

name and fame as a righteous man. At the same time it is possible that Daniel's name never figured in Ben-Sira's catalogue, and was intentionally left out, in deference to the opinion of those who, in his day, were yet doubtful whether Daniel should be accounted "holy writ" or not.

If there was a controversy in Israel, about B.C. 200, over the question of Daniel's claim to a place among the canonical Scriptures, it was set at rest, once for all, by the events of 168 B.C. and the years following. But if the hypothesis offered above is true, viz., that the *text* of Daniel is not of sixth-century origin, but fourth-century at the earliest, the knowledge of this may have led to placing this book with the Psalter and the Megilloth rather than with the Prophets.

H. T. F. DUCKWORTH.

THE ALPHABETIC STRUCTURE OF PSALMS IX. AND X.

SOME few years since ¹ I attempted to prove afresh (for at the time it was not generally admitted by English scholars) the existence in the first chapter of Nahum of part of an alphabetic poem; in recoil from certain over-elaborate and inconclusive attempts to prove that an *entire* alphabetic poem lay concealed there, several writers had expressed scepticism of the existence of even a part of such a poem, for which nevertheless the evidence, rightly considered, was really, and is now more generally admitted to be, irresistible.

I here propose to re-discuss the question of the alphabetic structure of Psalms ix. and x. In this case it is agreed that we have to do with parts of an alphabetic poem (or of two) but opinion remains divided as to the extent of these parts. In the interests alike of the criticism of the Psalter, the

¹ THE EXPOSITOR, 1898 (Sept.), pp. 207-220.

history of the Hebrew text and the interpretation of the particular Psalm (or Psalms), it is important to narrow down the legitimate differences of opinion to the utmost.

In the present Hebrew text, and consequently in modern versions, Psalms ix. and x. form two distinct poems. On the other hand, in the Septuagint, probably also in the later Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, certainly also in Jerome's version, which was made direct from the Hebrew, Psalms ix. and x. formed a single undivided whole.¹ Is the unity of the poem as presented in the versions accidental or fictitious? or does the division into two Psalms in the Hebrew text correspond to original diversity of origin? These questions, which are of first importance for the interpretation of the poem (or poems), are intimately connected with the question of the alphabetic structure.

The unity of the two Psalms has been maintained chiefly by those who also hold that the incompleteness of the alphabetic scheme, which marks the text in its present condition, is mainly due to textual corruption. This theory has been presented (with many differences in detail) by Bickell, by Dr. T. K. Abbot, whose valuable article,² dependent in the main on Bickell, but with important independent suggestions, seems to have exercised less influence than it deserved, by Dr. Cheyne in the second edition of his *Book of Psalms*, and by Duhm. It is, I believe, substantially correct, and its failure to gain more general support from English writers is probably due to the numerous and, in some cases, necessarily uncertain conjectures with which its presentation has been connected. My more particular purpose is to show that the alphabetic arrangement certainly extends *further*

¹ See Baethgen, *Psalmen*³, p. 22.

² In *Hermathena*, 1889, pp. 21-28; also in *Essays chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments*, pp. 200-207.

than has been generally admitted except by those who have argued that it extended throughout. If this can be established, it will invalidate the most attractive of the theories that deny the unity of the poem, that of Baethgen, which I shall describe below, and it will establish at the least a considerable presumption that the alphabetic arrangement, where it now fails to appear or appears less clearly, once existed, and consequently that the two Psalms are a unity whose integrity has been impaired mainly, if not exclusively, by the ordinary accidents of textual transmission.

To facilitate the discussion I give first a translation with some notes on the text, chiefly on those parts of the text which are of importance in the present examination. In order to concentrate attention on my main point, I have left unadopted, and generally, too, unnoticed, many emendations suggested more especially by Dr. Cheyne and Duhm which otherwise would unquestionably deserve attention, if not acceptance. But the result of my examination, as I point out at the close, appears to me to render certain types of these emendations improbable.

In the translation all departures from the Hebrew consonantal text, whether justified by the ancient versions or not, are printed in italics. Words which are unintelligible (either in themselves or in their context), and yet cannot be satisfactorily emended, are left untranslated and represented by . . . ; in some cases where a lacuna may be suspected I have used the signs + + +. Words or letters omitted are represented by \wedge . So far as the alphabetic strophes are clear, I have printed them as strophes with the initial letter at the head, following the method adopted in the Authorized Version and Revised Version of Psalm cxix. and by Dr. G. A. Smith in his translation of Lamentations ii. and iv. in the EXPOSITOR for April, 1906, pp. 327-336. The initial letters, which do not occur in the present Hebrew

text, I have given in brackets alongside of the immediately preceding initial, at the head of a section extending (without subdivision into strophes) down to the next initial occurring in the text. In this way I hope that I may bring the problem presented by the present state of the text somewhat clearly before the reader's eye. In Psalm ix. the verses are numbered according to the Hebrew enumeration, which, beginning with 2, is one in advance of the English throughout. In Psalm x. the Hebrew and English enumerations agree.

