

Critical Notes.

PROFESSOR JOHN P. PETERS.

NEW YORK.

IN a paper read before this society, and published in the *JOURNAL*, XI. 38-52, I discussed among other difficult passages in the Old Testament several passages from Ezekiel, where the difficulty lay in the text. To those I would add the following :

Ezekiel xlii. 3. This verse is part of a very corrupt, and even unintelligible passage, including vs. 1-12. I call attention to it because Cornill has failed to understand the testimony of the Septuagint. The verse begins with the word *διαγεγραμμένοι*, which has no corresponding word in the Hebrew. Cornill comments on the word thus : "Was ich nicht zu deuten weiss." He observes that the verse breaks the connection between vs. 2 and 4, and accordingly transposes it, placing it after vs. 4. But *διαγεγραμμένοι* merely means "erased." The verse was erased, and a scribe noted the fact after he had written the verse, precisely in the same way in which Babylonian scribes wrote on their tablets the word *Xibi*, "erased," or, as I am informed, Chinese scribes still write in their manuscripts the word for erased, without erasing the passage. An analysis of the verse itself shows it to be a gloss, explaining the situation of the chambers (*לשכה*) mentioned in vs. 1. Ezekiel had described the temple, xli. 10, as surrounded on two sides by an open space, *הגורה*, twenty cubits in breadth. This the glossator describes by simply borrowing the word "twenty" from that verse as *העשרים*, "the twenty" already referred to. To locate the chambers on the other side he refers to the *רצפה*, a pavement which ran along the outer edge of the outer court (xl. 17 f.). Accordingly he describes the chamber as "over against the twenty of the inner court, and over against the pavement of the outer court," *i.e.* bounded on one side by the *גורה*, twenty cubits broad, and on the other by the *רצפה*. This use of *העשרים* seemed so singular that the translator, or some copyist from whose copy he translated, supposed *העשרים* to be a mistake for *השערים*, by the transposition of two letters. Accordingly

the Septuagint renders αὶ πύλαι. That it was in the Hebrew text rather than in the translation that the correction was made is perhaps suggested by the word διαγεγραμμένοι. The translator after translating recognized it as an annotation, and marked it as erased by the word διαγεγραμμένοι.

Ezekiel xli. 26 and xliv. 3 afford examples of annotations of another character. The last three words of xli. 26, וצלעות הבית והעזבים, are quite without connection with what precedes and what follows. The words are all well-known words, and are translated in the Septuagint, showing that they existed in the text at the time when that translation was made. Now the וצלעות, or side chambers of the sanctuary, were described in vs. 5-7, while the עזבים were described in vs. 25. The words וצלעות הבית והעזבים are a note of the contents of the passage 5-26, made by some student on the margin for convenience of understanding and reference; probably one of several such notes, of which this one ultimately crept into the text by the error of a copyist. A similar note was את הנשיא, "the prince," with which the section dealing with the prince commences, xliv. 3. But this latter seems to have been of later origin than the other, and is lacking in the Septuagint.

Ezekiel xlv. 12 furnishes an example of a change of text in total disregard of the simplest rules of Hebrew grammar. The Masoretic text reads twice, עשרים שקלים, where grammatical rules require שקל, and חמשה שקל where the rule requires שקלים. These grammatical errors testify to the correctness of the Septuagint text, which substitutes חמשה for the first עשרים, עשרה for the second, and חמשים for חמשה. This gives a rational sentence: "And the shekel shall be for you twenty *gera*; five shekels a V; and ten shekels an X; and fifty shekels the *maneh*." Now what led to the very singular change in the Hebrew text, a change which, it will be observed, was made after the date of the Septuagint translation? The text of Ezekiel places the maneh at fifty shekels, which seems to have been the old Hebrew ratio, and was actually retained in the silver coinage. But the maneh of fifty shekels gave way to the Babylonian maneh of sixty shekels. It was to bring this passage into harmony with the practice of the Jews that the Masoretic text was made to read: "And the shekel shall be for you twenty *gera*; twenty shekels, fifteen shekels, twenty-five shekels shall be for you the *maneh*." It is, to be sure, a very blundering and ungrammatical emendation, but

