wounds (referring to the daughters of Judah, i.e. the Judean cities in the *Shephelah*). The suffix *-hēn*, it may be supposed, was written *-h* with a mark of abbreviation; cf. *Nah.* 25, end of first paragraph *ad* l 11.

A tertiary gloss (or illustrative quotation; cf. *AJSL*, 26. 10) to the gloss in Mic. 1 9 appears in Mic. 4 9:

4 9	<i>Attāh lamāh</i>	<i>thar'i rē' ?</i>
	<i>Hā-mēlkh en-bākh</i>	<i>im-yo'çēkh avādh</i>
	<i>Ki-hāhziqekh hīl</i>	<i>kai-yōledhāh ?</i>
10	<i>Hūli va-ghōhi</i>	<i>bāth Çiyōn !<sup>a</sup></i>
	<i>Ki-'attāh theçī<sup>β</sup></i>	<i>vē-šakhānt bas-sadhēh</i>
	<i>U-vāth 'adh-Bavēl</i>	<i>šam-tinnaçēli.γ</i>

(a) 4 10 *kai-yōledhāh*  
(γ) *šam-igh'alēkh šš*

(β) *mīq-qiryāh*  
*mīk-kāph oyçōākh*

(δδ) *Γαλιλέα*

4 9	Now why dost thou	cry out aloud ?
	Hast thou no king ?	is thy counselor gone ?
	That pangs have seized thee	like a woman in travail ?

10 Suffer pangs and labor, Now must thou forth, <sup>β</sup> Must go to Babel!	O maiden Zion! <sup>α</sup> and dwell in the field, there thou wilt be rescued.
--	---

(α) 4 10 as a woman in travail  
(γ) There lie <sup>44</sup> will redeem thee

(β) the city  
from the hand of thy foes

(88) JHYH

*Gđhî* in v. 10 is an intransitive imperative like *bđšî* (for *bđšî*), be ashamed, or *bđ'î*, enter. In Ps. 22<sup>10</sup> we must read *mēghîhî*. This Hiphil *hēghîh* is a synonym of Assyr. *uđšuru* = *muđšuru*, the Piel of the stem from which the term *Masorah* is derived; see JAOS 16. cvi, *Numbers* 63 18, ZAT, 29. 74, 210. For another misplaced gloss (or variant) at the end of the fourth chapter, see below, note 27.

(5) In v. 9 they are called *daughters of the neighborhood*, i. e. dependent cities in the adjacent region of the Foothills (cf. note 6). The clause *mîpādāh bēnōth* (not *bēth!*) *ha'ēql* is a gloss to *e'sēh mîspēdh kat-tannîm* in v. 8. For *ēql*, propinquity (= Arab. *waql* connection, union), cf. Jer. 41 17 (OLZ, 12. 65 below).

(6) The region of the foothills between the mountains of Judah and the Mediterranean.

(7) See KB, 2. 95, 13; EB, 4364. 4368; RE, 14. 118; cf. also Professor Kemper Fullerton's article, *The Invasion of Sennacherib*, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, October, 1906.

(8) Cf. KB, 2. 93, 73 and Is. 20 5, 2 K. 18 21 19 9; also IN, 466. Contrast RE, 14. 118, 1.

(9) Similarly, we have in Syriac: *šáinā*, peace, tranquillity, security, instead of *šá'nā* whence Heb. *šá'nān*. Heb. *šiyôn* corresponds to Arab. *šiyān*, an infinitive form of *šāna*, *yašānu*, to guard, protect; the intensive form *šāwāna* means especially to *surround with a wall*. The *h* in the Syriac form *šihyān* is secondary; cf. AJSL, 1. 178, n. 4; 20. 171; 22. 205 and 250 below; 23. 245; *Nah.* 40 (*nahag* = *nā'ag* = *nagag*).

(10) This is also the connotation of *Samaria* and *Beth-shean*, more correctly: *Beth-shān*; see *Kings* 77. 43, 274. 10. *Šān* is connected with *šá'nān*, and *Samaria* (Heb. *Šōmrōn*, originally *Šōmirānu*) is derived from *šamar*, to guard. For Jerusalem = Place of Security, see OLZ, 12. 248.

(11) For undeleted corrigenda see *Kings* 194. 20; cf. *Nah.* 35 (*gđw gđwái*).

(12) It is by no means necessary to say *bā'aphār hūhpallā'î*; cf. Jer. 6 2: *hūhpallēšî va'ēphr*. The preposition *bē* instead of *lē* in this case is Aramaic rather than Hebrew; *lā'aphār hūhpallēšî* is idiomatic Hebrew. We read in Job 7 21, *ki'attāh lā'aphār āškāv*, for now I lie down in the dust. In Ps. 7 6 we find: *u-khvedhî* (cf. ZDMG, 63. 515, l. 23) *lā'aphār yaškēn*, let him lay my soul in the dust, with the preceding gloss *wē-irmōs la'ārç haiyái*, let him trample my life to the earth. We say also in English to *cast (fall, sink) to the ground*. Electricians speak of conductors *put to earth*. In Ps. 44 20 we have: *ki-šāhah lā'aphār naphšēnu | dawqāh la'ārç biñēnu*, our soul is bowed down to the dust, our body cleaves to the ground. Cf. also Is. 21 9 25 12 28 2, Ez. 19 12 26 11 33 20, Am. 3 11 5 7, Ps. 89 45 143 3, Lam. 2 11. In Jer. 14 2 we must read *qadhādhū la'ārç*, they are bowed down to the ground = Assyr. *qaqqartš quddudū*; cf. HW, 580<sup>b</sup>. 503<sup>b</sup>. The

received text *qadhêrû la-'ârç* cannot mean *sind tiefgebeugt zur Erde hin* (Giesebrecht). The Peshita has *nêphâl(u) bê-'âr'â*. For the graphic confusion of *r* and *d* see below, note 108, and for Syr. *qê'idh*, to bend (esp. the knees) = Assy. *qadhûu*, cf. AJSL, 23. 245. Arab. *qâ'ada*, to sit, means originally *to squat*; for Arab. *qa'ida*, concubine, cf. Syr. *nêphâl 'am*, to have sexual intercourse with.

(13) That is, *lie concealed, bury thyself*. Cf. Symmachus rendering *ὄνοστίλλεσθαι*, to retire, in Jer. 25 *ss*. The original meaning is *burrow*. The renderings *sprinkle* (LXX, *καταάρτειν, σπρωτόνναι*; Vulgate, *conspargere, aspergere*; Peshita, *ithpalpâl* or *ittêpû*) or *wallow, roll* are gratuitous.

(14) The clause *Tell it not in Gath* (cf. above, p. 89), at the beginning of this verse is a marginal quotation (BL, 80, l. 6) from David's elegy on the death of Saul and Jonathan (JHUC, No. 163, p. 55<sup>b</sup>).

(15) The negative in *bakhô al-tiokh* of the received text, instead of *bakhô bêkhlô*, is due to the preceding illustrative quotation *bê-Ghath al-taggidhu*.

(16) *Bê-ôêth* in the received text is a corruption of *bênôêthâikh*. The words *bêth*, *batk*, *bênê*, *bênôth* are often confounded; cf. note 25. For *bath* = *batk*, cf. Is. 10 *ss* and *Est.* 20, last note on 2 *γ*. Ruth 2 *γ* we must read instead of *batk* *hab-baitk mē'ât*, which is meaningless, *šavêthâk hab-bath mē'ât*, the girl rested little. For *bath* = girl, cf. Cant. 6 *s*, Gen. 30 *ss*. Similarly we must read in Mic. 1 *ss* *Bath-Akheiv*, the maiden Achzib, instead of *bâtûš Akheiv*, the houses of Achzib; cf. below, note 49. *Bakhâk*, to weep, may be construed with the accusative (cf. Deut. 21 *ss*: *bakhethâk âth-avîha wê-'âth-immâk*) just as we may use *weep* instead of *bewail, bemoan* (cf. *un-weep*).