X

- IX. ^a I will give thanks unto *Thee*, Yahweh, with my whole heart
 I will recount all Thy wonders ;
^b I will rejoice and exult in Thee,
 I will make melody to Thy Name, O Most High.

י

- ^c Because mine enemies shall turn backward,
 Shall stumble and perish at Thy presence ;
^d For Thou hast maintained my right and my cause,
 Hast sat upon the throne as a righteous judge.

יג, (ד), (ה)

- ^e Thou hast rebuked the nations + + +,
 Thou hast destroyed the wicked + + + ;
 Thou hast wiped out their name for ever and aye,
^f The enemy (?) + + +.
Silent (?) are the ruins for ever,
 And the cities Thou didst uproot—perished is their memory.
Behold (?) ^g Yahweh sitteth (enthroned) for ever,

^{2a} *Thee* with LXX. (i.e. אֹרֶךְ for אֹרֶחַ of the Hebrew text), and in agreement with the address to Yahweh in the following verses.

^{ab} Duhm, perhaps rightly, sees here fragments of two parallel lines (for the thought is certainly parallel) rather than the whole of a single line (R.V. and most).

^{7 g} These verses are certainly corrupt, but the above emendations (like others that have been proposed) are little more than makeshifts.

Silent : reading רָמוּ for רָמוּ. The Authorized Version (— R.V. marg.) is sufficiently criticized by Kirkpatrick, but the Revised Version is also very questionable ; literally the Hebrew text runs, *The enemy* (singular) *are* (plural) *ruins for ever*.

Behold : reading הַמָּה וַיְהוּה for הַמָּה וַיְהוּה of the Hebrew text. The Revised Version again substitutes for a wrong translation of the Author-

He hath established His throne for judgment ;
 ° And 'tis He will judge the world in righteousness,
 He will pass sentence on the peoples in equity.

10 So may Yahweh be a high retreat for the crushed,
 A high retreat in seasons of extremity ;
 11 And let them that know Thy Name trust in Thee,
 For Thou hast not forsaken them that seek Thee, O Yahweh.

12 Make melody unto Yahweh, who sitteth (enthroned) in Zion,
 Declare among the peoples His doings ;
 13 For he that requireth blood hath remembered ^ ,
 He hath not forgotten the cry of the afflicted.

14 Be gracious to me, Yahweh, behold my affliction ^ ,
 O Thou who raisest me up from the gates of Death ;
 15 In order that I may recount all Thy praises,
 (And) in the gates of Zion's daughter exult in Thy salvation.

16 The nations have sunk down in the pit they made,
 In the net they hid their own foot has been caught ;
 17 Yahweh hath made Himself known in the execution of justice,
 The wicked has been trapped in the work of his own hands.

18 The wicked shall return unto Sheol,
 (Even) all the nations that forget God ;

19 For the poor shall not be forgotten for ever,
 (Nor) the hope of the afflicted perish for aye.

ized Version a wrong one of its own. In rendering *their very memorial has perished*, it emphasizes *memorial* which the Hebrew text does not, and omits the emphasis which (doubtless owing to textual corruption) actually falls on the pronoun. The only correct rendering of the present text is *their memorial, even theirs, has perished*.

13^a *Remembered* : Hebrew text adds *them* ; but the position of the pronoun is suspicious.

14^a *Affliction* : Hebrew text adds מִשְׁנְאָי which Revised Version renders (*which I suffer*) of *them that hate me*. But the construction is harsh, and the presence of the word overloads the line. Not improbably מִשְׁנְאָי has arisen from מִשְׁנֵאֵי, the participle originally used in the next line, which was subsequently explained by the synonymous כָּרִימֵי (so Lagarde, and many since).

- ²⁰ Arise, Yahweh, let not frail man be strong,
Let the nations be judged before Thy face ;
²¹ Appoint terror for them, O Yahweh,
Let the nations know they are frail men.

(מ) ל

- X. ¹ Wherefore, Yahweh, standest Thou afar off,
Hidest Thou (Thine eyes) in seasons of extremity ?
² In arrogance the wicked hotly pursues the afflicted ;
Let them be caught in the devices they have imagined.
³ For the wicked praiseth *his* desire ;
The greedy getter blesseth *his* appetite.

(ס) נ

- ⁴ The wicked ³ contemneth Yahweh (saying)—
⁴ “ According to His full anger He will not punish ” ;
“ There is no God ” is the sum of his thoughts ;
⁵ Stable are his ways at all times.

