

*HAS AMMINADIB IN CANTICLES ANY
EXISTENCE?*

THIS question must be taken in connection with Canticles vi. 12, vii. 2 [1], vii. 7. Bickell's most ingenious correction of vi. 12, vii. 2, reported by Budde, has probably drawn the attention of many students. Budde's own criticisms of this will also, I presume, have been respectfully considered. For my own part, I am sure that Grätz and Bickell are right in rejecting the enigmatical "chariots of my princely people" (so R. V.) or "chariots of Ammi-nadib" (R. V. marg.). שְׂמַתְנִי is, almost beyond a doubt, a corruption of שֵׁם אֲתוֹן, and מְרַכְבַּת a corruption of בַּת לֶךְ לֶךְ; רַדְדִי לֶךְ; שֵׁם אֲתוֹן [אֲתֹן] לֶךְ; שֵׁם אֲתוֹן occurs at the end of vii. 13.

This is all due to Bickell. I do not feel quite so sure that he has solved the mystery of לֹא יָדַעְתִּי נַפְשִׁי in vi. 12, but the words are certainly intrusive. I think too that he has certainly missed the true explanation of בַּת עַמִּי נָרִיב, vi. 12, and בַּת נָרִיב, vii. 2. On this point the student will refer to Budde, who has not perhaps seen to the heart of the problem, but rightly suspects that Bickell is almost too ingenious. From Bickell I turn to another scholar—Perles—who acutely groups these passages with vii. 7; he proposes to read in vii. 7, for אֶהְבֶּה בַּת עַמִּי נָרִיב, אֶהְבֶּה בַּת עַמִּי נָרִיב. This cannot be right; Amminadab (LXX.) or Amminadib (A. V.) has no existence. In vii. 7 we should almost certainly read אֶהְבֶּה בַּת תַּעֲנִינִי; cf. Micah i. 16, בְּנֵי תַעֲנִינֶיךָ; ii. 9, מְבֵנֵי תַעֲנִינֶיךָ (Wellhausen's certain correction). But Perles's impression that vii. 7 is to be grouped with vi. 12 and vii. 2 is perfectly right, in my opinion. In the two latter passages we should read, for בַּת עַמִּי נָרִיב and בַּת נָרִיב, בַּת תַּעֲנִינִי. Transposition and corruption account for the changed aspect of the phrase, נ=ב; ד=ו; מ=ת. There is one superfluous י; the older text probably was without this, for

LXX. has in vi. 12 *αμειναδαβ*, and in vii. 2 *θυγατερ ναδαβ*. The nett result is that in Canticles vi. 12, vii. 2, vii. 7 the reading of the (corrected) text should probably be,—

“There will I give thee (the enjoyment of) my love”
(= vii. 13*d*).

“How beautiful are thy steps in the sandals, O maiden
in whom I have delight.”

“How beautiful art thou, how pleasant, O maiden in
whom I have delight.”

I am sorry for any one who regrets the loss of Amminadib; for lost for ever Amminadib certainly is, whether the present solution of the problems of the text be adopted or not. But the pleasure which Budde's excellent commentary on Canticles must produce in all who read it will compensate for any passing disappointment.

Twenty years ago, the clue which Budde has so admirably used was in my own hands. I used it (in an unpublished work on the Old Testament) so far as to break up the Song of Songs into a moderate number of lyric passages, connected with the wedding of any country maiden; so far Wetzstein's discovery led me, while the dramatic hypothesis was still in almost undisturbed possession of the field. Stade, however, was the first to express in print a conviction of the importance of Wetzstein's communication. And now that the German consul's clue has been so efficaciously handled by Budde, we may hope that opinion will finally gravitate to the new theory. A number of corrections of the text, however, still have to be made. In the *Jewish Quarterly Review* and the *Expository Times* for 1898-1899 I have indicated some of those which have struck me as probable. I have now ventured to add one more, remarking, before I lay down the pen, that the correction of Canticles vii. 7 connects itself with a correction offered, in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for Janu-

ary, 1899, of the preceding verse. The "purple" hair of the bride, in the tresses of which "the king is held captive," is indeed purely imaginary, or rather due to an ingenious attempt of a scribe to make some sort of sense out of a corrupt text. The correction offered has, in my opinion, a very high degree of probability, because it is supported by numerous parallels elsewhere. There is a wonderful amount of method and consistency in the errors of the scribes. It is this method, this consistency, which so frequently enables us to correct them, sometimes plausibly, sometimes probably, sometimes certainly. Budde himself having remarked, in his note on vi. 12, that "none of the possibilities mentioned is quite satisfactory; we must wait for help from some other quarter," I have thought it not inappropriate to mention my own solutions of a few of the difficulties which he himself recognises to be still unexplained. I feel sure that he will come over to Bickell's view about the "chariots" of vi. 12; the explanations cited by Driver (*Introd.*, 6th ed. p. 446) are indeed hopelessly wrong; and I hope that he may on consideration recognise the plausibility of my own engrafted view.

T. K. CHEYNE.