(17) The *daughters of Jerusalem* are the Judean cities in the *Shephelah*, captured by Sennacherib; cf. note 5.

(18) Cf. *Pur.* 25 *s*, *Est.* 37 = AJSL, 24. 133; see also below, note 26.

(19) According to *Martí*, v. 1<sup>a</sup> is the sequel of v. 9; he combines vv. 1<sup>a</sup> *s. s. s. s.* But v. 1<sup>b</sup> is one of the latest glosses in the Book, and v. 1<sup>a</sup> belongs to the introductory (Maccabean) psalm which glorifies John Hyrcanus' destruction of Samaria about 107 B.C. Cf. note 121.

(20) For lines with 3 + 2 beats in English poems see my paper *The Religion of the Hebrew Prophets* in the *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1908), p. 270; cf. BL, xliii, n.† and the remarks on the anapestic pentameter in Browning's *Saul* on p. 25 of *The Elements of English Verse* by J. W. Bright and R. D. Miller (Boston, 1910).

(21) For the Assyrian invasion of the *Shephelah*, cf. note 17. This elegy was originally preceded by 2 *s*.

(22) That is, *scantily clad*, with nothing on but a loin-cloth; cf. our *undressed* and above, note 18. A misplaced gloss to 'ârôm is 'aryâh in v. 11; cf. 'êrôm wê-'aryâh, Ez. 16 *γ. ss* 23 *ss*. *Boêth* in Mic. 1 11, which is wanting in LXX, is a tertiary gloss to 'aryâh. Without the gloss 'aryâh the adjective 'ârôm, naked, might be mistaken for 'arôm, cunning; and without the tertiary gloss *boêth*, the noun 'aryâh might be misread 'arêhâ = LXX *ῥὰς πόλεισ ἀτρήσ*. For both 'ârôm and 'êrôm we had better read throughout 'rôm; cf. *rîšôn = rōšôn, ikhôn = lôkhôn, hîçôn = hûçôn, Pîšôn = Pûšôn*; see *Nah*.

86, last but one paragraph of notes on v. 18. The original form was 'ārām (for 'āvārām). This became, with obscuration of the ā-vowels, 'ōrōm, and then, with dissimilation, 'īrōm.

(23) The Heb. text has *barefoot and unclad*; the order has been reversed in the English translation for the sake of the rhythm. Heb. šōlāl means *stripped*, especially *unshod* (Jer. 2 28), i.e. *without shoes*. The imperative šal (nē'alēkha), Ex. 3 8 (cf. Josh. 5 15), must be derived from šalāl, and it would be better to read šōl instead of šal. Šōlāl is a synonym of yāhēf; cf. Is. 20 2. Elēkhāh before šōlāl in the present passage is a gloss.

(24) That is *ostriches*. At night the ostrich emits a hoarse, melancholy note resembling the lowing of an ox in pain; cf. Job 30 2. In Arabic the ostrich is called abu 'ḡ-ḡahārū, father of the deserts.

(25) For 'al-bēnē ta'nūghāikh we must read 'al-bēnōth ta'nūghāikh; cf. notes 16 and 49. Cant. 7 7 the beloved is called bath-ta'nūghim, daughter of delight, i.e. a delightful maiden, a delightful girl; cf. also note 107. The omission of the final t of bath there and of bēnōth in the present passage is due to haplography.

(26) Heb. wa-ghōzzi, shave, is a gloss to the preceding gorhī, tonsure, make bald! The hair was cut off as a sign of mourning; cf. Lev. 21 5, Is. 15 2, Ez. 7 18. Originally a man in grief would tear his hair; afterwards it was merely tonsured as a conventional sign of mourning; see Pur. 26. 1; cf. above, note 18, and the conclusion of note 27.

(27) Lit. *tonsure thy tonsure*; the imperative harhīvi before gorhāthēkh is a gloss like elēkhāh before šōlāl in v. 8. Also ki-ighlū mimmekh, because they will be deported from thee, at the end of this verse, is a gloss. The omission of the preformative of the imperfect after ki is due to haplography. A misplaced gloss to this verse is preserved at the end of ch. 4, where we must read: 'attāh hithgōdhēdh hithgōdhādhi | maḡōr sam-'alēnu || baš-ševē yakkū 'al-lēhi | āth-šōphēt Iera'el, Now lacerate thy flesh, | he has laid siege against us. || With a rod on the cheek they'll smite | the ruler of Israel. Israel stands for Judah; cf. note 85. This ruler (or regent) of Judah is Zedekiah (2 K. 25 6). Jerusalem is to lacerate her flesh in mourning, because she is besieged by the Chaldeans; cf. Jer. 47 8 16 8 41 8, Deut. 14 1, 1 K. 18 28. For laceration of the flesh in mourning see EB, 971. The mourners did not shed their blood to feed the manes of departed friends, but originally mourners were so excited that they scratched themselves till the blood ran; afterwards they made merely some symbolical incisions; cf. above, note 26, and the remarks on the covering of the mustache in note 102. Another misplaced gloss (to 1 12) in the fourth chapter has been pointed out at the conclusion of note 4.

(28) That is, a griffin vulture (*Gyps fulvus*). Vultures have their head and neck more or less bare of feathers.

(29) The siege and capture of the Judean cities in the *Shephelah* endangers Jerusalem. Jerusalem was afterwards blockaded by Sennacherib.

(30) The Assyrian besiegers. Lit. *breaker*, i.e. *one who makes breaches* in the walls, etc. Cf. Πολυρκητής and *The Hammer* (Nah. 2 1).

(31) The Assyrians.

(32) Sennacherib.





(33) Saphir has the same meaning as Jaffa; *Saphir* (later *Sappir*) means *beautiful* in Aramaic, and *yaphô* (for *yaphâh*) is the feminine of Heb. *yaphêh*, beautiful. The name Shapira is Aramaic, the name Jaffé is Hebrew. Philipp Jaffé was a distinguished contributor to the *Monumenta Germaniae historica*. For Shapira cf. E. König, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Bonn, 1893) § 7. Saphir was the name of a well-known Jewish journalist who died at Vienna in 1858; but his name was derived from *sapphire*, Heb. *sappîr*; cf. Rubinstein, etc.

(34) This is an Arabic plural form of *Saphîr*; cf. e.g. Arab *fâris*, horseman; plur. *fawâris*.

(35) Arab. *ḥasy* (or *ḥisy*, *ḥesy*) means *level ground saturated with water*.

(36) Cf. 2 K. 18 14, 17 19 18, Is. 36 2.

(37) See the plate facing p. 48 of the translation of *Isaiah* in the Polychrome Bible.

(38) For the name *Sennacherib* see my paper *Midian and Sinai* in ZDMG, 63. 517, note 18, and my paper *The Burning Bush and the Origin of Judaism* in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 48, p. 359, n. 19.

(39) A *kusî nîmêdî* is a (high) chair with a footstool; see my paper *Some Assyrian Etymologies* in AJSL, 26. 7, § 6.

(40) Bezold's and Delitzsch's renderings *received* (KB, 2. 115) and *reviewed* (HW, 150<sup>a</sup>) are impossible. *He caused to proceed* would be *ušētiq*.

(41) See J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln* (Leipzig, 1908), Nos. 328 and 329, also Nos. 287, l. 15; 288, l. 43. For the cuneiform tablet found at *Tel el-Hesi* see *ibid.* No. 333; cf. OLZ, 2. 6, 54, 78, and p. 53 of the translation of *Joshua* in the Polychrome Bible.