³ The last two words of the Hebrew text of this verse belong to verse 4 : see next note. After their removal, there remains—

כִּי־הִלֵּל רָשָׁע עַל תְּאוֹת נַפְשׁוֹ
וּבְצַע בָּרֶךְ

These lines are obviously ill-balanced ; *הִלֵּל רָשָׁע* in the first is parallel to *בְּצַע בָּרֶךְ* in the second, but the object in the first line consists of two words parallel in sense, while the second contains no object at all. Apparently, then, the missing object of the second line has accidentally shifted up to the line above. If so, *תְּאוֹת* once immediately preceded *וּבְצַע* ; by a wrong division of words the *ל* appears to have become detached from an original *תְּאוֹתוֹ* and prefixed to *בְּצַע*. In line one the *עַל* is probably derived from an original *ל* by reading the final *ע* of the preceding word twice. The two lines now balance and parallel one another perfectly. For the phrase *to bless one's own soul or appetite*, used of the godless, cf. xlix. 19. This is Duhm's emendation, and, to quote his words, the thought is “ The godless man praises not God, but his own belly (cf. Luke xii. 19) ” : cf. also Phil. iii. 19. The lines, thus restored, run as follows:—

כִּי־הִלֵּל רָשָׁע לְתְאוֹתוֹ
וּבְצַע בָּרֶךְ נַפְשׁוֹ

⁴ In the Hebrew text the last line of v. 3 and the first of v. 4 stand thus:—

וּבְצַע בָּרֶךְ נֹאֲץ יְהוָה
רָשָׁע כְּנֹבָה אִפּוֹ בְלִי־דָרֶשׁ

But the citation from this verse in v. 13 (*עַל מַה נֹאֲץ רָשָׁע אֱלֹהִים*) *Wherefore “hath the wicked contemned God”*) clearly shows that *נֹאֲץ יְהוָה רָשָׁע* originally stood here as an independent sentence ; and so it does stand in the earliest form of the text, to wit, in the LXX. Consequently, what precedes *נֹאֲץ* belongs to v. 3 ; what follows *רָשָׁע* begins a new line and a new sentence. These positive reasons for the division of sentences

In the height (?) are Thy judgments from before him ;
 As for all his adversaries, he puffeth at them ;
 * He saith in his heart, " I shall never be shaken,"

. 7

adopted above are supported by strong negative considerations, viz. that the last line of v. 3 as it stands in the Hebrew text and R.V. admits of no satisfactory and natural explanation, and that those who follow the Hebrew sentence-division are driven to a highly questionable translation of the words כִּנְבוֹה אָפוֹ—the *pride of his countenance* (R.V.), or the *loftiness of his looks* ; but *countenance* in Hebrew is פָּנִים, not אָפוֹ. אָפוֹ means *nostril, nose*, and then, metaphorically, *anger* ; that in Hebrew (or Arabic) it ever acquired the sense *face* is, to say the least, unproven. It is customary (and idiomatically correct) to render אָפוֹ אֶרֶץ—the *face to the earth* ; but there is no reason to question that the Hebrew thought of the *nose*, rather than the whole face, touching the ground.

^{5b} *In the height* : questionable, but, if correct, to be paraphrased as in R.V. Abbot happily suggests כָּרוֹם כָּרוֹם, and renders, *Removed are Thy judgments from before him*.

⁶ This verse originally included the first word of v. 7 (see next note). The smooth translation of the R.V., with its excellent parallels, completely conceals the really desperate character of the Hebrew text. Presumably the Revisers treated אָפוֹ as — δὲ recitative, and therefore left it untranslated. This is a rare usage, but sufficiently established to justify invoking it, if אָפוֹ really *introduced* the speech here ; but it does not : it stands nearly at the end of the words spoken (after *all generations*) ! The A.V. (*He hath said in his heart, I shall not be moved : for (I shall) never (be in adversity)*) is, perhaps, a less illegitimate translation, but the sense is self-condemnatory—I shall not be moved, because I shall not be moved. Tautologous, too, is Dr. Driver's translation (*Parallel Psalter*), " I shall not be moved, I who to all generations shall not be in adversity." Other attempts have been made to render and explain the verse as it stands, but these may suffice⁷ to show that the present text is really impossible. We might, indeed, render—*He hath said in his heart, I shall never be moved who is not in adversity*, i.e. He who is now prosperous is confident that his prosperity will continue, but for three considerations : (1) The two lines would be exceedingly ill-balanced ; (2) the *order* would be as awkward in Hebrew as I have intentionally made it in English ; and (3) it takes no account of אֱלֹהֵי which has to be included from v. 7.

Duhm's treatment of the words אָפוֹ לֹא בָרַע, together with אֱלֹהֵי of v. 7, may be in the right direction, but it is not free from some of the objections urged against the present text. He points אֱלֹהֵי of v. 7 אֱלֹהֵי (— אֱלֹהֵי Gesenius-Kautzsch's *Grammar*, 91 e), the word found in a similar context in lxxiii. 4 (wrongly rendered in R.V.), and renders, *He whose paunch is not ill (fed)*, i.e. the godless " in fair round belly with good capon lined " forgets God, and is quite happy about his own fate.