it succeeds after a fashion in making Ezekiel say that 60 shekels = 1 maneh, and so harmonizing what was regarded as a prediction with fact. It is needless to add that the corrector misunderstood the real meaning of Ezekiel's statement. The verse in its correct form gives us the information that the old Hebrew maneh consisted of fifty instead of sixty shekels; and also that at the time of the fall of the Jewish state something of the nature of a fixed coinage existed, with shekel, five shekel, and ten shekel pieces. Ex. xxx. 13, in the Priest's Code, adds to these coins the half-shekel piece. If any one is surprised at the cumbrous and ungrammatical treatment of the text in this emendation, let him turn to vs. 21 of the same chapter and observe the manner in which some editor has attempted to introduce into the text of that verse a recognition of the Feast of Weeks by the impossible change of שְׁבֻעוֹת into שְׁבֻעַת. Both the changes in vs. 12 and that in vs. 21 seem to indicate a period when Hebrew had become a dead language, and interpretation had begun to set the letter above the context.

Ezekiel xlv. 14 has been regarded as a case of emendation with an object, namely, to bring the statements of Ezekiel into harmony with those of Deuteronomy. In this case, however, it is the Septuagint rather than the Hebrew which is supposed to be the emended text. The Hebrew reads וְחֶק הַשְּׁמֶן הַבַּת מִנְשֵׁר הַבַּת מִן חֹמֶר הַבַּת מִנְשֵׁר הַבַּת מִן חֹמֶר הַבַּת מִנְשֵׁר הַבַּת מִן חֹמֶר. The text as it stands is repetitious and also grammatically impossible. Analyzing it for itself in connection with the preceding verse, it would seem as though הַבַּת הַשְּׁמֶן were a repetition through a misunderstanding of וְחֶק הַשְּׁמֶן, while in the second part חֹמֶר has been inserted and כִּי misread כִּי. The text as it stands translates, "And the rule in the matter of oil, the *bath* the oil, the tenth of a *bath* out of a *kor*. Ten *baths* make a *homer*, for ten *baths* make a *homer*." With the proposed emendations it would read, "And the rule in the matter of oil is the tenth of a *bath* from a *kor*. Ten *baths* make a *kor*, ten *baths* make a *homer*." This would read smoothly, and run in almost parallel construction with vs. 13. The last half of the verse would be manifestly an explanation of the term כֹּר, not explained in vs. 11, where the wet and dry measures were defined. It is worthy of note that the word כֹּר for חֹמֶר seems to have come to the Hebrews from the Aramaean, and to be of later date. Moreover, the explanatory second half of the verse is suspiciously like a gloss. If this line of emendation be adopted at all, one is inclined to

substitute **מחמר** for **מן הכר**, as in vs. 13, and omit the second half altogether. Verses 13, 14, and 15 would then be structurally uniform and give us a descending scale for the **תרומה**; viz., of wheat and barley, 1 in 60; of oil, 1 in 100; of the flocks, 1 in 200. This seems to be in glaring contradiction to the rule of the tithe prescribed in Deuteronomy xiv. 23 and mentioned in Amos iv. 4 and elsewhere as a regular practice. The Septuagint is evidently translated from a different text, which we may restore, **וחק השמן בת השמן מצשרה בתים כי עשרת הבתים חמר**, *i.e.* "And the rule in the matter of oil is a *bath* of oil from ten *baths*, for ten *baths* make a *homer*." So far as oil is concerned, this would agree with Deuteronomy. Taking the Masoretic consonant text it will be observed that the Septuagint is almost identical with it up to the middle of the second half of the verse, the last clause being dropped apparently as an idle repetition. Assuming for a moment that the Masoretic text is the more original, the Septuagint would be derived from it by the omission of **ה** in the first **הבת**; the insertion of **'** after the second; the omission of the **נ** of **מן** and the **ה** of **הכר**, and the change of the **ר** of **הכר** into **'**. The Septuagint would then give us a grammatically correct sentence directing the tithing of oil. The transformations which this verse has undergone are in any case curious. I am inclined to think that they took place in this sequence: Original verse