(42) Cf. F. J. Bliss, *A Mound of Many Cities; or Tell el-Hesi excavated* (London, 1898).

(43) In Mic. 1 1 *Dêvâr Yahwêh âšâr hayâh âl-Mikkâh ham-Mârêšatî bîmê Yêhizqiyâh mâlkh Yêhûdâh* represents a secondary addition, and *Yôtham Ahâz* as well as the second relative clause *âšâr hayâh 'al-šômêrôn w-îrûšalêm* are tertiary or quaternary glosses. The clause *âšâr hayâh 'al-šômêrôn w-îrûšalêm* is based on a misinterpretation of the introductory (Maccabean) hymn; cf. note 121. The addition of the names *Yôtham Ahâz*, which may be derived from Is. 1 1, is still later. The secondary addition may be pre-Maccabean, but the tertiary and quaternary glosses may be post-Maccabean. The addition of *Yôtham Ahâz* necessitated the reading *malkhê Yêhûdâh* instead of *mâlkh Yêhûdâh*. In *lê-malkhê Isra'êl* (for *Yêhûdâh*; cf. note 85) at the end of v. 14, the plural ending is due to dittography. For the origin of the termination *-ê* see *Kings* 260. 34; 270, n. \*; cf. *Nah.* 42, n. †; for the original meaning of the name *Yêhûdâh* cf. ZDMG, 63. 513, n. 1; and for the difference between *Israel* and *Judah* cf. *ibid.* 507, ll. 1-7. 29-32. 38-42; 512, l. 41-513, l. 8. Also in Jer. 26 18 we must read *ham-Mûrêšatî*; the *Waw* before the *Resh* is due to dittography; cf. ZDMG, 63. 515, l. 19. The fragmentary couplet in Jer. 26 18, *šîyôn sadhêh theharêš | w-îrûšalêm 'iyim tihyêh || wê-har-hab-Bâith lê-ômath yâ'r | \* \* \* \* \* ||* is not quoted from Mic. 3 12, where it is not connected either with what precedes or what follows, but it has been added in Mic. 3 12 from Jer. 26 18. In 1 K. 22 28, on

the other hand, *Jim'ê 'ammim kullâm* represents a late insertion from Mic. 1 s; see below, note 121; cf. *Kings* 173 16. For the accusatives *sadhêh* and *'iyim*, see GK, § 117, ii; WdG, 2, 49, A. For *sadhêh* cf. OLZ, 12, 214, n. 15; AJSL, 26, 8, § 8.

(44) The *â* of the prefix *mâ* in *Mârêšâh* is unchangeable as it is in *mâ'ôz*, *mâghên*, etc. Cf. *Nah.* 19, below. *Mârêšâh* is connected with *rôš* (Aram. *rêš*), head (cf. *Josh.* 15 4), and means *capital*; cf. Lat. *caput regionis* and Heb. *rôš Arâm Dammêsq* (*Is.* 7 8). For the etymology of the name *Damascus*, see AJSL, 26, 26.

(45) Cf. French *le fleuve de l'Euphrate*; GK, §§ 128, k; 130, e; OLZ, 12, 213, note 11.

(46) Cf. *môdh* for *mê'ôdh* (*Nah.* 27) and *Bêth-šân* for *Bêth-šê'an* (see above, note 10).

(47) Cf. my paper *Some Germanic Etymologies* in *The American Journal of Philology*, vol. 27, p. 162.

(48) For the plural *bâtîm*, houses, and the singular *baith* (for *bêth*, *bâth*, *bâ't*) see *Nah.* 20, l. 4; cf. GK, 296, below. For the change from *â* to *ê* cf. Haupt, *The Assyrian E-vowel* (Baltimore, 1887), p. 19. The lower classes in London say *taibl* instead of *têbl* = *table*; cf. the pronunciation *now* (*nau*) for *no*, etc.

(49) Cf. above, notes 16 and 25.

(50) Cf. *Jud.* 15 s: *miç-gadhîš wê-'adh-qâmâh*, both the shocks and the standing grain; or *Gen.* 31 2: *miç-tôv 'adh-ra*, either good or bad; contrast *Is.* 1 s: *mik-kaph râghl wê-'adh rôš*, from the sole of the foot to the head.

(51) For *dâru*, cf. KAT<sup>2</sup>, 501; BA, 3, 579. Xenophon calls the Acropolis of Nineveh *τεῖχος*; see JAOS, 28, 99, n. 4; cf. *Nah.* 8, l. 12. *Bîl* before *dêrâni* in col. 3, l. 13 of Sennacherib's prism is a silent determinative.

(52) We must, of course, read *'ivrî* instead of *'orî*. The singular *'ivrî* is due to the preceding *hihpallesi*; cf. above, note 18.

(53) Read *miš-Šaphîr*; the omission of the preposition is due to haplography; *miš-Šaphîr* was preceded by *lakhêmi*. The intervening *yôšêvth* must be canceled; it is an erroneous repetition of *yôšêvth* in the following glosses (*yôšêvth Ça'nân* and *yôšêvth marôm*; cf. note 4) and in the second line of this couplet (*yôšêvth Lakhîš*). In v. 15<sup>a</sup> we must read *bath Mârêšâh* instead of *yôšêvth Mârêšâh*.

(54) Lit. *its post*; cf. *Kings*, 299, 30.

(55) Lit. *he* (= some one) *will take it*; cf. *Nah.* 30 (*ad v. 8*). *Mik-kêm* after *iqqâh* is a gloss. For the additional glosses inserted between *iqqâh* and *Šaphîr*, viz. *šryâh (bôšth)* — *lo-yaç'âh yôšêvth Ça'nân* — *mispâdh bêth ha-êçl*, see above, notes 5 and 22, also p. 86, l. 29. A misplaced gloss to *'ivrî lakhêmi miš-Šaphîr*, *iqqâh 'âmdathô* appears in 2 10: *qûmu u-lêkhû, ki-lo-zôth ham-mnuhâh*, Arise and go, for this is no safe place! For *mênûhâh*, tranquillity, comfort, security, see AJSL, 21, 141, note 21, and for the article, cf. OLZ, 11, 128. The second half of Mic. 2 10 must be read: *ba-'vâr tum'âh têhubbêlô vê-šâvîl nîmrâç*, because of impurity (i.e. transgression of the moral law) ye will be ensnared in a deadly snare. This is a misplaced gloss to 2 s: *Hinnô hošêv | 'al-ham-mišpâhâh || lo-tamišu miš-šâm | çav'êrêth-êkêzîm*; Lo, against this clique | He'll plan something || wherefrom they will not | slip their

necks. Also *hāvi* between *mašikkh* and *gōrāl* in v. 8 is a misplaced gloss to *lo-yamīdu miš-šām çauwērōthekhēm*. For *hāvi nīmraç* cf. *mēçūdhāh rā'āh* Eccl. 9 18; *nīmraç* = *nahiāh* Nah. 3 19. For *wē-hāvi* instead of *wē-hāvi* (*bē-hāvi*) contrast OLZ, 12. 214, note 15. Cf. below, note 110.

(56) For *rēihōm* we must read the inf. abs. *rathōm*; cf. GK § 113, bb.

(57) For Heb. *rākhā*, see *Est.* 81 = AJSL, 24. 157.

(58) We should rather say, *Attach the steed to the cart, harness the horse to the vehicle* (Lat. *equos ad currum, or plaustrum, jungere*); French *atteler des chevaux à une voiture*; Arab. *'āllaqa 'l-xāila ft-'l-'ājalati*, but Livy says *currus albis equis junctus*, and Cicero, *reda equis juncta*.