⁷ Again the R.V. conceals the strange order of the Hebrew text as at present divided. To visualize the argument for the division adopted

ב

His mouth is full of deceits and oppression,
 Under his tongue is mischief and trouble;
 * He sitteth in places of ambush in the villages,
 In secret places he slayeth the innocent.

ג (3)

His eyes watch privily for the hapless,
 * He lieth in ambush in a secret place as a lion in his covert,
 He lieth in ambush to snatch away the afflicted,
 He snatcheth away the afflicted, dragging him off in his net.

¹⁰ [The righteous] . . . sinketh down,
 And the hapless fall by his strong ones (?).

above, I give the R.V. altered only in so far as to restore the Hebrew order:—

Cursing | his mouth is full of | and | deceit and oppression,
 Under his tongue is | mischief and iniquity.

A mere glance at the lines suggests the strong probability that the words *cursing* and *and* in the first line are intrusive, and have spoilt a very fine and perfect parallelism. But, further: (1) The position of אלה, *cursing*, before the verb throws on it a strong emphasis, for which, nevertheless, no reason can be discovered, and the real object consisting, like its parallel in the next line of a *pair* of qualities, comes limping awkwardly in at the end as an afterthought. Why is there a stress on cursing? Why so much more stress on cursing than on deceit or oppression? Why, perhaps we may further ask, is cursing somewhat incongruously coupled with "deceit and oppression"? These are questions which commentators who follow the traditional division of the text have never answered, if they have even considered them. (2) The inclusion of אלה in the first line would overload it, giving it five word-accent against the four of its parallel: this lack of balance is only aggravated when Baethgen removes עשׂ from v. 6 and prefixes it to v. 7!

Read, then, in 7a פיהו מלא מרמות ותך, i.e. omit the ך before מרמות (necessarily introduced when אלה had been connected with v. 7), or less probably the waw of ומרמות may have shifted from an original מלאו, lit. *Deceit and oppression fill his mouth*.

* *In a secret place*: The omission of these words, which may have been accidentally repeated from 8b, would improve the vigour and rhythm of the line.

¹⁰ Again, the attempt to render the existing Hebrew text has reduced commentators to the most desperate straits. R.V. renders,

He croucheth, he boweth down,

And the helpless fall by his strong ones.

But to whom does the pronoun refer? Many, since Ewald, have referred it to the lion, and have quite gratuitously explained "his strong ones" to mean his claws. But this involves the extremely improbable sup-

- ¹¹ He saith in his heart, "God has forgotten,
He hath hidden His face (and) seeth nevermore."

פ

- ¹² Arise, Yahweh, O God, lift up Thine hand :
Forget not *the cry* of the afflicted ;
¹³ Wherefore hath the wicked contemned Yahweh ?
Hath he said in his heart, "Thou wilt not punish" ?

ו

- ¹⁴ Thou hast seen \wedge \wedge mischief and vexation,
Thou lookest (upon them) to place them in Thy hand ;
The hapless committeth his cause unto Thee,
Thou hast been the helper of the orphan.

ז

- ¹⁵ Break the arm of the wicked⁷ and evil,

position that the pronoun refers to a subject introduced *allusively* three lines before (9a) and *dismissed*, for 9b, c cannot refer to the lion, since the lion does not hunt with a net, nor insist that his meal shall consist in particular of the poor. As the text stands, the subject of 9b, c, that is, the wicked man, can alone be reasonably regarded as the subject of 10a. But, then, why should the wicked man be described as *crushed* ? for this, and not to *crouch* (R.V.) is the sense of רכה. As a matter of fact, 10a must be interpreted by its parallel 10b ; both lines must refer to the poor : but, then, a term referring to the poor is as badly needed in 10a as in 10b—indeed, more so. Thus exegetical considerations point strongly to the loss in 10a of a term parallel to חלכאים in 10b. Rhythmical considerations point strongly in the same direction. For (1) 10a (two words) is shorter than its parallel (three words) ; and (2) it is abnormally short in relation to the entire poem : it is the only real and unambiguous case (even in the present text) of a line of two words. The obscure רכה (or רכה ירה k're) I have left untranslated above, but to bring out the sense I have tentatively made good the loss of the term parallel to *hapless* in 10b. Whether that term was *righteous* or one of a dozen others must be determined, if determined it can be, by other arguments than those here adduced to prove that *some* word, be it what it may, has fallen out of the text at this point.

¹³ * b. The lines are ill-balanced ; perhaps אל (O God) in a is an editor's substitute for Yahweh : in line b צעקת has been supplied in accordance with ix. 13.

¹⁴ a. The Hebrew text is scarcely tolerable. Duhm (followed above) omits כִּי אַתָּה as a corrupt duplication of אַתָּה. Even so perhaps the original text is not exactly recovered.

¹⁵ a. The LXX., which connects *the wicked and the evil*, is preferable to the Massoretic interpretation of the Hebrew text, which begins a fresh sentence with the second term (so R.V.).

