The Seventy-Second Psalm

WILLIAM G. SEIPLE
NORTH JAPAN COLLEGE, SENDAI, JAPAN

THE Seventy-second Psalm is generally considered Messianic. Jewish interpretation, as reflected in the Peshitta, the Targum, the Talmud and the Midrashim,\(^1\) and the mediaeval commentators Rashi (1040-1105), Ibn Ezra (1092-1167) and Kimhi (1105-1170), referred it to the Messiah, while early Christian exegesis, as we learn from the Vulgate and Church Fathers like St. Jerome\(^2\) and Theodoret, found in it, in one way or another, an allusion to the Christ. Mediaeval commentators, like Calvin and Melanchthon, and more recent commentators, like J. D. Michaelis, E. W. Hengstenberg, Franz Delitzsch, Briggs\(^3\) and others regard it as typically Messianic, referring it historically to Solomon or some other reigning king but in a spiritual sense to the Messiah or the Christ. But in the Critical Notes on the Books of Kings (SBOT), p. 227, l. 36 f., Professor Paul Haupt considers this psalm a poem celebrating the accession of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285 B.C.). The King spoken of in the first verse is Ptolemy Lagi, the "second Nebuchadnezzar"; and the King's son, Ptolemy II Philadelphus, the "second Cyrus".\(^4\)

\(^1\) Cf. B. Pick, "Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied by the Ancient Synagogue" Hebraica (= AJSL), 2, 134-5.—For the abbreviations see this Journal, vol. 29, p. 112, and the references quoted there.


\(^4\) Cf. also JHUC, No. 163, p. 54 a below and p. 69, n. ǂ.
A number of other scholars also refer this psalm to the same period. As early as 1831, Hitzig in his *Begriff der Kritik*, p. 108, referred this psalm to Ptolemy Philadelphus. Olshausen thought that verse 10 referred to one of the Ptolemies but could not agree with Hitzig, as he questioned whether such an identification of the "oppressed" with the people of God, as we have in v. 2, was justifiable as early as the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Reuss assigned the psalm to the time of the early Macedonian rulers, before the Maccabean uprising, i.e., to the period of the Ptolemies. Cheyne in 1891 referred the psalm to Ptolemy Philadelphus and thought it "was most probably composed in Jerusalem before the release of the Jewish captives—not long after the accession of Philadelphus in his father's lifetime, B.C. 285." Wellhausen thinks the king mentioned in the psalm is an Egyptian and consequently assigns it to the period of the Ptolemies. Smend concludes from verses 8-10, where the limits and extent of the king's dominion are mentioned, that the description suits one of the Ptolemies.

Various other views have been proposed. Because of the superscription, the great mediaeval Jewish commentators, Rashi, Ibn Ezra and David Kimhi, regarded David as the author of this psalm and the king referred to in it as Solomon. The great Reformer, John Calvin, considered it the last prayer of David for his son Solomon, who probably put it into poetic form. Venema (1762), Keil, Hengstenberg, and Professor Franz Delitzsch assigned the authorship of the psalm to Solomon. The superscription of our psalm, however, cannot be taken as furnishing any genuine historical evidence of its author or date.

---

10 The great Syrian theologian and Biblical scholar, Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia, more than 1500 years ago, could not regard the super-
Although the title ascribes the authorship to Solomon, he is neither the writer nor the subject of the psalm. It has been ascribed to Solomon, on account of a certain general resemblance of the picture of imperial sway which the psalm presents with that of Solomon's empire in 1 Kings 3-10. The phrases "the king" and "the son of the king" are taken to refer to David and Solomon respectively. The gift of righteous judgment for which request is made in v. 1 is supposed to refer to the wisdom and justice of Solomon. Verses 7 and 8 are supposed to describe his peaceful and extended rule, while v. 10 is taken to be an allusion to the visit of the Queen of Sheba (cf. 1 Kings 10:1 ff.).

Ewald assigned this psalm to the times of Josiah (640-608 B.C.) or even later. Graetz was inclined to refer it to Hezekiah on his accession to the throne (720 B.C.). In this he was followed by Halévy, whereas Dillmann assigned it to the period following Isaiah's activity (740-701 B.C.). Briggs (Psalms, 1907) makes it a prayer composed for the occasion of Josiah's accession to the throne. Driver in his Introduction (8th ed., 1898), p. 385, makes it pre-exilic but the latest of the royal psalms (2, 18, 20, 21, 28, 45, 61, 63, 72).