(59) In the description of Sennacherib's second invasion of Southern Palestine from the north (Is. 10 28-32) this idea is explained by *he'tsū*, they bring into safety, they save. This (non-Isaianic) poem (which consists of two stanzas, each of which is composed of two couplets, with 2 + 2 beats in each line) may be translated as follows:

28	He is come to Aiath,	he is passed to Migron;
29	He musters { } at Michmash, <sup>a</sup>	Geba is the night-camp. <sup>β</sup>
	Ramah is frightened,	and γ Gibeah flees,
31	Madmenah takes flight,	the δ Gebites pack off.{}
30	Now call for help, Listen, Laishah!	O maiden Gallim! answer her, Anathoth!
32	This very day His fist he shakes	he'll halt at Nob, 'gainst the mount of the Temple. <sup>ζ</sup>

(a) 29 they have passed the pass (β) where they spend the night (γ) Saul's  
(δ) 31 inhabitants (ε) 28 their belongings (ζ) 32 Zion (η) the hill of Jerusalem

For the second campaign of Sennacherib against Jerusalem, see EB, 4368; RE, 14. 119, l. 6; cf. also the conclusion of Professor Fullerton's paper cited above, note 7. — Aiath (= Ai) is probably the low hill *Khirbet Hātyān*, just S of *Dēr Diwān*, E of Beth-el, about 9 miles from Jerusalem. — Migron = *Makrān*, north of Michmash. — Michmash is the modern *Mukhmāš*, 7 miles N of Jerusalem. It is separated from Geba by a very steep and rough valley at the bottom of which is the Pass of Michmash. A glossator has therefore added *they have passed the pass*; cf. 1 S. 14 a. s. — Geba is the modern *Jeba'*, 5½ miles N from Jerusalem. It stands on the top of a rocky ridge, commanding an extensive view, and was therefore suitable for a bivouac. — Ramah is the modern *er-Rān*, 5 miles north from Jerusalem, 2000 feet above the level of the sea. — Gibeah, the birthplace of Saul, is *Tel-el-Fūl*, a bare conical hill about 4 miles N of Jerusalem. — Madmenah, Geb, Gallim, Laishah, Nob have not been identified. Madmenah means *dung-hill*; Geb = *pit, cistern*; Gallim = *wells*; Laishah = *lion*; Nob = *hollow*. — Laishah may be the modern *el-'Isdūriyeh*, a small village on the eastern slope of a mountain to the NNE of the Mount of Olives, less than an hour's walk from Anathoth, the birthplace of Jeremiah, i.e. the modern *'Anāth*, NE of Jerusalem.

The Hebrew text should be read as follows :

ISAIAH 10 20-22

20	Bâ 'al-'Aiyâth	'avâr lē-Mighrôn
20	Bē-Mikhmas iphqôdh } <sup>a</sup>	Géva' malôn. <sup>β</sup>
	Hāredhâh ha-Râmâh	Giv'âth v nâsâh
21	Nôdhâdâh Madhmenâh	<sup>δ</sup> hag-Getim he'izu. { <sup>γ</sup>
20	Çahî qôlêkh	bâth Gallim
	Haqšivi Lâisah	'ânîha 'Anathôth.
22	'Odh hai-yôm	bē-Nôv la'môdh
	Yēnôphêph yadhô	'al-hâr hab-Bâith. <sup>δ</sup>

(a) 29 'avêrâ ma'barâh

(3) lônâ

(γ) Ša'âl

(8) 31 yôševôš

(c) 23 kelôv

(5) 32 Çiyôn

(7) giv'âth Yêrûšalém

We must transpose the prepositions prefixed to *Mighrôn* and *Mikhmas* (v. 20). For *yaphqîdh* read the Qal *iphqôdh*, he musters (his army). *Kelûv* is a misplaced gloss to *he'izu* at the end of the first stanza. For *iphqôdh* without an object, cf. 1 S. 14 17. *Iphqôdh* was probably written *plene*; cf. the *scriptio plena* of *ya'môdh*, Nah. 1 6 (see *Nah.* 19 and *AJSL*, 28. 10) and *šrôš* for *šrâš* (*Mic.* 6 15; see note 89; cf. also note 96). For the perfect forms *hāredhâh*, *nâsâh*, *nôdhâdâh*, we must read the participles; contrast note 116. Verse 21 must be inserted before v. 20. For *çahî qôlêkh*, cf. GK, § 117, s, and *Nah.* 39, l. 6. The prefixed *l* in *la'môdh* (v. 22) is the emphatic *la* = verily; cf. *Est.* 56, l. 4, and below, note 68. Before *hâr* we must insert '*al*'; cf. *Pur.* 5. 29; 33. 28. *Bâith* should have the article; cf. *Mic.* 3 12. *Çiyôn* is secondary, and *giv'âth Yêrûšalém* is a tertiary gloss. In *'ânîha Anathôth*, perhaps also in *nôdhâdâh Madhmenâh*, we have paronomasia; but not in the first three hemistichs of v. 20, or in the first hemistich of the second couplet of the first stanza, nor is there any intentional paronomasia in *Nov* and *yēnôphêph*; *Duhm*'s renderings *Erregt ist Harama*, *Gelle laut*, *Bath Gallim*, *lausche Laischa*, etc., are therefore gratuitous. We might imitate the paronomasia (cf. note 3) in *nôdhâdâh Madhmenâh* by the rendering *Madmenah is menaced*, or *Like mad runs Madmenah*. The paronomasia, however, may be accidental; at any rate this poem, which is later than B.C. 690, cannot be called a *capucinade*.

I was reminded of the couplet

Ramah is frightened,      and Gibeah flees,  
Madmenah takes flight,      the Gebites pack off.

by a paragraph in the cablegrams from Paris, Jan. 25, 1910, describing the enormous damage in France done by the raging waters: *Melum is in darkness*, *Verdon-S-Le Daube is partially flooded*, *Verdun is submerged*, and *Chambery is threatened*. The majority of the names in this cablegram are just as corrupt as a great many names in the Old Testament (cf. e.g. *Est.* 68). The names should, of course, read *Melum*, *Verdun-sur-le-Doubs*, *Verdun*, *Chambéry*.

(80) The assonance of *rākhs* (or, in pause, *rākhs*) and *Lakhis* is not very striking. If we read in the first hemistich *Ṭa'ōn rēkhāv ba-rēkhāv*, we should have a better paronomasia, but *rathōm merkavāh la-rākhs* is no doubt original. *Ṭa'ōn* (cf. Gen. 45 17) is an Aramaic word; the genuine Hebrew form would be *ṣa'ōn* (cf. Is. 33 20) = Assy. *ṣenu*; see *Nah.* 26, l. 2; 35, l. 3; *Est.* 47 (ad 6 s). For Heb. *rēkhāv*, property, cf. *Est.* 61. *Bēkhāv* (Ps. 104 s) appears in Assyrian as *rukādu*; cf. HW, 620<sup>a</sup>; *Kings* 175. 2.

(61) In the present passage *lakhén* is not the common word meaning *therefore*, but the adverb *kén*, thus, with prefixed emphatic *l*, so that *lakhén* *tittēni* means *verily thus thou wilt give*, or *so thou must indeed give*; cf. the remark on *la'mōdh* above, note 59. This *lakhén*, such being the case, under these circumstances, accordingly, has about the same meaning as *bēkhén*; cf. *Est.* 22 (ad 2 vs). For *scriptio plena* of this emphatic particle, see OLZ, 10. 305. In the Talmud (e.g. *Pea.* 54<sup>a</sup>; *Yōm.* 22<sup>b</sup>; *Sanh.* 40<sup>b</sup>; cf. BT, 2. 511<sup>b</sup>, l. 19; 811<sup>b</sup>, l. 9; 7. 168<sup>b</sup>, l. 2) we find *lai*, verily, which is a contraction of *lā-hi*. The explanation (*not so!*) given in Levy's Talmudic dictionary (2. 462) is wrong; contrast Dalman's *Wörterbuch*, p. 202<sup>a</sup>; cf. also *Levi's* grammar, § 163, end (= *AJSL*, 13. 70). Another Talmudic particle which has not been explained is *ammāi*, why (e.g. *Shabb.* 48<sup>a</sup>, 80<sup>a</sup>; *Erub.* 70<sup>a</sup>, 97<sup>a</sup>). This corresponds to Assy. *ammāi*, why? for *ana māni*, for what? Contrast HW, 407<sup>a</sup>; AG<sup>2</sup>, 217.