Though \wedge wickedness be sought for, it shall not be found ;
¹⁶ Yahweh is King for ever and aye,
 The nations are perished out of His land.

ת

¹⁷ Thou, Yahweh, hast heard the desire of the humble,
 Thou directest their heart, makest Thine ear attentive ;
¹⁸ To do justice to the orphan and the crushed,
 That frail man of the earth may terrorize no more.

The two laws of an alphabetic poem are (1) that the initials of successive strophes follow the order of the alphabet, and (2) that these initials should follow one another at regular intervals. This regular interval in Psalms ix. and x. is four lines, as may be seen by a glance at the strophes beginning with א, ב, ג, ד, ה, ו, ז, ח, ט, י, ק, ל, מ, נ, not at present to refer to others.

The lines throughout the poem are of equal or approximately equal length, the normal length being three or four accented words. Of the eighty-three lines into which the Revised Version divides the two Psalms, fifteen are abnormally long or short, i.e. they contain more than four or less than three accented words. Of these eight in the Hebrew text contain only two accented words, six contain five, and one contains seven. But the line of seven words (x. 14*a*) should certainly be read as two lines (and probably of three words each, one word being dittographic) as in the above translation, x. 14*a*, *b*. On the other hand, the Revised Version wrongly makes two lines (each of two accents) out of one in the case of ix. 14*b*, *c* = ix. 15*b* in the above translation. In this case the mis-division of the Revised Version spoils the parallelism. The case is similar, though less

^{15b}. The meaning is clear—Exterminate wickedness : but how precisely this was expressed is uncertain. I have read שׁוּׁרָה for שׁוּׁרָה , and both verbs as Niphals.

^{18b} The line is over long. Duhm omits the last three words, and renders *hat they may be in dread no more*.

obvious, with ix. 13*a*, *b* (R. V.) = ix. 14*a* above (one line of four accents ; see note above). With this corrected division of lines the Π strophe, like the nine strophes enumerated above, contains four lines, each of normal length, instead of four abnormally short lines and two normal lines, giving in all, in the Revised Version, six lines to the strophe which would be altogether abnormal.

We have still to consider five lines each containing in the Massoretic text two word accents, and six lines each containing five. Of the five lines of two accents, four become of the normal length of three accents, if we simply delete the makkeph : these are ix. 2*b*, 4*a*, 14*b*, x. 12*b* ; in the last case, however, the shortness is more probably caused by the loss of a word (see note above). The only remaining instance of a line of two accents is x. 10*a*, and in that line, as I have shown above, there are very strong exegetical reasons for suspecting the loss of a word.

Two of the lines of five accents contain a word which there are strong reasons (already given), apart from rhythmic considerations, for transposing in the one case (ix. 7*b*) to the following, and in the other (x. 7*a*) to the preceding line. With the removal of the intrusive words these lines become of the normal length of four words. If in x. 6*a* לָרָר וְרָר be makkephed, as in Psalm cxxxv. 13, and in ix. 19*a* לֹא לִנְצַח, as in Psalm ciii. 9, these lines also are of normal length. There remain x. 12*a* and x. 18*b*, where reasons, other than rhythmical, for reducing the length of the lines are less cogent.

This survey may suffice to show that the text of lines containing less than three or more than four accents is open to grave suspicion.

The most crucial question in dealing with the structure of Psalms ix. and x. is this—How far back from the end of the Psalm does the alphabetic arrangement extend ? It

is generally said that the strophes beginning with the last four letters (ל, ש, ג, ק) remain; but it is also commonly stated or *implied* that the immediately preceding strophes have been lost and their place taken by others, or that these strophes, though as they stand they are original, were never brought into the alphabetic scheme. But what are the facts? I turn first to the twelve lines immediately preceding the ק strophe, for here are facts which have been overlooked or not appreciated.

1. The eighth line (x. 8c) before the ק strophe begins with ל, i.e. ל occurs as an initial letter *at the exact interval* from ק at which it should occur in an alphabetic poem following the order observed in Lamentations ii., iii., iv.¹ where the ד strophe precedes the ל (see EXPOSITOR, April, 1906, pp. 327-36).

Even if this fact stood by itself and so might possibly be due to accident, it ought to be taken account of; but it does not stand alone, for

2. If we read back three lines and four words (i.e. the normal length of a line), in all therefore four lines, from the point where the initial ל occurs, we find the word פִּירוּ: i.e. פ stands *at the exact interval* from ק and ל at which it should stand by the well established laws of this poem. I have stated the fact thus, for thus stated it is indisputable. It is true that according to the traditional verse division פִּירוּ does not stand at the beginning of the line, but I have shown in the note on the passage above that there are the strongest reasons (entirely independent of alphabetic considerations) for holding that the line originally began with this word, and that the traditional division of the text gives bad sense, bad rhythm and bad parallelism.

