

## The Form תִּרְנָה, Prov. i. 20, viii. 3.

PROFESSOR KARL J. GRIMM, PH.D.

URSINUS COLLEGE, COLLEGEVILLE, PA.

**W**E read in Prov. i<sup>20</sup>:

חִכְמוֹתַי בְּחַוְצוֹת תִּרְנָה בְּרֹחֲבוֹת תַּחֲנוֹן קוֹלָהּ:

Wisdom cries aloud in the street, in the broad places she utters her voice.

What form is תִּרְנָה?

Most scholars are inclined to regard the form as the third singular feminine imperfect Qal of רִנָּן 'to call aloud.' Then, however, we should expect תִּרְנִן. Ewald,<sup>2</sup> Hitzig,<sup>3</sup> and Böttcher<sup>4</sup> suppose that the feminine ending תֵּ- has been added in order to differentiate it from the second person masculine which would, likewise, be תִּרְנִן. But this seems hardly probable. The examples adduced in support of this explanation are very few, and when we consider that in hundreds of cases the language did not make use of such means to differentiate the two forms, the suspicion arises that the three cases where this seems to have been done are due to a corruption of the text. An examination of the passages reveals the fact that such is really the case.

In Job 22<sup>21</sup> we meet with the anomalous form תִּבְוֹאֲתֶךָ. We read:

הִסְבֵּדְנָא עִמּוֹ וְשָׁלֶם בָּדַם תִּבְוֹאֲתֶךָ בִּיבָה

This is commonly translated:

Acquaint thyself with Him and be at peace: thereby good will come unto thee.

The Septuagint, however, followed by the Syriac version and the Targum, reads ὁ καρπὸς σου, which points to תִּבְוֹאֲתֶךָ.<sup>5</sup> Deut. 33<sup>16</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See on חִכְמוֹתַי Professor Haupt in *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament, Proverbs*, p. 34, ll. 31 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Lehrbuch d. hebr. Sprache*, § 191 c. <sup>3</sup> Commentary on Proverbs, *ad loc.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ausführliches Lehrbuch d. hebr. Sprache*, § 929.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Olshausen in his Commentary on Job, *ad loc.*; also in his *Lehrbuch d. hebr. Sprache*, § 226; Siegfried, *Job* in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, p. 40; Duhm, *Hiob* in Marti's *Kurzer Hand-Commentar*, 1897, *ad loc.* Baethgen in Kautsch's *Altes Testament*; Budde, *Hiob* in the Nowack series of commentaries, 1896, p. 126, emend תִּבְוֹאֲתֶךָ.

we should read, with Dillmann, Steuernagel, and Driver, תְּבוֹאָה instead of the abnormal תְּבוֹאָתָה<sup>6</sup>:

From the choice fruits of the earth and its fulness,  
And the favor of Him that dwelt in the bush —  
Let them come (תְּבוֹאָה) upon the head of Joseph,  
And upon the crown of him that is prince among his brethren.

In Ezek. 23<sup>20</sup> (16 Qerê), again, the Septuagint appears to present the better text, reading the second person *καὶ ἐπέθου ἐπὶ τοὺς Χαλδαίους* בְּתִקְנָבָה 'thou dostest,' instead of the masoretic תִּקְנָבָה.<sup>7</sup>

In like manner, untenable is the supposition that the plural ending נָה has been added to differentiate the third person feminine from the second person masculine; nor is it more likely that the third person feminine plural is used *for* the third person singular.<sup>8</sup> In Ex. 1<sup>10</sup> we must read, with the Samaritan Pentateuch and all the ancient versions, תִּקְרָאנָה instead of the masoretic תִּקְרָאנָה. תִּקְרָאנָה, Prov. 6<sup>27</sup>, is the third person feminine plural of the imperfect, in meaning as well as in form.<sup>10</sup>

Some scholars, including Delitzsch, Stade, Wildeboer, and Toy, explain the form as an emphatic form *taqtulanna*. But then we would rather expect *taronnanna*, corresponding to the Arabic *ta-muddanna*. Moreover, instead of the masoretic תִּשְׁלַחְנָה Jud. 5<sup>26</sup>, to which Delitzsch refers, we should read, with de Dieu, Clericus, Schnurrer, Olshausen, Stade, Gesenius-Kautzsch, König, Bickell, Moore, תִּשְׁלַחְנָה: "Her hand she (Deborah) stretches forth to the pin."<sup>11</sup> Similarly, in Obadiah, v. 13, תִּשְׁלַחְנָה is impossible. We should emend

אֵל תִּשְׁלַח יָד בְּחִילוֹ בְּיוֹם אָדָו

Do not lay hand on his substance in the day of his calamity.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>6</sup> See their commentaries *ad loc.* Cf. also Olshausen, *Lehrbuch*, § 226 c; Stade, *Lehrbuch d. hebr. Grammatik*, § 510 h; König, *Lehrgebäude d. hebr. Sprache*, I. p. 646 f.; Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebr. Grammatik*<sup>26</sup>, § 48 d.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, 1886, *ad loc.*

<sup>8</sup> Olshausen, *Lehrbuch*, § 226, p. 452.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Dillmann-Ryssel, *Commentary on Exodus*, 1897, p. 9; König, *Lehrg.*, I. pp. 607, 608.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. König, *Lehrg.*, I. pp. 182, 183.