*Lakhén* has four different meanings in the Old Testament: (a) *therefore*; — (b) *verily thus*; — (c) *not at all*; — (d) *all right*.

In (a) *lakhén*, therefore, the prefixed *la* is the preposition *lē*, for (cf. *la-sōth*, Job 37 1, Jer. 5 7), while the second element represents the adverb *kén*, thus. This *kén*, thus, appears in Arab. *lākinna* (see below, c) and in Syr. *hākhānnā*, thus. Assy. *kī'am* (HW, 326<sup>a</sup>) shows that *kén* is a contraction of *kī'ā-ma*, i.e. the adverbial accusative of *kī* (KAT<sup>2</sup>, 505) with the emphatic *-ma* which appears in Hebrew as *-nā* (GK, 318, n. 3). *Kī'ā-ma* became *kiamma*, *kianna*, *kanna*, or *kinna*, and finally *kīn*, *kén*.

We find the same adverb in (b) *lakhén*, verily thus; but the prefixed *la* in this case is the emphatic particle; cf. e.g. Num. 16 11, 1 S. 3 14, Mic. 2 5 5, 2, Job 34 2 42 s; cf. also Is. 26 14 61 7.

Also in (c) *lakhén*, not at all, by no means, we have this adverb *kén*, thus; but here the prefixed *la* represents the negative, so that *lakhén* means originally *not so* (= *lō khén*, Gen. 48 18). LXX *οὐχ οὐτως* in Gen. 4 15, Job 20 2, Jud. 11 s (where *u-maddū' bāthēm elāi 'attāh ka'sār qar lakhēm* is a gloss) is quite correct; contrast Driver *ad* 1 S. 3 14 28 2. The Vulgate renders Gen. 4 15 correctly: *nequaquam ita fiet*, and the Peshita has: *lā hā-khānnā*. In Arabic this *lakhén* appears as the adversative particle *lākinna*; Arab. *jā'ani Zaidun lākinna 'Amran lam yaji'* (WdG, 2. 333, D) means originally *Zaid came to me; not so Amr: he did not come*.

In (d) *lakhén*, all right (e.g. Gen. 30 15, Jud. 8 7, 1 S. 28 2, 1 K. 22 19, 2 K. 1 4. 8, Is. 7 14), the prefixed *la* is the emphatic particle as in (c) *lakhén*, verily thus; but the *kén* in this connection is the adjective *kén*, straight (cf. HW, 322<sup>b</sup>). This *lakhén* means originally *quite correct*, lit. *verily* (it is) *correct*. It would, of course, be possible to explain this *lakhén*, all right, as *quite so*, lit. *verily* (it is) *so*; on the other hand, *lakhén*, not at all, might

be taken as a compound of *la*, not, and *khen*, correct; but I believe that the second element of *lakhén*, all right, is the adjective *kén*, right (from the stem *kûn*), while the second element of *lakhén*, not at all, is the adverb *kén* (= *kîd-ma*), thus.

In the third edition of Professor Kautzsch's German translation of the Old Testament *lakhén* is correctly rendered *nun gut* in Jud. 8 17, or *gut* in 1 S. 28 2; nor are the translations *meinetwegen* in Gen. 30 15, or *somit* in Num. 16 11, or *so . . . denn* in 1 S. 3 14 inappropriate; but the renderings *ebendarum* in Gen. 4 15, or *ja* in Jud. 11 5, or *darum* in 1 K. 22 19, 2 K. 1 4 6, Is. 7 15 are erroneous.

(62) Cf. BL, 111.

(63) Cf. Jud. 1 12, Josh. 15 15. The same word (Heb. *šillûšîm*) is used in 1 K. 9 15.

(64) See p. 396 of Grisebach's new edition of *Des Knaben Wunderhorn*, cited *Pur.* 40, l. 36; BL, 48, l. 5.

(65) When Prince Eugene captured Lille in 1708, Charles VI was but 23 years old, while Louis XIV was 70.

(66) The name of the German fortress *Magdeburg* means *Maiden Castle*.

(67) See *Cant.* 6, 32, 60, 84, BL, 5, 41, 117, 133.

(68) The prefixed *lè* is the emphatic particle; cf. above, note 61, and below, note 111, end.

(69) See *Cant.* 68; BL, 89.

(70) In one of these songs the maiden says: When thou art thirsty, there is the water of my breasts which are like water-wheels, i. e. If you desire me, my charms will satisfy you; see BL, 89, l. 6; 72, l. 6; 126 (*ad p.* 73). Cf. also Hos. 2 4, and below, note 80.

(71) See Haupt, *The Book of Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905), p. 44, n. 15; cf. *Oriental Studies* (Boston, Ginn & Co., 1894), p. 276, note 63; contrast Professor G. A. Barton's commentary on *Ecclesiastes* (New York, 1908), p. 195.

(72) That is, Have no carnal connection with any other but thy lawful spouse; let her be thy sole wellspring of happiness. Thou must not commit adultery.

(73) For interrogative clauses without an interrogative particle cf. *Cant.* 74; BL, 111; GK, § 150, a. It would be better to prefix *al* to *yaphûçu*; the omission of the negative which we find in LXX may be due to a misunderstanding of the passage.

(74) That is, the women with whom thou hast sexual intercourse. Thy source of (sensual) pleasure must be a sealed fountain, inaccessible to any one but thyself; see BL, 88, note 31; cf. also the Talmudic passage discussed in JBL, 21. 54.

(75) Beyond the walls of thy house, in the street. Cf. *Ecclesiasticus* 9 7.

(76) Bring no sacrifices to *Venus vulgiva*; have no intercourse with a prostitute who walks the streets and squares.

(77) Have no carnal connection with a woman who has a number of paramours.

(78) We must read *barûr*, pure, instead of *barûkh*, blessed.

(79) *The lovely hind, the charming wild goat* (the female of the ibex or

*steinbock*) at the beginning of this verse are glosses (or variants) to *the wife of thy youth*. Cf. BL, 75, n. 32; 86, n. 20.

(80) Lit. *water thee*; cf. above, note 70.

(81) The first *tiḡēh* (v. 19) is a mistake for *tišbē*, from *savā*, to drink (*tertīa Aleph*). For the confusion, at the hands of the scribes, of different expressions in two hemistichs cf. OLZ, 12. 212, l. 10 (in Cant. 8 e we must read *kaṭ-ṭabbā'th*, like a signet, instead of the second *kaḥ-ḥdithām*, like a seal; cf. MT, 9, n. 6), and for this use of *savā*, to drink, cf. Prov. 7 18 (BL, 74, n. 24) and the Talmudic *sarāph* (= Arab. *sārība*) in Berakhoth 62<sup>a</sup>. Also in Prov. 20 1 we must read *savā*, drunk, instead of *šdghēh*: wine mocks, strong drink is exciting; he who gets drunk is unwise (Heb. *Leṣ-yáin, homēh šekḥār | savā-vo lō yāhḥām*). *Wē-khoi* before *savā* is scribal expansion. In Prov. 5 23, on the other hand, *iḡēh* is a corruption of *issaphēh*; see *Proverbs* 39 19.