Toy and G. Buchanan Gray both consider the psalm post-exilic, the former placing it between the years B.C. 500 and 300, and the latter making it "a product of the period after the Exile but before the Maccabees and not later than the end of the

scription of the Psalms, either in the Hebrew or the LXX, as original and authoritative, a view that is now generally recognized. Cf. T. K. Cheyne, "Early Criticism of the Psalter in Connection with Theodore of Mopsuestia", Thinker (June, 1893), pp. 496-8, and F. Baethgen, "Siebzehn makkabäische Psalmen nach Theodor von Mopsuestia", ZAT; 1886, pp. 261-288; 1887, pp. 1-60.


fourth century”. W. Robertson Smith referred the psalm to the Persian period, “the last days of the Achaemenian empire”, during the civil wars under Artaxerxes III Ochus (B.C. 361-336). G. Beer thinks it may be post-exilic and perhaps refer to one of the great kings of Persia. Baethgen, who, following Giese­brecht, omits vv. 8-11 as a later insertion, makes the rest of the psalm an ode belonging to the later period and commemorating the accession of an Israelite king to the throne, but thinks it cannot be determined to which king it refers.

Others put the date of our psalm as late as the Maccabean period. Professor Church in Church and Seeley’s The Hammer, p. 370, seems inclined to apply it to Judas Maccabaeus. Duhm refers the psalm, with the exception of vv. 5-11, which he considers a later insertion, to a native Israelite king after the Exile, and thinks it was composed under the Hasmonean kings for ritual purposes, perhaps in the time of Aristobulus I (104-3 B.C.) or his brother Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.). S. Weiss­mann, in the Jüdisches Literaturblatt, May 13, 1886, sees an allusion to the Jewish name of Hyrcanus II, who was high priest from 79-40 B.C., in the ἀπαξ λεγόμενον ἰπ v. 17.

The language of v. 2, where the entire Jewish nation are spoken of as “oppressed” (καθαρύ) precludes a Solomonic date for our psalm, as such a condition of affairs does not harmonize with the ideal picture of the wisdom and justice of Solomon’s reign. There can be no reference here to a pre-exilic king, either of Israel or Judah, as the conditions set forth in the psalm distinctly presuppose the post-exilic period, when the Jews felt the burden of foreign domination with all its attendant ills. The language, too, of the rest of the psalm bears the stamp of a late date. Cf. the parallel in v. 8 to Zech. 9:10 (late Maccabean, so

11 Cf. C. H. Toy, JBL, 7, 53 and 18, 162; and G. Buchanan Gray, JQR, 7, 679.
15 Cf. B. Duhm, Die Psalmen erklärt (Freiburg i/B., 1899), p. 189.
Prof. Haupt) and the allusion in v. 17b to Gen. 22:18 and 26:4 (640 B.C.).

With the settlement of the question of post-exilic date, there arises another question, viz., whether the king here mentioned is a native Israelite or a foreigner. Reuss" thinks there is no mention of a later Jewish king, "for to which of them could the greatest flatterer promise the tribute of Arabia and Ethiopia, of the isles and western possessions?"

The expression "Thy people" in v. 2 seems to be a clear reference to a foreign king. The king appears distinct from the people of God. Wellhausen, in a note on the phrase "Thy people" in the English translation of the Psalms (SBOT, p. 193) remarks: "Not: his people. They do not look upon themselves as belonging to the monarch for whom they pray. They are a spiritual, non-political people (Thy people = Thy pious ones), taking no part in the kingdom and its government". Baethgen admits that the wishes and hopes expressed in vv. 8-11 are so great that we can hardly understand them, if they are referred to an Israelite king, particularly one who lived in a time of oppression, but thinks it improbable that the patriarchal promises of Gen. 22:18 and 26:4, to which allusion is made in v. 17b, should be applied by a pious Israelite to a foreign king.20

In v. 15, constant prayer is made for the sovereign. Passages like Ezra 6:9 and 7:23 show us that the post-exilic Jewish community prayed for their sovereigns. Accordingly v. 15b of our psalm finds a striking parallel in Baruch 1:11, where prayer is made for the heathen kings Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar: καὶ προσεύχασθε περὶ τῆς ὕπηκον Ναβουχοδονωστὸς βασιλέως Βαβυλῶνος καὶ εἰς ὕπηκον Βαλτασάρ νιὸς αὐτοῦ. Cheyne, in commenting on Ps. 72:15 in his Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter, p. 154, n. i, says: "An occasional special prayer for a Jewish sovereign can be understood, but scarcely that constant repetition of prayer and blessing (Ps. lxxii. 15), except for a foreign ruler of whom much spiritual good might be hoped, but little as yet could be known".