וחק השמן מצשר הבת מחמר

1. By blunder of scribe **וחק השמן** was written twice.
2. Through similarity of form in archaic script the second erased **וחק השמן** was transformed into **הבת השמן**.
3. A scribe familiar with the *kor* as the common measure of his day, equivalent to the old Hebrew *homer*, substituted the former for the latter.
4. A student, observing that the **כר** was not mentioned in Ezekiel's table of measures, vs. 11, added a marginal note, which later crept into the text, "10 *baths* make a *kor*, 10 *baths* make a *homer*."
5. A scribe reading **הבתים חמר** in the second half of the gloss, wrote **חמר** by mistake after the first **הבתים** also.
6. A scribe finding **הבתים חמר כר**, and not understanding or overlooking the indication for the erasure of **חמר**, sought to make sense of the passage by changing **כי** to **כר**.

Such I imagine to have been the evolution of the Masoretic text. The Septuagint translators had this text before them. It was almost

untranslatable. They were familiar with the tithe, as prescribed and practised, and involuntarily saw in ... *מצשרהבתם* of the Hebrew not *מצשר הַבַּת מִן* but *מצשר הַבַּתם*; while *כר עשרת* seemed to them an error for the *כי עשרת* with which the last clause began.

The corruption of the text, then, took place before the Septuagint translation; and the Septuagint was an honest attempt to translate a corrupt and unintelligible verse on the basis of the best information of the translators; and not an attempt, as Smend and others have thought, to emend the text in order to bring it into harmony with Deuteronomy. Such an emendation, as can be seen from vs. 14, 21, and other passages, would have shown itself in the Masoretic rather than in the Septuagint text.

Ezekiel xliii. 3. A gloss of a different nature from the preceding is to be found in the words, *כבר . . . ומראות*. It will be generally admitted that the first *כמראה* in this verse must be erased, following the Septuagint, and *בבאי* changed to *בבאי*. We should then translate, "And the vision which I saw was like the vision which I saw when He came to destroy the city, and visions like the vision which I saw by the river Kebar; and I fell upon my face." Now the last half of the verse does not belong with the first half, either in construction or sense, and we are no better off if with Cornill, following in substance Ewald, we adopt the Septuagint reading of the second half, "and the appearance of the chariot which I saw by the river Kebar, and I fell upon my face." This reading of the Septuagint would involve the change of *ומראות* to *ומראה*, and of *כמראה* to *המרכב* or *המרכבה* (not to *הרכב* as proposed by Cornill). No chariot or vehicle is mentioned in the earlier visions seen by Ezekiel, and the Septuagint reading is, as it seems to me, manifestly an error, and yet an error which suggests its own correction. The *המרכב* of the text from which the Septuagint translation was made was an error, easily made in the archaic script, for *הכרויב* (*cf.* x. 15), and this again for *הככור* or *הככור* of iii. 23. The passage is a citation of the latter part of the last mentioned verse. A reader wished to comment on the word *ומראה*, or *המראה*, as I suppose it was originally. He accordingly wrote that word in the margin or at the foot of the page, and after it his comment, which consisted of a citation of iii. 23^b.¹

¹ For similar annotations compare my paper in the *JOURNAL*, Vol. XI., Part I. Compare also x. 9-16, which has been recognized as a series of annotations or citations as follows: x. 9 = i. 15, 16^a; 10 = i. 16^b; 11 = i. 17; 12 = i. 18; 16^b = i. 19^b.

