

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

PROF. T. K. CHEYNE.

OXFORD, ENGLAND.

Psalm xxii. 25. כִּי לֹא־בָּזָה וְלֹא שָׁקַץ עֲנוּת עֵינַי.

Can עֲנוּת be the right object of שָׁקַץ and בָּזָה? Cf. Ps. ix. 13, cii. 18. Should we not read צַעֲקָתָא? The last letter of the preceding word is א. For another instance of the loss of the initial א of צַעֲקָתָא see Ps. lv. 4, where several critics after Olshausen have read צַעֲקָתָא. צַעֲקָתָא became עֲנוּתָא. LXX. freely, τῆ δειψία. It is not very probable that this represents עֲנוּתָא (as Gesenius thinks), but עֲנוּתָא may have been read by LXX. in vs. 22, where Mas. text has עֲנוּתָא, which Thrupp and Wellhausen have rightly corrected into עֲנוּתָא, 'my distressed (life).'

Nahum ii. 8. Is not Mr. Paul Ruben (*Academy*, March 7, 1896) right in correcting הַקְּלָתָהּ into הַסְּתִלָּהּ, on the ground of Delitzsch's statement (*Assyr. HWB.* s.v.), "*etellu*, fem. *etellitu*, 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 הַצֵּב as the corrupt fragment of a hemstitch. May we read הַשֹּׁפָה מְלֻכָּה 'and the queen shall be laid bare' (an assumed Pu'al)? Kimchi's וְנִצְבָּה וְנִשְׁנָל was not so bad, after all. Nor was Ewald so rash as Rödiger thought (*Ges. Thes.* s.v. צֵב) 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 הַצֵּב. 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.