(82) Cf. the modern German term *Eheirrung*.

(83) Lit. *a strange woman's*. The majority of the prostitutes at that time, it may be supposed, were foreigners.

(84) The Hebrew text should be read as follows:

15 <i>Šēheh-máim mīl-lēv bōrēkha</i>	<i>wē-nozīm mīl-tōkh bērēkha.</i>
16 <i>Yaphūcu ma'ynoithēkha ḥūcah</i>	<i>ba-rḥōvoth páighe máim ?</i>
17 <i>Ihyū lēkhā lēvaddēkha</i>	<i>wē-ēn lē-zarim ittākh.</i>
18 <i>Yēhī mēḡōrkhá varūr</i>	<i>u-smāh me-ēsth nē'urēkha.</i>
19 <i>Daddēha yērauwākha vē-khol-ēth</i>	<i>bē-ahvathāh tišbē thamīdh.</i>
20 <i>Lámah thīḡēh vē-zarāh</i>	<i>u-thēhābbeq hēq nokhrīyāh ?</i>

In the first hemistich meter and parallelism require the insertion of *lēv*, heart, interior, before *bōrēkha*; cf. AJSL, 23. 258, note 3. *Ḥeq* means *lap* rather than *bosom*; see JBL, 21. 23, 46; cf. our phrase *to take to one's bosom* = to marry. For the explanation, in the second triplet, of the imagery of the first triplet cf. *Nah.* 29, l. 3.

(85) *Israel* is a scribal error for *Judah*; cf. notes 27 and 93.

(86) Read *yavō 'elāikh* for *avī lākh*. The omission of the initial *Aleph* of *elāikh* was due to haplography; cf. *Est.* 47 (*ad v.* 4).

(87) We must read *bath* instead of *yošēvith*; cf. above, note 53.

(88) See 2 S. 16 23; cf. EB, 2948.

(89) There is no etymological connection between *Marešah* and *yōrēs*, heir. *Marešah* is connected with *rōš*, head (cf. note 44), whereas *yōrēs*, heir, is connected with *šrōš*, must, the unfermented juice pressed from the grape. The original meaning of the stem *yarās*, to inherit, is *to press, squeeze, extort, rob, bereave*. In Mic. 6 15 we must read *šrās*, instead of *šrōš*, 23 a verb in the sense of *thou wilt press* the juice from the grapes. The *Waw* is due to dittography of the *r*; cf. the remarks on the *scriptio plena* of *īphqōdh* in note 59. We must read this late passage: *Tōkhāl wē-lō thīšbā' | (attāh) tīzrā' wē-lō thīḡōr || (attāh) ttāhrōkh (zāth) wē-lō thasūkh (šāmn) | wē-thīrās wē-lō thīšēh (yain)*, i.e. *Thou wilt eat and not be sated; | thou wilt sow, but thou wilt not reap; || thou wilt tread, but thou wilt not anoint; | thou wilt press, but thou wilt not drink*. This couplet should be inserted after vv. 13, 14, and for the 2 masc. we may read the 2 fem.

(90) Cf. the conclusion of the last but one paragraph of note 59.

(91) Cf. GK, § 119, s; Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.* § 224. This *dativus com- modi* is by no means late or colloquial.

(92) For the glosses in this verse see above, note 55; and for the late (theological) gloss in the next verse (12) cf. note 4.

(93) The second half of this verse (*rešîth haṭṭâth-ai | lē-vâih Çiyôn || kî-vâkh nimçê'û | piš'e Yēhūdāh*, The primary sin | is Zion's, the maiden's; || in thee were found | Judah's transgressions) is a late (tertiary) gloss to v. 6 which is a secondary (theological) addition to the last couplet (vv. 6, 7) of the introductory (Maccabean) psalm celebrating John Hyrcanus' destruction of Samaria about 107 B.C. JHWH says: *I made Samaria a heap, | pouring down her stones to the valley*, and a (theological) glossator (who erroneously referred this to Sargon's capture of Samaria in 721 B.C.) added in v. 6: *All this is due to Jacob's transgression, to the sins of the Israelitish nation*. This is followed by the gloss *Who* (represents) *Jacob's transgression? Is it not Samaria?* and by the gloss *Who* (represents) *the heights of Judah? Is it not Jerusalem?* This last gloss refers to *wē-dharâkh 'al-bamôthe ha-'ârç* at the end of v. 3. We must not substitute the singular *haṭṭâth* for *haṭṭôth* in v. 6; nor can we read *Bêth-Yēhūdāh* instead of *Bêth-Isra'él*, and *haṭṭâth Yēhūdāh* instead of *bamôth Yēhūdāh*. Marti regards this late gloss in v. 6<sup>b</sup> as the first genuine line of Micah. Contrast note 102.

(94) 'Ôdh at the beginning of this verse is incorrect dittography of 'adh at the beginning of the following line.

(95) For 'adhê instead of 'adh cf. *minnê* for *min*, AJSL, 19. 133, below.

(96) 'Adhullâm instead of 'blâm is due to the common graphic confusion of *Waw* and *Daleth*; cf. the remarks on the *scriptio plena* of *iphqôdh* in note 59 and below, notes 97 and 108.

(97) *Yavô* is corrupted from *yôvâdh* (with *Waw* for *Daleth*, and *Aleph* transposed).

(98) The following verse (1 16) is the second line of the second couplet of the first stanza of this elegy; see above, p. 87.

(99) Lit. *Attach the cart to the steed*; cf. notes 56-60.

(100) Lit. *Achzib is indeed* (cf. note 68) *an achzab* (i.e. a deceitful brook which dries up during the summer) *to the king of Judah*; cf. above, p. 91.

(101) Lit. *the heir will go in to thee, O maiden Mareshah*; cf. notes 86-89.

(102) The text of this poem must be restored as follows:

A	i	3	9	<i>Ha-mthá'avim mišpát</i>	<i>w-eth-kól hayšarûh yē' aqqêšu</i>
			10	<i>Bonê Çiyôn bê-dhamim</i>	<i>w-Irûšalém bê'aulâh.</i>
	ii		2	<i>Hag-gozîm 'orâm me-'alehém</i>	<i>wē-šerâm me-'al-'âçmothám</i>
				<i>W-eth-âçmôthehém piççêhu</i>	<i>kē-vasar bê-thôkh qallâth.</i>
				[ <i>noçkhim</i>	
B	iii		6	<i>Ham-math'im eth-'ammî, han-</i>	<i>bē-šinnehém, wē-qar'û šalôm!</i>
				<i>Wa-'šer lo-itên 'al-pihém</i>	<i>wē-qiddêšû 'aláu mihamâh.</i>
				[ <i>hazôn</i>	
	iv		6	<i>Lakhen-lâilâh lakhém me-</i>	<i>wē-hasekhâh lakhém miq-qâsm!</i>
			7	<i>U-vôšu haḥ-hozîm wē-haphêru</i>	<i>wē-'at'û 'al-saphâm kullâm.</i>



For the *enjambement* in the first line of the second stanza (v. 5) cf. *Nah.* 29 (*ad* 2 1).

This poem may be rendered as follows :

- A 1 3 9 O ye who detest what is right,  
           perverting whatever is straight !  
 10 Who build up Zion with blood,  
           Jerusalem with outrage.
- ii 2 Who strip the skin from the poor,  
       the flesh from off their bones,  
       And chop their bones to pieces,  
       as though it were flesh in a pot.
- B iii 5 Ye who lead my people astray ;  
       have they aught to bite, they cry : Good !  
       But if one put nought in their mouth,  
       they open war against him.
- iv 6 Night will be for you, beyond vision  
       and darkness, beyond divination.  
       The seers will be shamed and abashed ;  
       they will all cover up their mustaches.