¹ The same order (ל before ד) was found by the Greek translators in their Hebrew text of Prov. xxxi. It was probably also found in the original form of Ps. xxxiv., for sense seems to require the transposition of vv. 16 and 17 (- 15, 16 R.V.).

3. Although the fourth line (x. 10a) before the initial ρ does not begin with \aleph , there are, as I have already shown, the strongest independent reasons for believing that this abnormally short line has lost a word in the course of textual transmission.

I submit that this combination of facts—the abnormal shortness and strangeness of the fourth line before initial ρ , the occurrence of initial γ at the beginning of the eighth and of initial δ at the beginning of the twelfth line—is not accidental, but is due to the fact that Psalm x. concludes not merely with the last four but with the last seven strophes of an alphabetic poem.

Working back afresh from the initial ρ in x. 12 we find at the beginning of the twentieth line before it the letter λ (in x. 3b),¹ i.e. λ stands *at the exact interval* before ρ at which it should stand in an alphabetic poem of four-lined strophes. On the other hand, if we count downwards from the initial γ in ix. 18, or the γ in x. 1, it occurs two lines too soon. Moreover the initial δ , which should precede it, and the ρ , which should follow, are not found in the present text. Having regard to these facts alone, we might consider the position of λ in relation to ρ accidental. But when we connect this with our previous conclusion, such an explanation becomes difficult; for λ occurs at the correct interval before not only ρ but also before δ and γ . I recall further at this point that the fifth line after the λ (x. 5b), where initial ρ should stand, is suspicious, though perhaps not impossible, in style, and that the substitution of a similar word beginning with ρ appears to be a considerable improvement. The case of the missing initial δ may be taken with a consideration of the first part of the poem; and this may be brief, for opinion differs less seriously here.

¹ For the justification of following the Greek as against the Hebrew tradition in beginning the line with \aleph , see note above.

Of late it has never been seriously questioned that Psalm ix. was originally alphabetic, and this being so it is unnecessary to discuss at length whether the 7 and 7 strophes were shorter than the rest in the original poem. No reason or sound analogy can be given for such abbreviation, and we have not the slightest ground for assuming that the author was such a bungler as without reason to have failed in the very simple art of writing an alphabetic poem. It follows that the equivalent of about four lines has fallen out of the text between ix. 6 and ix. 10.

But if this has certainly happened at one point in the poem, it is not improbable that it has happened elsewhere. If, therefore, the alphabetic structure can be traced down to the 5 strophe and from the 2 strophe to the end, the most probable explanation of the facts that in the present text six lines only instead of eight stand between initial 5 and initial 2 and that initial 2 is absent must surely be that two lines have fallen out of the text, one of which contained the missing initial.

The only strophes now left for consideration are those with the initials ' and 2. The ' strophe clearly begins with ix. 18, for the initial ' occurs here and at the correct interval after 2; but where did it end? The data appear to me somewhat ambiguous. But the question is obviously connected with another: does the original 2 occur in the present text; if so, where? One suggestion may be decisively dismissed, for it too implicitly charges the author with bungling. It has been said that the p with which ix. 20 begins was intentionally substituted for 2 because the two letters had some resemblance in sound! This is as if the composer of an English acrostic should find it beyond his powers to discover a suitable word beginning with C and should use instead a word beginning with G!

If the original 2 survives, it most probably survives in

the first word of ix. 19; then the present text would present a ' strophe of two followed by a ∩ strophe of six lines. In that case we must suppose that a couplet has shifted from the ' into the ∩ strophe, and we may, with Duhm, place ix. 21 immediately after ix. 18. But this, though a possible, and indeed a not improbable solution, is not certain, for though ix. 21 follows ix. 18 well enough, its connexion with ix. 18 is by no means obviously better than with ix. 20.

Others have suggested that ix. 20, 21 do not belong to the original alphabetic poem but are an independent close to Psalm ix. This theory would be more probable if the verses were absent from the Greek text; but they are not, and the theory requires the assumption that verses intended to form an independent close to Psalm ix. after it had been separated from Psalm x. are present in a text which still treats Psalms ix. and x. as continuous.

One curious fact must not be concealed. Psalm ix. 20 begins with *p* and the third line following (ix. 21*a*) with *ψ*. In this sequence Baethgen detects the continuation, after a gap of several strophes, of ix. 19. He also assumes the loss of two lines after ix. 20. This particular assumption is invalidated, if it be shown that the original *p* strophe really occurs in Psalm x. It is just possible, however, that, if ix. 20, 21 are intrusive, they were derived from an alphabetic poem of two-lined strophes; but the sequence may quite well be accidental; to be sure of alphabetic structure we need a sequence of at least three letters, for only so can we determine the fixed interval between the letters which gives the sequence its significance.

I conclude my discussion with a brief criticism of certain theories as to the literary and textual history of Psalms ix. and x.