From v. 8, where The River, i.e., the Euphrates, is mentioned

---

19 Cf. above, n. 6.
20 Cf. above, n. 17.
as one of the boundaries of the king's realm, we conclude that there is no reference here to any of the Chaldean, Persian, or Seleucid kings, as, for all of these kings, the Euphrates was an inland stream. From the extent of the king's sway as given in v. 10, an Egyptian king seems to be meant. According to Hitzig, it is neither Inarus, Nectanebus, nor any of the Egyptian kings who tried to throw off the Persian yoke.\(^{21}\) Wellhausen considers Pharaoh Necho (610-595 B.C.) out of the question. Only the Ptolemies (323-31 B.C.), then, remain for consideration; and because of the extent of the king's dominion in v. 10, one of the first three Ptolemies must be referred to. The phrase "the son of the king" v. 1 cannot refer to Ptolemy Lagi, who was not the son of a king. If we refer the psalm to Ptolemy III Euergetes, we cannot explain the terms of praise in v. 14f. Accordingly, only Ptolemy II Philadelphus is left.\(^{22}\)

Our psalm was perhaps presented and recited in Greek at Alexandria by an Alexandrian Jew in 285 B.C., when Ptolemy Lagi appointed his son, Ptolemy Philadelphus, as co-regent, just as Ps. 45 was perhaps presented in Greek by the high-priest Jonathan at the wedding of King Alexander Balas of Syria with the Egyptian princess Cleopatra, daughter of Ptolemy VI Philometor, at Ptolemais in 150 B.C.\(^{23}\) Hebrew translations of these two poems may have been later inserted and preserved in the Psalter. The expression אֵֽנֶּֽמְנוּ "my poem" Ps. 45 2 seems to be a translation of the Greek ποίημα and to point to this.\(^{24}\)

Our psalm was perhaps written as an expression of the Jewish hopes which Ptolemy's reputation warranted. Ptolemy I Soter, at the age of eighty-two, had abdicated in favor of his younger son, Ptolemy Philadelphus, and died two years later (283 B.C.). An allusion to this event may be seen in the expression the king's son v. 1. According to Professor Haupt, the phrase


\(^{22}\) Cheyne assigns also Ps. 45 to Ptolemy Philadelphus, on the occasion of his marriage with Arsinoe, the daughter of Lysimachus, king of Thrace, cf. his *Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, p. 170f.


\(^{24}\) Cf. Paul Haupt, "The Poetic Form of the First Psalm", *AJS*, 19, 136, n. 11, end.
Bestow on the King Thy justice at the beginning of our psalm has the double meaning of Endow the King with Thy justice and Punish (give it to) him for all he has done to us.25

Punishment is desired for the aged king, Ptolemy I Soter, who, in 312 B.C., took advantage of the Sabbath law to attack and capture Jerusalem, when the Jews were unarmed, and subsequently adopted rigorous measures and carried away very many Jews as prisoners of war to Egypt (cf. Jos. c. Ap. I. 22 and id., Ant. XII. 1 and Schürer GJV [1909], 3, 34).

According to Josephus (Ant. XII. 1), Ptolemy Philadelphus ransomed with his own money 120,000 Palestinian Jews who had been made prisoners of war by his father and sold into slavery, spending for this purpose more than 460 talents (= $496,800) and paying for each captive 120 drachmas (= $21.60). In the pseudepigraphical Letter of Aristeas,26 §§ 15-27 and particularly § 37, the number of captives is “more than a hundred thousand” and the price for each twenty drachmas. Thus he “delivered the crying needy” (v. 12) and “redeemed their lives from oppression” (v. 14a), for “their blood was precious in his sight” (v. 14b). Our psalm was probably composed after the news of the release of the captives came to Jerusalem. Josephus tells us (Ant. XII. 5) that the high-priest Eleazar, in his reply to the king’s letter, says that from feelings or heartfelt gratitude sacrifices were offered for Ptolemy and his family immediately on receipt of the news, and that the people prayed for the king and the prosperity of his kingdom. Cf. v. 15 and Letter of Aristeas, § 45: “We therefore straightway offered sacrifices on thy behalf and on behalf of thy sister and thy children and thy friends’, and the whole people prayed that thy undertakings


might ever prosper, and that Almighty God would preserve thy kingdom in peace with honor, and that the transcription of the holy law might be to thy profit and carefully executed”.

