Notes on Psalm xxii. 25 and Nahum ii. 8.

PROF. T. K. CHEYNE.


Psalm xxii. 25. יְהַבֵי נֶחֱנָה יִשָּׂא לִפְרוֹת. Can נֶחֱנָה be the right object of יָשָׂא and נֹעַ? Cf. Ps. ix. 13, cii. 18. Should we not read נֶשָׂא? The last letter of the preceding word is נ. For another instance of the loss of the initial נ of נָשָׂא see Ps. lv. 4, where several critics after Olshausen have read נָשָׂא. נָשֵׂא became נָשָׁא. LXX. freely, τῇ δείκουσι. It is not very probable that this represents נָשָׂא (as Gesenius thinks), but נָשָׁא may have been read by LXX. in vs. 22, where Mas. text has נָשָׂא, which Thrupp and Wellhausen have rightly corrected into נָשׁ, 'my distressed (life).'</n

Nahum ii. 8. Is not Mr. Paul Ruben (Academy, March 7, 1896) right in correcting נִבְּלוּסָה into נִבְּלוּתָה, on the ground of Delitzsch's statement (Assyr. HWB. s.v.), "etelitu, fem. etelilitu, great, high, exalted; as a subst., lord, or, if necessary, lady, used of gods and kings." Of course, we must now go further, and treat נִבְּלוּתָה as the corrupt fragment of a hemstitch. May we read נִבְּלוּתָה 'and the queen shall be laid bare' (an assumed Pu'al)? Kimchi's נִבְּלוּסָה was not so bad, after all. Nor was Ewald so rash as Rödiger thought (Ges. Thes. s.v. נִבְּלוּסָה) in suspecting that Assyriology might speak a decisive word on the subject; he only erred in looking to it for light on the supposed proper name נִבְּלוּסָה. It is needless to recount the vain attempts of modern commentators, to which Professor Davidson (Nahum, Habakkuk, etc., London, 1896) has added another — learned, but plainly impossible.