<sup>11</sup> See Moore, *The Book of Judges* in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, 1900, p. 37, ll. 49 ff.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Olshausen, *Lehrb.*, p. 452; König, *Lehrg.*, I. pp. 285 ff.; Ges.-Kautzsch, § 47 k; Nowack, *Kleine Propheten*, 1897, p. 168.

Likewise, in Job 17<sup>16</sup>, תִּרְדְּנָה is not an emphatic form, but the third person feminine plural.<sup>13</sup>

Could תִּרְדְּנָה perhaps be intended as a cohortative? Nowack, Strack, Kautzsch, and Toy answer in the affirmative. The verse, however, has no cohortative meaning; and it seems extremely unlikely that a cohortative should have been employed when the sense does not require it, especially as no other instances can be found. In Isa. 5<sup>19</sup>, תִּיָּשָׂה and תִּבּוֹאָה are cohortatives both as to form and meaning:<sup>14</sup>

תִּבְחַלֵּי הַשָּׂדֵא	הִי מִשְׂכֵי הַשָּׂן
: הַשָּׂדֵא	וְתַעֲבֹד הַתְּנִלָּה
מַעֲשֵׂהוּ לִמְעַן נִרְאָה	הָאֲמִרִים יִפְרֵר תִּיָּשָׂה
עֲגַת קְרוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִקְעָה	וְתִקְרַב וְתִבּוֹאָה

Woe unto those who draw guilt on themselves with cords of ungodliness,  
And punishment as with traces of a wain;  
Who say: Let his work hasten, let it speed, that we may see it,  
Let the purpose of Israel's Holy One draw nigh and come, that we may perceive  
it!<sup>15</sup>

In Ezek. 23<sup>30(16)</sup>, the seemingly cohortative תִּזְנַבְנָה is, as has been pointed out above, due to the corruption of the text.

Nor does the sense of the passage allow us to see in תִּרְדְּנָה a form like the Arabic contracted form of the jussive of the *verba media geminata*, where the second radical throws back its vowel upon the first, and combines with the third, in which case the doubled consonant takes a supplemental vowel, e.g. *īamudda* instead of *īamdud*.<sup>16</sup>

It is more probable that the form is intended by the Masorites as the third person feminine plural, representing a form תִּמְכַּנָּה<sup>17</sup>; cf. Arabic *tamdudna*; *īaqirna* for *īaqirna*. The objection that we should require a form תִּרְדְּנִינָה, just as we have תִּמְכַּנִּינָה 'they surrounded,' is not valid. This formation, based on the analogy of *verba līa* (originally *verba līa*), occurs but three times in the Old Testament (in the first two instances in close proximity to the correspond-

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Siegfried, *Job in Haupt's Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, p. 36; König, *Lehrg.*, I. p. 402.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1900, p. 58.

<sup>15</sup> Cheyne's translation in *The Polychrome Bible*.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Wright-de Goeje, *Arabic Grammar*<sup>3</sup>, Cambridge, 1896, I. §§ 121, 125.

<sup>17</sup> So Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude d. hebr. Sprache*, Leipzig, 1817, p. 286, rem.; A. Müller, *Hebr. Schulgrammatik*, Halle, 1878, § 279 g; König, *Lehrg.*, I. pp. 323 ff.; contrast his *Syntax*, §§ 262 d, 348 c.

ing forms of verbs (לִיָּהּ), viz. Gen. 37<sup>7</sup> תִּסְבִּינָה; Gen. 41<sup>54</sup> תִּחְלִינָה; and 1 Sam. 3<sup>11</sup> תִּצְלִינָה.<sup>18</sup> Four times we meet with the form סִבְּנָה where the doubling of the first radical appears to be due to the analogy of verbs פִּין, viz.: 2 Ki. 21<sup>12</sup>, Jer. 19<sup>3</sup> תִּצְלִנָה; Gen. 30<sup>36</sup> תִּחְמָנָה; and Ezek. 6<sup>6</sup> תִּשְׁמָנָה.<sup>19</sup> But twice also the organic form is found, viz. in Zech. 14<sup>12</sup>, where we have the third plur. Niph'al of מָקַק <sup>20</sup> מִקָּק: בְּחַרְיָהֶם וְעֵינָיו תִּמְכָּנָה בְּחַרְיָהֶם “their eyes will be consumed in their sockets”; and in Ps. 71<sup>22a</sup> שִׁפְתַי תִּרְנָה <sup>21</sup> תִּרְנָה “My lips shall shout for joy for Thee.” Here we have the third feminine plural of the Pi'el. That this formation does not occur in the Qal—beside the form in question—may be due to accident. It may, however, safely be concluded that both the organic and the analogical formations existed side by side, just as in Arabic.<sup>22</sup>