Professor Kirkpatrick's ultimate conclusion is that Psalm ix. "appears to be complete in itself, and it seems preferable

to regard Psalm x. as a companion piece rather than as part of a continuous whole." This appears to me highly improbable, and it certainly does nothing to alleviate the grave exegetical difficulties which Baethgen attempts to remove ; but I will not discuss it here, for it does not depend on any conclusion as to the completeness of the alphabetic structure, since it would not be safe to deny that a writer may have chosen to compose two separate poems, one following the alphabetic scheme to the eleventh letter, the other from the twelfth to the twenty-second and last.

Some other theories which deny the unity of Psalms ix. and x. have proceeded from the assumption that parts of the two Psalms are alphabetic, and parts non-alphabetic ; and that x. 1-11 or x. 3-11 are the non-alphabetic part, which is of different origin from the rest. Now such theories must be so modified as to be scarcely worth maintaining if my argument that even in the present text the alphabetic structure can be clearly traced back to x. 7 is sound ; and they fall completely to the ground if my further argument that the original initial \aleph survives in its original position in x. 3 is also admitted.

Baethgen's theory may be considered at greater length, for it is based on weighty exegetical considerations. I will cite his remarks somewhat fully. After indicating the reasons for considering that Psalms ix. and x. were originally connected, he continues : "The reason for the division adopted by the Massoretes lies in the difference of subject ; but the conclusion of Psalm x. refers to the same circumstances that form the subject of Psalm ix. ; moreover the alphabetic scheme does not reach its close till the end of Psalm x. Psalm ix. is a song of thanksgiving and triumph over the defeat of heathen foes. . . . With x. 1 ff. there begin bitter complaints about the absence (*Ausbleiben*) of divine help. But the oppressors are not the same as in Psalm ix. ;

they are not heathen, but godless Israelites. . . . Corresponding to this remarkable change from triumph to bitter complaint and to the entirely different historic background which is presupposed is a break in the alphabetic arrangement." Baethgen then points out, as I have already done, how the alphabetic scheme survives down to the ' strophe in ix. 19 and then continues, "After this everything is lost till ρ ix. 20, ψ ix. 21. In x. 1-11 there is no alphabetic arrangement. In x. 12, 13 again ρ , in x. 14 γ , in x. 15 f. ψ , and x. 17, 18 τ . Since x. 16-18 agree most excellently with the beginning, and indeed with the entire contents of Psalm ix., but not in the slightest with the rest of Psalm x., the conjecture that x. 1-15 formed no original part of the poem cannot be dismissed. The verses x. 12-15 follow, it is true, an alphabetic arrangement, but their subject matter and language connect them with x. 1-11; cf. x. 13 with x. 3, 4, 11, x. 14 with x. 8-10 (חלכה), x. 15 with x. 4. The language of x. 1-15 is harder and more peculiar than that of ix. 1-21, x. 16-18; yet between both parts there are links, cf. x. 1 and ix. 10 (לעתות בצרה): x. 12 with ix. 13, 19. It is no longer possible to explain satisfactorily all these remarkable phenomena. The interpolation of x. 1-15 and the loss of the strophes from κ to λ between ix. 19 and ix. 20 may have been accidental and perhaps due to a leaf getting misplaced in binding. . . . But it is just as likely that a later editor intentionally gave the Psalm its present form by removing a section and substituting another for it."

Certainly Baethgen's strongest argument is drawn from the apparent difference of subject in the present text—in ix. and x. 16-19 the nations, in x. 1-15 the wicked. Both Dr. Cheyne and Duhm, who maintain the substantial unity of the whole feel this so strongly that they assimilate ix. and x. 16-18 to x. 1-15 by reading where the term *nations* (גוים) occurs either *the treacherous* (בגדים; so Cheyne), or *the proud* (גאים; so Duhm).

Baethgen's argument from difference of style I believe to be fallacious; the style of x. 1-15 only appears harder when we treat what has suffered corruption and become unintelligible as the original style of the writer. Doubtless parts of x. 1-15, particularly x. 6-10, are in the present text harder than most of Psalm ix.; but they are corrupt; and in turn ix. 6, 7, which are also corrupt, are harder than, for example, x. 1, 2 or x. 7 (after אלה) to x. 9.

But the theory breaks down owing to the improbabilities which it implies in connexion with the alphabetic sequence. It will be sufficient to consider what Baethgen, in common with every one else, admits, that x. 12-18 constitute a perfect sequence of four alphabetic strophes (א, ב, ג, ד). Yet on Baethgen's theory this perfect sequence is the result of accident. The last strophe and a half belonged to one poem, the remaining two and a half to another; in binding, a leaf fell out of place and with it the original alphabetic order was broken, and yet, marvellous to relate, the leaf which accidentally took its place contained part of another alphabetic poem of precisely the same structure which exactly dovetailed into the end of the poem. The last lines of the lost leaf should have contained the four lines of a ד strophe, followed by four lines of a ג strophe, followed by two lines of a ב strophe: the leaf which on the hypothesis was accidentally substituted for it actually contained four lines of a ד strophe, followed by four lines of a ג strophe, followed by two lines of a ב strophe. Moreover the accidentally substituted leaf so well dovetails into the leaf that preceded that it commences with ב at the exact and correct interval of eight lines from the initial א.