The mustache was covered as a sign of mourning ; cf. *Ezek.* 24 17 and above, note 26 ; *night* and *darkness* mean *disaster*. The outlook will be so gloomy that even the false prophets will not be able to prophesy anything favorable. The last but one stanza means : as long as the false prophets have something to eat they extol the prosperity of the kingdom. For the opening stanza cf. *Hab.* 2 12, *Is.* 1 15 59 s, *Jer.* 2 24, *Ez.* 23 48 ; also 1 K. 21 15. 12, 2 K. 21 16. Zion may be built up and embellished, Jerusalem may be enlarged and enriched, but the rulers are responsible for many bloody deeds and flagrant outrages.

(103) The prophet speaks, not *ЈНВН*. The original reading in the second hemistich of couplet iii was not *hinēni* (or *hinni*) *hōdēt*, but *hinno hōdēt*, he will plan, and this may be impersonal : some one will plan, it will be planned.

(104) We must read *šēlemāh* instead of *salmāh* ; cf. my remarks on *Am.* 1 9 in *OLZ*, 10. 308. *Šēlemāh* is explained by the gloss *me-ōvērīm bātāh* (*šēvī milhāmāh*) at the end of the verse.

(105) Even when a man seized the upper garment of a poor debtor, he was bound to restore it to him at sunset ; cf. *Ex.* 22 26, *Deut.* 24 13.

(106) Lit. *my wives* (Heb. *našai*). A glossator who took exception to this plural, added *'ammi*, thus reading *nēšš 'ammi*. He referred the suffixes, of course, to *ЈНВН*, not to the prophet. Cf. note 103.

(107) This denotes especially the places of conjugal bliss, the conjugal chambers, the harems ; cf. note 25. In a cuneiform incantation against evil spirits (*iv. R.* 27, No. 5 ; cf. *HW*, 513<sup>b</sup>, 696<sup>a</sup>) we read : *They startle the maid in her chamber, they drive the lord from his harem*, lit. *from the house of her union*, i.e. *union with her* (*GK*, § 128, h). *Prov.* 21 9 (25 24) means : *A corner on the roof is better than a termagant's conjugal chamber*, Heb.

*Too-la-ševth 'al-pinnath gágh me'ésth médhunim u-veh-háv.*

The two lines in the cuneiform incantation are :

*Ardata ina-maštakiša ušēlū  
edla ina-bit emūtiša ušēqū.*

For *ušēlū*, they startle, cf. BL, 80; for *maštaku*, chamber, cf. *Kings* 231. 40; for *bit emūti*, harem, Heb. *bēth hāv*, see *Kings* 161. 47.

(108) For *hadhari*, My glory (with the subsequent gloss *lē-'dīām*, for ever), we must read *hōrōthái*, my pregnant women; the *r* was miswritten *d*, and the *t* corrupted to *r*; cf. *AJSL*, 24. 105; 26. 10 and the remarks on Jer. 14 2 in note 12; also note 96. We find confusion of *Taw* and *Resh* e.g. in *Ieθeρ* = *Yēthēth*, Gen. 36 40. For *hōrāh* = *em*, mother, cf. Hos. 2 7; Cant. 3 4 (see BL, 5, viii; 19 δ). Heb. *harāh*, to be pregnant, is connected with Arab. *āriya*, to burn, which is used of anger, or of a pot, the lower portion of which has been burned black; cf. Arab. *ārra* = *āqada* and *jāma'a*; also Ps. 51 7: *bē-heṭ yāhmāthni immi*, in sin did my mother conceive me. Another Arabic word derived from the root *ar* is *urhūn*, a menstruant girl.

(109) That is, *clique*.

(110) *Ra'āh* as well as the preceding demonstrative pronoun *ha-zōth* and the following relative pronoun *āsār* represent explanatory glosses. For the misplaced glosses to this passage, which we find in v. 6 (*hāvi*, snare) and v. 10<sup>b</sup>, see the conclusion of note 55.

(111) The Hebrew text must be read as follows :

A 2 1	<i>Hoi-hōšve āun Bē-'ōr ya 'sūha</i>	<i>'al-miškēvothām ki-yēs i-el-yadhām.</i>
2	<i>Wē-hamdū sadhōth Wē-'āšqu gāv</i>	<i>wē-ghazlū vattim bethō wē-nahlathō.</i>
B 6	<i>W-attēm lē-'ammī Mim-mūl šelemāh</i>	<i>oyēv tithqomām āddarōth taphšitūn</i>
9	<i>Nāšāt tēgharšūn Me-'al-'ōlalehēn</i>	<i>miḅ-beth-tā'nughehēn tiqhū horothái.</i>
C 3	<i>Hinnō hošēv Lo-thamīšu miš-šām,</i>	<i>'al-ham-mišpahāh šauwērōthekkhēm.</i>
4	<i>Issū mašāl Šadhōdh nēsāddōnu,</i>	<i>wē-nahā nēhī: sadhēnu yēhāllēq.</i>

A glossator has added (in v. 5) to the last line: *takhēn lō-ihyēh lēkhā mašlikh gōrāl bi-qēhāl Yahwēh*, Thus (cf. n. 61) thou wilt have none who casts the lot (cf. Josh. 18 10) in the congregation of JHVH. — Another glossator remarks (in v. 6): *Lo-yatšiphu kha-'ēlleh, lo-yassigh kēlimmōth bēth Ya'qōv*, They ought not to talk such things, the House of Jacob cannot experience (lit. *attain*, from *hissigh*, Hiphil of *wasāgh*, with *Štn*) dishonor. *Yatšiphūn* and *allatšiphū* are variants (cf. *Nah.* 40 5; BL, 26. 3) to *latšiphū*. — A third glossator asks (in v. 7): *Ha-'ōmār, qašēr rūh Yahwēh 'im-*

*ēlîšh bē-ma'lēlêhēm ? hālîš dhēvarāu yēšivū 'im-hai-yasār hah-hōlēkh ahṛūu ?*  
Am I to think that JHVH has become impatient with them? Are not His words kind with him who is upright and follows Him? — Finally a glossator has added (in v. 11) :

<i>Lu-'îš halākḥ</i>	<i>wē-rûh kizzēv</i>
<i>Attîph lēkhā</i>	<i>lai-yāin wē-laš-šekhār</i>
<i>Wē-hayûh mattîph</i>	<i>ha-'ām haz-sēh !</i>

If a man should come with windy lies :  
"I'll talk to thee both wine and mead,"  
He would be the talker for such a people !

*Lû rûh kizzēv* means literally *if he lied wind*, i. e. if he uttered idle and untrue words ; *wa-šāqr* is an explanatory gloss to *rûh*. For the perfect in conditional clauses see GK, § 159, g. x ; SB, §§ 157, 159. The *l* prefixed to *hai-yāin* and *haš-šekhār* corresponds to the Assy. *lû . . . lû = sive . . . sive* or *et . . . et* ; see JHUC, No. 114, p. 107<sup>b</sup>, below ; GK, § 143, c ; cf. above, note 68.

(112) For Maccabean psalms see my remarks JHUC, No. 163, p. 54<sup>a</sup> ; AJSL, 23. 225, 256 ; MT, 6.

(113) See GJV, 1. 268 ; 2. 196.

(114) See my paper in ZDMG, 61. 275 ; cf. *Nah.* 1.

(115) Contrast Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* and Sievers' *Alttestamentliche Miscellen*, X (in the *Berichte der philologisch-historischen Klasse der Kgl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, May 4, 1907), pp. 70–80.

(116) We must read the perfect *yaqr* instead of the participle *yōqē* ; cf. *halākḥ* for *hōlēkh* in 2 11 ; see note 111.