Now, however, the question arises: did the *author* of the verse intend a form תִּרְנָה, *i.e.* the third person feminine plural imperfect of רָנַן ‘to shout’? This seems doubtful. The form occurs again at the close of Prov. 8<sup>3</sup> where we read (1-3):

וּתְבוֹינָה תִּמְן קוֹלָהּ	הֲלֹא חֲקָמָה תִּקְרָא
בְּתוֹךְ <sup>22</sup> נְתִיבוֹת נֶאֱבָהּ	בְּרֹאשׁ מַרְמִים עַל דָּרָךְ
מִבּוֹא מַתָּחִים תִּרְנָה	לֵד שִׁקְרִים לִמְנֵי <sup>24</sup> קֶרֶת

Did not wisdom call?

and understanding utter her voice?

At the head of the thoroughfares, on the road,

in the streets she takes her stand.

Beside the gateways, at the portal of the city,

at the entrance of the gates she  
cries aloud.

It seems strange that the author of the *maschal*, Prov. 1<sup>20</sup>, should have begun by putting the predicate in the plural, and then should

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, s.v.; Ewald, *Lehrb.*, § 197 a; Olshausen, *Lehrb.*, § 243; Barth, *Zeitschrift d. deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. xliii. p. 178; Müller, *Hebr. Schulgrammatik*, § 279; Stade, *Lehrb.*, § 536 d; König, *Lehrg.*, I. p. 337; Ges.-Kautzsch, § 67 f.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Smend, *Des Prophet Ezechiel*<sup>2</sup>, 1880, p. 38; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 208; Stade, *Lehrb.*, § 536 d; Ges.-Kautzsch, § 67 f, rem. 2; Bertholet, *Ezechiel* in Marti's *Kurzgefasster Hand-Commentar*, 1897, p. 35; Kraetzschmar, *Ezechiel* in the Nowack series of commentaries, p. 66.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Gesenius, *Lehrg.*, p. 373; Olshausen, *Lehrb.*, § 264 e; Böttcher, II. p. 488; Stade, *Lehrb.*, § 542 b; König, *Lehrg.*, i. p. 345.

<sup>21</sup> So with Jablonski, Michaelis, and Bacr. Cf. on the pointing, Delitzsch, *Commentary on Psalms*<sup>6</sup>, p. 478.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Wright-de Goeje<sup>3</sup>, I. § 120 c.

<sup>23</sup> The masoretic פִּין is a scribal error. See Toy's *Proverbs*, 1899, *ad loc.*

<sup>24</sup> So with the Vulgate *juxta portas civitatis*. The Hebrew text has לִפְנֵי.

have continued in the singular. In Prov. 8<sup>3</sup>, on the other hand, the section commences with the predicate in the singular, and closes with the plural. So far as I can see, no reason can be assigned for this phenomenon, especially as it is not required by the rhythm of the passages.

Some scholars, including Heidenheim, Oort, and others, read the verse: "Wisdom בְּחָצוֹת רִנָּה בְּרַחְבוֹת תִּתֵּן קוֹלָהּ." This reading secures parallelism in the nouns, רַחְבוֹת :: חָצוֹת, the plural חָצוֹת being, moreover, supported by the Septuagint, the Peshitta, and the version of Symmachus. It loses it, however, as Toy remarks (*op. cit.*), in the verbs.

It has been suggested by J. D. Michaelis<sup>25</sup> and others that we might have here a byform רִנָּה, just as we have כָּלַל and כָּלַל 'to cease,' דָּמָה and דָּמַם 'to be quiet'; אָנָה and אָנַן 'to sigh'; חָנָה and חָנַן 'to be favorably disposed'; פָּנָה and פָּנַן 'to turn'; קָלָה and קָלַל 'to despise'; שָׁגָה and שָׁגַג 'to err'; שָׁחָה and שָׁחַח 'to bow down'; שָׁסָה and שָׁסַם 'to plunder,' etc. Now, we actually find the byform רִנָּה in Job 39<sup>23</sup>, where we read:

קִלְיוֹ תִרְנָה אֶשְׁפָּה לֵבִי תִנִּית וַיִּבְדֹּחַ

The quiver rattles against him, the flashing spear and the javelin.

It seems best, therefore, to point תִּרְנָה instead of the masoretic תִּרְנָה.<sup>26</sup>

In the same manner, we should emend in Prov. 8<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> *Supplem. ad Lexica Hebr.*, Göttingen, 1792, VI. p. 2254.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. P. Haupt, *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament, Proverbs*, p. 34, ll. 33 ff.