The case is scarcely better if we accept Baethgen's alternative suggestion that x. 1-15 were *intentionally* substituted for a section of the original alphabetic poem. For are we to suppose that the editor selected these verses in particular

because he noticed that they contained the suitable sequence ψ, γ, ρ ? Are we to suppose that in the passage thus chosen (x. 1-15) this sequence of these three letters at the same fixed interval was mere accident? The latter supposition becomes even more improbable, impossible indeed, when account is taken of the further sequence δ, ν , which connects, as shown above, with the sequence ψ, γ, ρ .

The only modification of Baethgen's theory which seems to me tenable is that x. 1-15 was throughout alphabetic, and was deliberately written to be interpolated between ix. 21 and x. 16 by a later editor, who for some reason found the verses thus replaced unsuitable. This would account for the admitted sequence ψ, γ, ρ , for the further traces of alphabetic structure, for the exact dovetailing of the inserted section and for the points of connexion in thought and style between x. 1-15 and ix. + x. 16-18. But in this form the theory cannot of course derive any argument from the present alphabetic phenomena. It must depend on the difference, apparent certainly if not original, of subject. But why should an editor, who thought it necessary to interpolate a long section, have failed to make the further slight changes necessary to assimilate the subject throughout?

Several of those who attribute the present incompleteness of the alphabetic structure to textual corruption have sought to restore the original text by transpositions. Some of these transpositions are certainly questionable. For the remnants of the alphabetic structure testify not only to the fact of textual corruption, *but also to certain limitations within which that corruption has occurred*; they must therefore be treated as regulating factors in any reconstruction of the text. Thus treated, they go far to invalidate not only theories of large interpolation of foreign matter, but also theories of extensive transposition and omission. In so far, therefore, as they involve such transpositions I find

the theories of Bickell, Cheyne, and, in a less degree, of Duhm, improbable. For example, on Bickell's theory, among the textual corruptions are the following: (1) ix. 20, 21 have been added to the original poem; (2) the original \beth strophe consisted of x. 3 (now somewhat expanded) + x. 4 + x. 5a, and has shifted from its original position so as to follow the \beth strophe, x. 1, 2; (3) the \beth and \daleth strophes have fallen out clean after x. 5b (from בְּרִים), x. 6 which constitute the original \beth strophe. But all this involves this rather improbable combination of accidents: (1) the position of initial \beth in the present text at the correct distance before initial פִּעְקִרְשֵׁת is pure accident, for on the theory it is not the original initial \beth ; (2) the \beth of x. 1 is the original initial, but it has only retained its position at the correct interval after initial י by a lucky combination of changes: the assumed interpolation of ix. 20, 21 would have removed it four lines too far from initial י , but this was neutralized by four lines exactly of the \beth strophe getting misplaced after the \beth strophe; (3) by accident eight consecutive lines (the \beth and \daleth strophes) drop out between x. 6 and 7 without any such break in the sense as would indicate so considerable a loss.

Dr. Cheyne's reconstruction assumes frequent expansion of the text through the intrusion of variant readings of the same line and corresponding losses of lines. With regard to the addition of ix. 20, 21, the transpositions at the beginning of Psalm x. and the loss of exactly the eight lines of the \beth and \daleth strophes he nearly agrees with Bickell. But further, on his theory, the occurrence of initial פ and ע at the correct interval before the initial ק is due to a lucky combination, within the twelve lines concerned, of addition and omission; two lines have fallen out between x. 10 and x. 11, but just this quantity of matter by a curious freak of fortune has been added within the same section by the

expansion of two original lines into the four lines 9*b* and 10*a, d* of the present text.

The text of Psalms ix. and x. has certainly suffered corruption. The LXX. contains a few more correct readings than the Hebrew text, and preserves the correct division of lines in one case where the Massoretic text has destroyed it. But even conjectural emendation is justified and indeed demanded, and that to a somewhat greater extent than I have admitted in the provisional translation given above for purposes of this discussion. Exegesis that fails to take account of this, that insists on interpreting everything in the present text as the actual words of the author, must go wrong. In addition to this general conclusion, the results, briefly summarized, which an examination of the structure of the poem appears to me to offer as the starting point of sound exegesis, are these: Psalms ix. and x. are a single poem; the original poem consisted of eighty-eight lines of three or four accented words; the equivalent of four or five of these lines has been lost—the equivalent of two or three between ix. 6 and ix. 10, two lines exactly between x. 1 and x. 4. On the other hand, at no point between ix. 2–5 or ix. 10–17 or x. 6–18 has the text received addition or suffered loss to the extent of more than a word or two, but several such small losses or additions or corruptions of words are indicated by the abnormal length of the lines or the impossibility of the style.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.