The Hebrew text itself furnishes important incidental evidence of a citation noted on the margin. The original text reads correctly the preposition על before נהר and also before פני; whereas in the citation we have incorrectly the writing אל. From the transliteration of proper names and the like in the Septuagint we learn that the soft ס of the Hebrew, corresponding to the Arabic 'ain, had at the beginning of the second century B.C. lost its guttural force, and become identical in sound with א, whereas the hard ש, corresponding to Arabic ghain, preserved a guttural force. The Masoretic text of the book of Ezekiel belongs to the period of confusion, and we find, accordingly, על and אל almost hopelessly confounded. We can, however, prove, I think, that in the time of Ezekiel the two were distinguished, and that they were distinguished in the original text of Ezekiel. The confusion was due to later scribes, who often wrote אל for על, rarely *vice versa*. When, therefore, we find in one passage the preposition על correctly written twice, and in the same passage the writing אל substituted, we can regard the erroneous writing as incidental proof of the later origin of the second passage. In this case the original על is preserved in iii. 23. A later annotator commenting on the ודמראה of xliii. 3 in copying a citation from iii. 23 wrote twice אל for על.

Such textual errors as the few in the book of Ezekiel which I have discussed in this and my former paper, have an importance and interest quite aside from the mere correction of the text, as showing us how texts were handled, and at how early a date they began to be annotated. We find that before 200 B.C. such annotation of texts had been practised for some generations, so that the annotations had had time to creep from the margin into the body of the manuscript, giving rise to texts varying considerably one from another. The text of the prophetic books, although lovingly and reverently studied, was evidently in the year 200 B.C. not officially fixed, nor did it stand by any means upon a plane with the text of the Pentateuch. Annotations and modifications were made with much freedom. Even after the Septuagint translation had been made and the canon of the Prophets adopted as such, we still find changes in the text, and some of these changes were made with a purpose, namely, to bring the words of the Prophets into harmony with the Law or with tradition. It is observable, however, that the freedom of treatment on the whole diminishes as we advance in time. The changes which we find to have been made after the period of the Septuagint translation, and especially after the adoption

of the square characters, are more often attempts to reform unintelligible or apparently contradictory passages than annotations, pious reflections, and the like. We see a decided movement toward reverence for the letter of the text as such without regard to the context, and yet even in the Maccabæan period we are still far from the definitely fixed text of the post-Christian Jewish church.

And now permit me to present two notes of a lexicographical rather than textual character.

2 Kings iii. 27 contains the account of the sacrifice by the king of Moab of his son as a whole burnt offering upon the wall in sight of the allied armies. Thereupon great קִצְוֹן "was upon Israel, and they departed from him and returned to their own land." The Canterbury revisers render, "There was great wrath against Israel," and in the margin, "There came great wrath upon Israel." In "Scriptures Hebrew and Christian" I translated, "great dismay came upon Israel." This translation does not go quite far enough; the correct translation would be "a great calamity," or "disaster," or "reverse" befell Israel. The root meaning of קִצְוֹן is 'wrath.' It is used both as verb and noun. As a noun it occurs together with אַף and חֵמָה. It is used more particularly of the wrath of God, and then, as in Josh. ix. 20; xx. 20; Jer. xxi. 5; Zech. i. 2, of calamity as the wrath of God, or the expression of that wrath. That is the sense of this passage, as can be gathered also from the inscription of Mesha of Moab. The passage is interesting as showing the deep-rooted feeling among the Hebrews, as among all other primitive peoples, of the efficacy of human sacrifice. It was this feeling, cropping out over and over again, which led the Jews astray into the horrible Moloch worship. In its imperfect monotheism our passage stands on a par with the story of Naaman's two mule loads of earth, and David's belief that Yahweh could not be worshipped in the land of the Philistines. The last edition of Gesenius gives the root sense of the word קִצְוֹן as 'break,' and translates קִצְוֹן, Joel i. 7, as a 'breaking,' agreeing in general with the Septuagint συγκλασμός. This does not make good sense. The word is used in that verse as a synonymous parallel to שִׁמְמָה, 'desolation,' and means 'calamity, destruction,' as in 2 Kings iii. 27. The Septuagint has merely guessed at the sense, as it has also done in rendering קִצְוֹן, Hos. x. 7, by φρύγανον, 'twig.' Gesenius correctly renders the word in that passage 'foam,' the wrath of the water. So far as Hebrew is con-

cerned, there is no evidence of the sense 'break'; the meaning everywhere is 'wrath,' or the result of wrath, 'calamity, disaster, destruction.'

