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 Yahwe], in Zion;
To thee let vows be performed in Jeru-shalem.
To thy holy place, [O Yahwe], let all men repair;
When our transgressions weighed us down, thou thyself didst cancel them.

The psalmist would have used ת 返回ם (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 ת 返回ם, although the Pual occurs nowhere else. ת 返回ם passed into ת 返回ם.


While acknowledging the reasonableness of König's arguments in his Lehrgebäude i. 294 f., respecting the non-syncopation 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 q.

(a) 1 Sam. 17 'שענש. Either this is a combination of two readings 'שנש and 'שנש, or, as Klostermann has suggested, 'שנש may be due to a copyist who misunderstood the final 'ש in 'שענש (so Klost. reads for 'שענש 'שנש, ομ στάχει 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. 9 'שענש should probably be pointed 'שענש. Isa. 52, 'שענש will find few defenders. Read 'שענש (Ryssel, Grätz, Kittel).

(c) Ps. 28, 'שענש. Scarcely defensible, except indeed by the improbable supposition that 'שענש in the Psalter was everywhere originally 'שענש. Read doubtless 'שענש. (Duhm's explanation of the common reading will hardly find supporters.)

(d) Ps. 45, 'שענש. Read 'שענש.

(e) Ps. 116, 'שענש. Here Φ gives ἢρωσεν. The initial ' is dittographic.
(f) Job 13:9, יִשָּׁהֵל, יִנְפֹּתָהּ. But note Dagesh in the latter form, which should doubtless be read יִנְפֹּתָהּ; therefore also יִנְפֹּתָהּ. Cf. Budde's note.

(g) Neh. 11:2, יִנְפֹּתָהּ יִנְפֹּתָהּ, which is supposed to mean "(who) raised the strain of "Hōdū" for the prayer." But גָּוָה has a shorter text, and גָּוָה presupposes יִנְפֹּתָהּ. יִנְפֹּתָהּ comes just before. For this גָּוָה m. gives ἀρχηγός τοῦ αἰνοῦ; גָּוָה ἀρχηγός τοῦ αἰνοῦ, i.e. יִנְפֹּתָהּ. It is extremely probable that יִנְפֹּתָהּ was originally יִנְפֹּתָהּ, and that this was a correction of יִנְפֹּתָהּ. יִנְפֹּתָהּ[ב] is probably a variant to יִנְפֹּתָהּ, which has intruded into the text (cf. Ps. 72:9, MT, יִנְפֹּתָהּ; but גָּוָה יִנְפֹּתָהּ = מִנְפֹּתָהּ).

(h) Ezek. 46:1, יִנְפֹּתָהּ, יִנְפֹּתָהּ, "on account of: 1. its loose connection with the preceding word, 2. the silence of גָּוָה, 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 יִנְפֹּתָהּ. I am glad to read Professor Toy's pithy remark, 'copyist's error.' To this we may add:

(i) The unusual יִנְפֹּתָהּ for יִנְפֹּתָהּ in Ps. 81:6. The improbability of this is extreme. יִנְפֹּתָהּ follows. Read יִנְפֹּתָהּ. יִנְפֹּתָהּ.

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.