

תפוחי; these represent תור. Thus we get as the sense of v.^{11a}, 'A necklace of pearls in sockets of wreathed gold.'

But we see that vs.^{11a} corresponds pretty closely to vs.^{12a}. Therefore vs.^{11b} should correspond to vs.^{12b}. And so most probably it does. חכם occurs twice over in vs.^{12b} (for מוכיח, as Bickell sees, is due to the transposition of the letters חכמ). Read in both passages דבר חכם (Bickell coincides only as to vs.^{12b}). Oddly enough vs.^{11b} gives דבר דבר twice over, and vs.^{12b} חכם virtually twice over. As to the amazing phrase על-אפניו, where Schultens sees an allusion to the tropes of elegant oriental style, it is merely a corruption, either of לְמַקְנָהוּ " (spoken) for its purpose," or "with reference to its purpose," or of לְלִטְמוֹתָיו (נִי = מ, פ = ש, א = צ), which is a weakened form of על-אזן שמעת. Sense and parallelism alike favour the second alternative.

Read therefore :

תור חרמים בְּמִשְׁבָּעֵי קָחַם דְּבַר חָכָם עַל-שִׁמְשֵׁוֹ

The two proverbs, vs.¹¹ and vs.¹², are thus in complete correspondence. But perhaps דְּבַרְיָ would be still better than דְּבַר? The loss of a ך need not startle any one. The sense is, "He who hears with intelligence the words of the wise values them not less than the most costly ornaments." The at first sight startling introduction of the sardius into ⚔ is easily accounted for. It is designed to distinguish כְּתָם from זָהָב. Compare Job 31²⁴ χρυσίον (זָהָב), ²⁶ λίθῳ πολυτελεί (כְּתָם). I have not had the advantage of consulting Baumgarten's *Étude critique* on the text of Proverbs (1890). But had this learned writer cleared up the passage, our new Hebrew Thesaurus (BDB. Part i, 1892) would, I think, have given us notice of it. Wildeboer's judicious but too brief commentary has nothing new to suggest. He thinks (with BDB., Delitzsch, and Strack) that עַל-אֶפְנוֹ = בְּעֵתוֹ (15²³), which, with vs.¹² before us, does not seem very probable.

2. On Psalm lxx. 3.

In the JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE, xvii. (1898), pp. 207 f., I have retracted my former view of the meaning of כָּל-בֶּשֶׁר יִבְאוּ in Ps. 65³, which I can no longer use in illustration of the large-hearted utterance in Mal. 1¹¹. The short article containing this retraction (along with other things) was written early in 1898. In the summer of the same year I had occasion to return to Ps. 65, and the text presupposed in the rendering given in that article no longer seems to

me correct. I will at any rate venture to put before the reader a rendering of the text which I now think defensible.

To thee let praise be chanted, | O Yahwè, in Zion;
To thee let vows be performed | in Yeru-shalem.

To thy holy place, [O Yahwè,] let all men repair;
When our transgressions weighed us down, | thou thyself didst cancel them.

דְּמִיָּה is non-existent. Every passage which presents this word in MT. can, I believe, be shown to be corrupt. But דְּמִיָּה will not do. The psalmist would have used נִאֻוָּה (33¹) if he had wished to say 'is seemly.' 'Seemly for thee,' however, might mean 'seemly for thee to offer'; it is too vague. Read הִתְקַדַּשׁ, although the Pual occurs nowhere else. רָמוּת passed into דְּמִיָּה.

There is much more to be said on this fascinating psalm, but time is wanting. Let me hope to be more fortunate on some other occasion. I will only remark that קָדַשׁ in vs.⁵ should certainly be בְּרָשָׁן (so Grätz). יִשְׂרָאֵל should as certainly be אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׂרָאֵל.

3. Some Supposed Archaisms in the Old Testament.

While acknowledging the reasonableness of König's arguments in his *Lehrgebäude* i. 294 f., respecting the non-syncope of certain verbal forms in the causative stems, I ought to state that I have great doubts as to the examples quoted by König on pp. 425, 585, by Driver in *Text of Samuel*, p. 113, and in Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 53 g.

(a) 1 Sam. 17⁴⁷ יְהוֹשִׁיעַ יְהוָה. Either this is a combination of two readings יְהוֹשִׁיעַ and יְהוֹשִׁיעַ, or, as Klostermann has suggested, יְהוֹשִׁיעַ may be due to a copyist who misunderstood the final ה in יְהוֹשִׁיעַ (so Klost. reads for יְהוֹשִׁיעַ יְהוָה, ἡ σωζεις κύριος). It is strange that Löhr should have contented himself here with appealing to the opinion of Driver expressed so long ago as 1890. Prof. H. P. Smith is silent.

(b) Jer. 9⁴ יְהִתְלַל יְהוָה should probably be pointed יְהִתְלַל יְהוָה. Isa. 52⁵, יְהִי לִי יְהוָה will find few defenders. Read יְהִתְלַל יְהוָה (Ryssel, Grätz, Kittel).

(c) Ps. 28⁷ אֲדוֹנָי. Scarcely defensible, except indeed by the improbable supposition that אֲדוֹרָה in the Psalter was everywhere originally אֲדוֹרָה. Read doubtless אֲנִי־לִי. (Duhm's explanation of the common reading will hardly find supporters.)

(d) Ps. 45¹⁶ יְהוֹדוּךָ. Read יְהַלְלוּךָ.

(e) Ps. 116⁶ יְהוֹשִׁיעַ. Here ἡ gives σωσεν. The initial י is dittographic.