2 Samuel i. 21. There are two difficulties in this verse, the first of which lies in the words וְשָׂרֵי תְרוּמוֹת. That this cannot mean "and fields of offerings" is pretty generally recognized. Driver says: "The text is suspicious. . . . It is difficult, however, to suggest any satisfactory emendation." Thenius points out that "fields of offerings" is a peculiarly inappropriate name for hills on which neither dew nor rain shall fall, and arguing from the Septuagint ὄρη θανάτου, reads for תְרוּמוֹת, הַרֵי מוֹת, correcting the preceding יַעֲרִי to וְשָׂרֵי. He translates, accordingly: "Ye forests and mountains of death." Wellhausen objects that יַעֲרִי וְהַרֵי מוֹת is not Hebrew, but is inclined to accept the correction מוֹת הַרֵי מוֹת for תְרוּמוֹת, supposing וְשָׂרֵי to be a corruption of another הַרֵי, that word having been duplicated by the error of a scribe. I formerly suggested the emendation וְשָׂרֵי רְמוֹת, "and high mountains," but while שָׂרֵי is feminine in form, I am inclined to think that it is in reality a masculine plural, like אֲבוֹת (plural *át* not *át*). Moreover the specific "mountain of Gilboa" seems to require as its parallel some phrase more specific than the very general "high mountains." The Septuagint, ὄρη θανάτου, gives us such a specific phrase, and represents, I am inclined to think, the original text. The emendation מוֹת הַרֵי is, I believe, correct, as an explanation of the word תְרוּמוֹת. But how account for the וְשָׂרֵי which precedes it?

The latest editions of Gesenius's *Handwörterbuch* give as the original meaning of שָׂרֵי or שָׂרֵי, 'level, plain country,' in distinction from hill country. There is in the use of this word in Hebrew absolutely no ground for such a statement. There is not a single instance where the word requires such a sense, and not a few where the opposite sense is indicated. In Assyrian we find the word *šadû* meaning 'mountain,' while the same sign is used to indicate this word and the word *mātu*, 'country,' suggesting that 'mountain' and 'country' were once one and the same thing. Now the meaning 'country' for שָׂרֵי in Hebrew is well established, and is recognized even in so conservative a work as the Canterbury Revision. A comparison of the passages in which the word is used in this sense shows, however, that the sense 'country' was old, and in the time of the great Judæan prophets obsolete or obsolescent. In the Hexateuch it appears once in that strange fourteenth chapter of Genesis (xiv. 7), of the Amale-

