

the blood of Zacharias involves nothing like so great a strain upon the idea of solidarity as does Christ's idea of heirship to the blood of Abel; and the "ye" is, after all, less appropriate to the murder of Baruch's son by two Zealots against the will of priests and people, than to the murder of Jehoiada's son by king and princes and multitude.

I shall be reminded, of course, that the proffered solutions are conjectural. But so also are the placid affirmations that Baruch is the same as Berechiah, and that the murder spoken of was committed thirty-eight years after the words are said to have been uttered, and that consequently Matthew's Gospel, as we have it, is a late and untrustworthy composition. As a matter of fact, there are conjectures on both sides, and we have to choose between them. And while, as I believe, the Zacharias of the Chronicles seems to satisfy best the more vital requirements of the case, the conjectures incidental to the establishment of this belief are, at least, as reasonable as those favoured by Dr. Martineau.

JOHN MASSIE.

### BREVIA.

**Psalms of Solomon.**—It is well known that two of the psalms in our Psalter have the heading "To Solomon." These are not the only psalms however which have been ascribed to the wise king. Not to mention the collection of psalms of Pharisean origin, which in the Greek version bears the title *Ψαλμοὶ* (or *Ψαλτήριον*) *Σολομῶντος*—a title for which the psalmists themselves can hardly be held responsible—there appears to be a fragment of an early psalm ascribed to Solomon in the First Book of Kings. It was Wellhausen who first pointed this out (see Bleek's *Einleitung*, ed. 4, p. 236), but his restoration may be compared with Klostermann's, in his work on Samuel and Kings in Strack's series of commentaries. The passage may have run thus,

“The sun hath Yahveh set up in heaven ;  
 (But) he said he would (himself) dwell in darkness ;  
 I have built a high mansion for thee,  
 A place for thee to dwell in for all ages.”

Lines 2, 3, and 4 are given in 1 Kings viii. 12, 13 as a speech of Solomon before his benediction. It needs however no remarkable divining power to see that ver. 14 ought to follow ver. 12; and this suspicion is confirmed by the fact that the Septuagint gives vers. 12, 13 in a more complete form (*i.e.* with the addition of the opening line given above), with an introductory and a closing formula after ver. 33: Τότε ἐλάλησε Σολομὼν ὑπὲρ τοῦ οἴκου, ὡς συνετέλεσε τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι αὐτόν, “Ἡλιον ἔστησεν ἐν οὐρανῷ Κύριος, καὶ εἶπε τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐν γνόφῳ. Οἰκοδομήσον οἶκόν μου, εὐπρεπῆ σεαυτῷ, τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ καινότητος. Οὐκ ἰδοὺ αὕτη γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίον τῆς ᾠδῆς ; I have here followed Lucian, who reads ἔστησεν for ἐγνώρισεν ; but in lines 2, 3, and 4 I have not attempted to emend by the help of the Septuagint, feeling with Klostermann that the received text yields a finer sense than the Greek version (which at any rate itself needs some emendation). In lines 1 and 2 there is a contrast between the sun in his glorious heavenly mansion and the Creator who dwelleth in thick clouds. Then in lines 3 and 4 Solomon exclaims that he has built a lofty house (גָּבֹהַ, in the sense of “height”; Septuagint’s εὐπρεπῆ reminds us of ἐκ τῆς δόξης in Ps. xlvi. 14, Septuagint) for Yahveh, that men may no longer worship the sun instead of its Maker,—a house eternal as those heavens in which the sun is fixed (cf. Ps. lxxviii. 69*a*). καινότητος implies that מִבְּרִיתֵנוּ was misread מִבְּרִיתֵנוּ (the opposite of the mistake in Ps. lxxxix. 8, Isa. liv. 4, Septuagint), and τῆς ᾠδῆς = מִשְׁנֵה for מִשְׁנֵה (see *Variorum Bible* on Josh. x. 13).

This discovery would be of great importance, could it be shown that the passage had supplied a theme or motive to any passage of our canonical psalms. More than one writer have speculated as to the existence of Davidic fragments incorporated (with or without modification) in existing psalms. How precious this Solomonic fragment would be, if it agreed in some striking points with any part of Psalms lxxii. and cxxvii.! Alas! it does not. One may even, if it be worth while, argue from the transparent falseness of the title of Psalm cxxvii. (which implies, as it would seem, that the psalm was uttered by Solomon at the building of the temple) to the incorrectness of the tradition in 1 Kings. May not the

editor of the "Book of the Upright" have been mistaken? Still I would rather believe that the fragment *is* Solomonic, just as I cling to the reasonable belief that David himself also composed religious songs—if not those in which Delitzsch still believes, then some others which "tradition, Time's suspected register," has failed to hand down to us.

**Isaiah lii. 15.**—After a full discussion of the difficult word פִּיִּי (A.V., he shall sprinkle), which the present writer felt obliged to leave untranslated in his own version of Isaiah, Professor Moore, of Andover Theological Seminary, comes to the conclusion that פִּיִּי shall be much moved, should probably be restored. Comp. Deuteronomy ii. 25, Isaiah lxiv. 1; in both instances commotion caused by what the peoples hear of Israel. The closest parallel is Jeremiah xxxiii. 9. Obviously the standard MS. of Isaiah was illegible at this point; the question is, how best to heal the corruption? Professor Moore disregards tradition altogether, and rightly, nor does he claim even the authority of the Septuagint, whose *θανύσσονται* may very well be a mere guess.

**Job v. 21.**—Some difficulty has been felt by students of the Book of Job in the sudden disappearance of the Satan from the machinery of the poem, and the non-mention of him in the speeches. Professor G. Hoffmann thinks he has restored a half-effaced reference to the Satan in Job v. 21 (*Phön. Inschriften*, p. 53; *Hiob*, p. 42). He renders the passage thus, "If the Slanderer (*ὁ διάβολος*) go to and fro, thou remainest hidden; thou hast naught to fear, if a demon cometh," with the gloss, "the demon of sickness," see Psalm xci. 6. This involves reading פִּיִּי ל for פִּיִּי ל in the first stichos, and פִּיִּי for פִּיִּי in the second. But the first part of the received text is supported by *μάστιξ γλώσσης*, Ecclesiasticus xxvi. 6, and the second by Proverbs iii. 25. If פִּיִּי be correct, we seem to catch the accents of later superstition. It is the Targum, not the psalmist, who introduces the *shedim* into the beautiful eulogy of faith (Ps. xci.). Nor does פִּיִּי occur anywhere in the Massoretic text.

T. K. CHEYNE.