(117) This couplet refers to a volcanic eruption, with streams of lava and earthquakes, whereby JHVH manifests Himself as in times of yore at Mount Sinai ; cf. p. 361 of my paper, *The Burning Bush*, cited above, in note 38, and ZDMG, 63. 520, n. 38.

(118) We must read *wē-sāmti*, I made, and *wē-higgārti*, I poured down, instead of *wē-samti*, I shall make, and *wē-higgarti*, I shall pour down.

(119) Of Greek gods.

(120) Votive offerings (*ἀναθήματα*) set up in the Greek temples of Samaria.

(121) The Hebrew text must be read as follows :

- |       |                                      |                                      |
|-------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| i 1 a | <i>Šim'ā 'ammîm kullām</i>           | <i>haqšivî êrc u-mî'ô'āl !</i>       |
|       | • <i>Kî-hinnēh yaqr mi-mqomô</i>     | <i>wē-dharākḥ 'al-bamôthe ārç.</i>   |
| ii    | • <i>We-namāssu hā-harîm tahtāu</i>  | <i>wē-ha-'āmaqîm îthbaqqā'u</i>      |
|       | • <i>Kā-donāgh mippēnē ha'ēs</i>     | <i>kē-māim muggarîm bē-morādḥ</i>    |
| iii   | • <i>Wē-sāmti Šomērôn lē-'avowāl</i> | <i>wē-higgārti lag-gāi āvanēha</i>   |
|       | • <i>Wē-khōl pēsîlēha yukkātū</i>    | <i>wē-khōl ethnannēha issarēphu.</i> |

For the glosses in vv. 1 and 5 see notes 43 and 93.

(122) The passage in *Italica* seems to be an explanatory gloss to the preceding clause. The Greek text reads as follows : 'Γρανοὶ μὲν οὖν τὴν πόλιν ἐλών, ἐπαινωῖ πολιορκήσας, οὐκ ἠρέσθη μόνω τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτὴν ἠφάνισεν, ἐπικλυστον τοῖς χειμάροισι ποιήσας (διασκάψας γὰρ αὐτήν, ὥστ' εἰς χαράδρας μεταπεσεῖν) τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ γενέσθαι ποτὲ πόλιν αὐτὴν ἀρεῖλετο. Cf. *Flavii Josephi Opera* ed. B. Niese, vol. iii (Berolini, 1892), p. 203.

(123) See GJV, 2. 196.

(124) Sargon says (KB, 2. 54, l. 23): *Samerina almi aksud*, I besieged and captured Samaria.

(125) See Josephus, *Ant.* 13. 10, 2.

(126) See GJV, 2. 18, 195.

(127) The Hebrew text of the Book of Micah, with critical notes, will be published in AJSL, July, 1910, the translation, with explanatory notes, will appear in AJSL, October, 1910.

(128) Georg Beer says in his most appreciative review of BL, published in the *Theologische Rundschau*, vol. 12, part 8 (Tübingen, 1909), pp. 300-302: *Was er uns hier anbietet, kommt fast einer Umdichtung des Hoheliedes gleich. H. teilt das Hohelied in zwölf Gesänge auf, wobei er nicht bloss zum Teil recht gewagten Umstellungen von Versen, sondern auch einer ganz anderen Anordnung der Lieder das Wort redet. . . . Haupt meint, dass die Lieder von Anfang an wohlgeordnet waren. Auch macht er sich anheischig, ihre ursprüngliche Reihenfolge und Gestalt wiederherzustellen. Eine Nötigung zu der von ihm als ursprünglich empfohlenen Reihenfolge der Lieder liegt aber nicht vor. . . . Jedenfalls ist der strikte Beweis, dass die Lieder III bis XI nur an der von Haupt ihnen zugewiesenen Stelle einst gestanden haben können, nicht erbracht. . . . Besser sieht es mit der Gestalt, die H. den einzelnen Liedern giebt. Professor Beer has misunderstood me. I stated (Cant. 19 = AJSL, 18. 209):*

While I admit that it may be impossible to recover the original songs and to retrace the plan of the collector, I believe that the traditional arrangement may be very much improved, and the Received Text freed from a great many subsequent additions and superfluous repetitions which have crept into the text. In this re-arrangement the songs certainly become much more intelligible than they are in their traditional 'charming confusion.' It makes very little difference in what order the various songs follow each other. The object of the present study is not the restoration of the sequence of the songs in the original collection, but the restoration of the individual songs. Whether No. 2 is placed before No. 8, or *vice versa*, is immaterial. It seems, however, that No. 9 is the sequel of No. 8. No. 11 might be inserted after No. 5, but this is of minor importance. . . . I do not claim to have restored the original order of the Book. The arrangement may have varied at an early date; it may even have been injudicious and inappropriate from the beginning. We have in Cant. not a *divan* collected by the poet himself, but a collection of popular songs by various authors, made by a later compiler. Consequently the main task of the Biblical critic is not, to restore the sequence of the various poems in the original collection, but to restore the original text of the individual poems.

*Sapienti sat!* Beer has forced an open door.

(129) Cf. Geo. A. Barton's commentary on Ecclesiastes (New York, 1908), p. 29.

(130) Cf. the plate facing p. 368 in vol. 6 (Leipzig, 1902) of Brockhaus' *Konversations-Lexikon (Neue revidierte Jubiläums-Ausgabe)*. Also the copy, which Michael Coxie made for Philip II of Spain, is scattered: parts of it are preserved in the Royal Museum of Berlin, others are in the Pinakothek of Munich.

## ABBREVIATIONS

AJSL = *American Journal of Semitic Languages* (Chicago).—BA = *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, edited by Delitzsch and Haupt.—BL = Paul Haupt, *Biblische Liebeslieder* (Leipzig, 1907).—BT = Lazarus Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud*.—E = east.—EB = Cheyne-Black, *Encyclopædia Biblica*.—GJV = E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, fourth edition (Leipzig, 1901-1909).—GK = Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebr. Grammatik*, 28th edition (Leipzig, 1909).—HW = Delitzsch, *Assyr. Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1896).—IN = Eduard Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (Halle, 1906).—JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.—JBL = *Journal of Biblical Literature*.—JHUC = *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* (Baltimore).—K = *Kings*.—KAT = E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, third edition (Berlin, 1903).—KAT<sup>2</sup> = second edition (Giessen, 1883).—KB = E. Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*.—MT = Haupt, *A Maccabean Talisman in the Florilegium Melchior de Vogüé* (Paris, 1909).—N = North.—OLZ = F. E. Peiser's *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* (Leipzig).—RE = *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, third edition, edited by A. Hauck (Leipzig, 1896-1909).—S = south or Samuel.—SB = Socin-Brockelmann, *Arabische Grammatik*, sixth edition (Berlin, 1909).—SBOT = Haupt, *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament*.—W = West.—WdG = Wright-de Goeje, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* (Cambridge, 1896).—ZAT = *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Giessen).—ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Leipzig).

*Cant.* = Haupt, *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902) = AJSL, 18, 193-245; 19, 1-32.—*Est.* = Haupt, *The Book of Esther* (Chicago, 1908) = AJSL, 24, 97-186.—*Nah.* = Haupt, *The Book of Nahum* (Baltimore, 1907) = JBL, 26, 1-53.—*Pur.* = Haupt, *Purim* (Leipzig, 1906) = BA, 6, part 2.

The (unabbreviated) names of Biblical books, e.g. *Genesis*, *Numbers*, *Kings*, *Proverbs*, refer to the Critical Notes on the Hebrew text in SBOT; the first number after the name of the book refers to the page; the second indicates the line. Cf. vol. xxvi of this JOURNAL, p. 49.