kites; once in the Yahwistic narrative (Gen. xxxii. 4), of Edom; once in the Elohist (Num. xxi. 20), of Moab; and once in another old passage of uncertain origin (Gen. xxxvi. 35), also of Moab. In Judges v. 4 it is applied to Edom; 1 Sam. vi. 1 and xxvii. 7, 11, to the Philistines; in Hosea xii. 13 it is used of Aram; in Obadiah 19 of Ephraim and Samaria. In the book of Ruth it is used six times (five of them in the form שד׳), of Moab. In 1 Chron. i. 46 and viii. 8, taken from passages in the older books already cited, it is used of Moab; and in Ps. lxxviii. 12, 43 it is used, perhaps poetically, of Zoan. In Judges xx., which is part of a later Judæan addition to the original North-Israelite stories, it is used (xx. 6) in a way which shows that the older sense ‘country’ was at least obsolescent, שדה נחלת ישראל, “land of the inheritance of Israel.” It was, to judge from these passages, the word used in the Moabite tongue to designate ‘country,’ so that the land of Moab especially receives the name שדה מואב. Among the Hebrews it was not, from the period when their literature begins, in common use in the sense of ‘country’; and so far as it is found in that sense, it is almost exclusively in writings originating in northern Israel. In classical use it designates landed property, or the landed property of an individual (Gen. xxiii. 17; 1 Sam. vi. 14, 18; 2 Kings ix. 25; Is. v. 8); the unenclosed country outside of the walls of a city, a camp, a house, or a garden (Lev. xiv. 7; 1 Sam. iv. 2; Jer. vi. 12; Ex. xxii. 4); wild or uninhabited country (Ex. x. 15; Job xxxix. 15); pasture land (Num. xxii. 4; Gen. xxxiv. 28); plough or seed land (Deut. xxiv. 19; 1 Sam. xiv. 14); field in general, orchard, vineyard, etc. (2 Chron. xxxi. 5; Joel i. 19; Cant. vii. 12; 2 Kings iv. 39); soil (Ez. xvii. 8); land in contrast to sea (1 Chron. xvi. 32); it is also used in the expressions “on the ground” (Ex. xvi. 25), “out of doors” (Prov. xxiv. 27). It is used four times to designate villages, suburbs, or small towns, in distinction from the capital (1 Sam. xxvii. 5; Ezek. xxvi. 6, 8; 1 Chron. xxvii. 25). In addition to these there are a number of passages, chiefly poetical, where שדה or שד׳ is used either distinctly in the sense of mountain or mountainous country, or in conjunction with phrases that show that the writer had a hill country in mind. In Num. xxiii. 14, in the Elohist story of Balaam, we are told that Balak took the prophet, שדה צפנים אל ראש הפסגה. The conjunction of itself suggests a mountain, as does the whole tenor of the story. Apparently the passage means “to Watcher’s Mountain, to the summit of the Pisgah.” Otherwise it could only mean “to the country of the Zuphites, to the summit of the Pisgah.” In

Judges v. 18 we find the passage, ונפתלי על מרומי שדה, "and Naphtali on the heights of the mountains." Here the sense seems unmistakable; the poet is describing in the words על מרומי שדה, the hill country of Galilee. In Deut. xxxii. 13 we have in parallel halves of the verse, במותי ארץ and תנוכת שדי, which suggests that the idea of שדי in the mind of the poet was at least not that of flat or level country, as in Gesenius. Jer. xvii. 3; xviii. 14; Ezek. xxi. 2; Is. lvi. 9; Ps. l. 11; lxxx. 14; xcvi. 12, all convey the same idea by their use of the word in conjunction or parallelism with הר, צור, or יצר.

The use of שדה or שדי, then, in Hebrew, seems to give evidence that it was originally employed, as the sign which denotes this word was used in Assyrian, to mean both 'country' and 'mountain.' Incidentally, also, this throws light on Assyrian use, and suggests that the reason why the same sign was used in the two meanings is that the same word, and that word *šadû*, not *mātu*, was originally used in the same two senses. It also suggests that the ancestors of Hebrews, Moabites, and Assyrians came originally from a mountainous country. It is evident, moreover, that both of these meanings were early, and that they soon became obsolete in literary Hebrew. How entirely they were forgotten in the third century B.C. is evident from the Septuagint, which knows no other meaning than 'field.' The rendering ὄρη θανάτου, 2 Sam. i. 21, which seems at first sight an exception to this rule, is a translation, not of שדי מות, but of הרי מות. The author wrote, I suppose, שדי מות, meaning "mountain of death." As this sense of שדי became obsolete some commentator added after שדי the explanatory gloss הרי. In the manuscript from which the Septuagint translation was made this word supplanted שדי altogether. In the copy from which the Masoretic text is descended both words were preserved side by side, until some late scribe, by accident or in the desire to make some sort of sense, changed הרי מות to תרומות.

