

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

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. רַמּוֹת 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 בְּרַשָּׁן (so Grätz). יִשְׂרָאֵל should as certainly be אֲשֶׁרִי.

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. 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 יהוה, Ἰησοῦς 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 יְהִתְלַו should probably be pointed יְהִתְלַו. Isa. 52⁵, יְהִי לְיָהוּא will find few defenders. Read יְהִתְלַו (Ryssel, Grätz, Kittel).

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

(d) Ps. 45¹⁶ יְהוֹדוּהָ. Read יְנַדְּלוּהָ.

(e) Ps. 116⁶ יְהוֹשִׁיעַ. Here Ⓞ gives ἕσωσεν. The initial י is dittographic.

(f) Job 13⁹, **תְּהַתְּלוּ בְּהַתְּלִי**. But note Dagesh in the latter form, which should doubtless be read **תְּהַתְּלוּ**; therefore also **בְּהַתְּלִי**. Cf. Budde's note.

(g) Neh. 11¹⁷, **יְהוּדָה לְהַתְּפִלָּה**, which is supposed to mean '(who) raised the strain of "Hōdū" for the prayer.' But **Ⓞ^B** has a shorter text, and **Ⓞ^L** presupposes **יְהוּדָה הַתְּהַתְּלָה**. **רֹאשׁ הַתְּהַתְּלָה** comes just before. For this **Ⓞ^{s.c.m.a.}** gives *ἀρχηγὸς τοῦ αἴνου*; **Ⓞ^L** *ἀρχων τοῦ αἴνου*, i.e. **הַתְּהַתְּלָה**. It is extremely probable that **יְהוּדָה** was originally **תְּהַתְּלָה**, and that this was a correction of **תְּהַתְּלָה**. **[ב]תְּפִלָּה** is probably a variant to **תְּהַתְּלָה**, which has intruded into the text (cf. Ps. 72²⁰, MT. **תְּפִלּוֹת**; but **Ⓞⁱ** *οἱ ὕμνοι* = **הַתְּהַתְּלוֹת**).

(h) Ezek. 46²², **מִהַקְצֵנוֹת**, "on account of: 1. its loose connection with the preceding word, 2. the silence of **Ⓞ**, and 3. the *puncta extraordinaria* of the Masoretes, is undeniably a gloss," says König, i. 294. But though a gloss, he will not admit that it is a miswritten gloss. Rather it is a case of dittography; it is miswritten for **מִקְצֵנוֹת**. I am glad to read Professor Toy's pithy remark, 'copyist's error.' To this we may add:

(i) The unusual **יְהוֹסֵף** for **יֹסֵף** in Ps. 81⁶. The improbability of this is extreme. **שְׁמִי** follows. Read **בְּיֹסֵף הַשְּׁמִיעַ**.

Of course, an absolutely conservative critic will reject all these remedies. But absolute conservatism has few, if any, representatives now. If any one will take the trouble to record and classify each example of corruption of the text that he meets with, he will not, I believe, call any of the above corrections rash or unjustified. I conclude that even the latest grammarians have been too conservative in their treatment of non-syncopated forms. The right method is (as Kautzsch fully admits) first to criticise the texts, and then to form acceptable theories to account for the phenomena.