The other difficulty in this verse lies in the words בלי משיח בשמן. Driver would read משובח, and translate "not anointed with oil," making the subject the shield of Saul. Wellhausen also would correct to משובח or נמשח, which latter seems to have been the reading before the Septuagint. The clause seems to me suspicious *in toto*. It looks too much as though a later student had made here a gloss to the effect that Saul was not the divinely appointed and anointed king over Israel, which later crept into the text. If the whole clause be not a gloss, then I should incline to suppose that

the original text was כְּלֵי מְשֹׁחַ בְּשֶׁמֶן, "the weapons of the one anointed with oil," which was later changed by some over-zealous or unintelligent "orthodoxist" to "not the Messiah with oil," as it is in the Masoretic text. But the form of the phrase, "not the Messiah with oil," the awkwardness of the passage, even when corrected as suggested by Wellhausen and Driver, and its superfluity both in sense and rhythm, lead me to think, as has been already said, that the three words are a gloss.

Psalm xlii. 7. The remaining passage to which I wish to call attention suggests critical questions of a different character from any of the foregoing. This Psalm has generally been described as a Levitical song of the captivity. Some have referred it to a later date, and to some lesser captivity. All have been hard pressed to explain what the captives were doing at the sources of the Jordan, Baniās, the ancient Dan. Cheyne explains the situation (*Bampton Lectures*, pp. 114, 115) in detail as referring to the defeat of the Ætolian mercenary, Scopas, by Antiochus III., 199-198 B.C., the former being supposed to have carried off from Jerusalem to the neighborhood of Baniās some Levites, who there compose Psalms xlii. and xliii. Other explanations which have been offered of the circumstances which could have brought Judæan captives to this point are equally improbable.

There seems to be little doubt that the place described in the words מֵאֶרֶץ יַרְדֵּן וְחַרְמוֹנִים מֵהַר מְצַעַר, "from Jordan land and Hermon, from the little hill," is Baniās; and the opinion that that is the place described derives added strength from the following verse, with its apparent reference to the out-rushing springs. But for the supposition that the Psalm is a song of captivity, and that any captive either really or figuratively is sighing from such a resting-place for the temple at Jerusalem I find no ground. This reference is generally found in verse 5, which is translated by Cheyne,

"This must I remember, pouring
out my soul upon me,
how I went along with the throng,
conducting them to the house of God,
with ringing cries and giving of thanks —
a festive multitude."

But this translation arbitrarily changes an imperfect to a perfect. The text has "I am wont to go," and refers not to something past, but to actually existing conditions. The poem seems to me to have

been in its original form a temple song of the temple of Dan, sung on one of the great pilgrim festivals, apparently the Feast of Tabernacles. The original poem seems to me to exist in part at least in verses 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8. אלה, at the beginning of verse 5 is, I suspect, a repetition from the אלהים at the close of verse 3, or the אלהיך at the close of verse 4. אלהי, at the beginning of verse 7 belongs, as is generally recognized, to verse 6, and I suspect that the words which follow it, עָלֵי נַפְשִׁי תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה, are a later addition, suggested by the refrain. I would translate these verses of the original poem thus :

2. "As longs the hind for water-brooks,
so longs my soul for Thee, O God ;
 3. My soul is athirst for God, the living God ;
when shall I come and see the face of God ?
 5. Let me make my *azkara* (offered portion of the meal offering) and
pour out libation for my life,
for I am wont to pass over בַּסֶּךְ אֲדָדָם (Sept. בַּסֶּךְ אֲדִירִים)
unto the house of God,
with the sound of shouting and thanksgiving, a multitude
keeping the pilgrim feast.
- * * * * *
7. Therefore I worship Thee from the land of Jordan,
and Hermonim, from mount Miz'ar (little?).
 8. Deep calleth unto deep, the voice of Thy water pipes ;
all Thy breakers and billows have passed over me."

Owing to the impossibility of translating the words בַּסֶּךְ אֲדָדָם, in verse 5, I am inclined to think that the Septuagint here offers an approximately more correct text, and that the reference is to the peculiar form of the celebration of the feast of Tabernacles with booths ; but the passage is very blind. Verse 7, as has been pointed out, indicates well the position of Baniyas, or Dan, on the foot-hills of Hermon at the sources of the Jordan. Verse 8 refers to the springs which originally gave the site its sanctity as a place in which the divine power especially manifested its presence by the gushing forth of the life-giving waters from the deep beneath the earth ; and the noise of the rushing fountains seems to be represented poetically as the voice of the deep beneath the earth calling to the deep above the earth. (In verse 5 I have read אוֹכִירָה for אוֹכֶרָה, and עָלֵי for עָלֶי.)

These verses seem to me to represent part at least of the original poem. Perhaps also verses 4, 10, 11 constituted part of that poem. If not, they represent the next accretion. The refrains, vs. 6 and 12,

seem to be later additions. The third stanza, Psalm xliii., is still later, and was formed on the second stanza as a text (*cf.* xliii. 2 with xlii. 10). The latest addition was xlii. 10, a pietistic insertion which interrupts the sense and destroys the symmetry of the stanzas. This verse makes use of verse 3. It also uses יהוה as the name of God. It represents in that particular a later Yahwistic recension, of which we find traces in a number of the Elohist Psalms.

Theoretically there is no difficulty in supposing that a Psalm of the northern kingdom could be adopted later into the Jewish Psalter; and many, if not the majority, of commentators have referred Psalm xlv. to such an origin. It was in the northern kingdom that Hebrew literature as such was first developed; and from that source come the tales of Judges and Kings, much of Samuel and of the Hexateuch, the groundwork, I think, of Canticles and Ruth, and the earliest prophets. In the kingdom of Israel literature had reached a comparatively high development while the kingdom of Judah still lay in darkness. It was the fall of Samaria which was the immediate cause of the renaissance in Judah. The relation of the two kingdoms in literature and religion was strikingly similar to the later relation of the Eastern and Western churches; and the fall of Samaria played the part in the literary and religious development of Israel which, at a later date, the fall of Constantinople played in the development of the West. That there was some sort of psalmody in the northern kingdom which was used for religious purposes is both *a priori* probable from a comparison of Babylonian psalmody, and is directly and indirectly vouched for, as it seems to me, by the prophets Amos and Hosea. Of this psalmody it is but natural that we should find fragments, if not entire Psalms, imbedded in the later Jewish Psalter. As already stated, the base of Psalm xlii. seems to me to have been a festival hymn used in the temple of Dan. The original part of Psalm xvi., which is, I think, to be found in vs. 2-7, would find its best explanation in a similar origin. Psalm lxxx. 2-4, on the other hand, seems to demand a Bethelic origin; for on no other supposition are the references to Joseph, Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasseh intelligible. The same is true of Psalm lxxvii. 15-20, which was later joined to another Psalm, vs. 2-11, the hand of the redactor being visible in vs. 12-14. Psalm lxxxi. 2-6 belongs in the same category. The division of these two latter Psalms into two distinct parts, moreover, is not original with me, for Cheyne also recognizes that both of these Psalms are composite. It is scarcely necessary to point out that this throws light on the use of *Elohim* in

the three main collections of the Second and Third Books of the Psalter, which finds its analogue only in the North-Israelite Elohist narrative in the Hexateuch. But even the Yahwistic collectors of Psalms lxxxiv.–lxxxix. must have been able to draw on some material which had come down from the northern kingdom, for certainly no one but a resident of Galilee could have used Tabor and Hermon to mark south and north (vs. 13), and not even Cheyne could maintain that this Psalm was written so late in the post-exilic period that the Jews could have been in possession of that region. This Psalm is composite, and vs. 10–13, or possibly 10–15, seem to be a fragment of an earlier poem, which, from its reference to Tabor and Hermon, the great natural landmarks of south and north in Galilee, and there only, must have been written in that region.

I do not claim, as will be seen, that these Psalms have necessarily come down to us in the exact form in which they were first sung. They have been edited, revised, adapted; they have grown, they have shrunk; they have been patched; they have been added to other Psalms, other Psalms have been added to them; and in their present form they are hymns of the second temple. But I do claim that there are references in Psalms xlii., lxxvii., lxxx., lxxxi., and lxxxix. which find their rational explanation only in a reference to North-Israelitic sources.