In v. 8 the king’s dominion is to extend “from sea to sea”, i.e., from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf, and “from The River to the ends of the earth”, i.e., from the Euphrates to the Pillars of Hercules, or Strait of Gibraltar. The description by the poet Theocritus of the conquests of Ptolemy Philadelphus (Idyl XVII 86-92) reminds us very strongly of vv. 8-11 of our psalm:

καὶ μὴν Φοινίκας ἀποτέμνεται Ἀρραβίας τε καὶ Συρίας Διβύας τε κελαινῶν τ’ Αἰθιοπίων.
Пармфилοισί τε πάσι καὶ αἴχμηται Κιλίκεσσι
σαμαίνει, Δυκίως τε φιλοπτολέμοισί τε Καρσί,
καὶ νάσοις Κυκλάδουςιν, ἐπεὶ οἱ νάσει ἄρισται
πόντον ἐπιπλώντι, Θάλασσα, δέ πάσα καὶ αὐτά
καὶ ποταμοὶ κελαδόντες ἀνάσσονται Πτολεμαίῳ.

"Yea, and he taketh him a portion of Phoenicia, and of Arabia, and of Syria; and of Libya, and the black Aethiopians. And he is lord of all the Pamphylians, and the Cilician warriors, and the Lycians, and the Carians, that joy in battle, and lord of the isles of the Cyclades—since his are the best of ships that sail over the deep,—, yea all the sea, and land and the sounding rivers are ruled by Ptolemy”.

Polybius tells us that the empire of the first Ptolemy included Egypt, the coast of the Red Sea to Berenike and the Elephant Coast, Cyrene, Palestine, Phoenicia, Cyprus, Rhodes, the “free” cities of the coast of Asia Minor, and the islands of the Aegean Sea. For a century, the Ptolemies controlled the Cyclades and the adjoining coasts, together with Palestine and Coele-Syria.

Ptolemy II received from his father Egypt, the adjacent parts of Arabia and Libya, Cyrene, Coele-Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine and Cyprus. By conquest, he extended his rule over the Aegean Sea with its coast cities and islands and also over Caria, Pam-
phylia, Cilicia, and Lycia. At one time during his reign, Egyptian garrisons were stationed even as far as the Euphrates.28

We may be quite certain that the tribute from the conquered countries flowed into his coffers, cf. v. 10. Of this we have a striking confirmation in Theocritus, Idyl XVII, l. 95 f.:

δλβφ μὲν πάντας κε καταβρίθοι βασιλῆς
tόσον ἐπ' ἀμαρ ἐκαστον ἐς ἀφυνὸν ἐρχεται οἶκον
πάντοθε.

"And in weight of wealth he surpasses all kings; such treasure comes day by day from every side to his rich palace." He was indeed the wealthiest ruler of his time. Appian tells us in his Prooemium, chapter 10, that, according to the royal archives (ἐκ τῶν βασιλικῶν ἀναγραφῶν), Ptolemy II, at the end of his reign, had an army of 200,000 infantry, 40,000 cavalry, 300 elephants, 2,000 war-chariots, weapons for 300,000 men, 2,000 minor war-vessels and 1,500 men-of-war, including quinqueremes, and the material for double this number, 800 sloops with gilded beaks and sterns, the enormous sum of 740,000 Egyptian talents in his treasury, and an annual income of 14,800 talents and 1,500,000 measures of grain.

The early Ptolemies made special efforts to attract trade and commerce with India, Arabia, and Ethiopia to Egypt. To this end, several cities were built on the Red Sea, the Arab pirates routed, and Pharaoh Necho’s canal made once more navigable.29 Mahaffy in his Story of Alexander’s Empire (New York, 1892), p. 121 f., gives us the following picture of the commercial life of Alexandria, this great center of Hellenism and Semitism, at this time: "It was the great mart where the wealth of Europe and of Asia changed hands. Alexander had opened the sea-way by exploring the coasts of Media and Persia. Caravans from the head of the Persian Gulf, and ships on the Red Sea, brought all the wonders of Ceylon and China, as well as of Farther India, to Alexandria. There, too, the wealth of Spain and Gaul,

the produce of Italy and Macedonia, the amber of the Baltic and the salt fish of Pontus, the silver of Spain and the copper of Cyprus, the timber of Macedonia and Crete, the pottery and oil of Greece—a thousand imports from all the Mediterranean—came to be exchanged for the spices of Arabia, the splendid birds and embroideries of India and Ceylon, the gold and ivory of Africa, the antelopes, the apes, the leopards, the elephants of tropical climes. Hence the enormous wealth of the Lagidae, for in addition to the marvellous fertility and great population—it is said to have been seven millions—of Egypt, they made all the profits of this enormous carrying trade.

Ptolemy II explored Ethiopia and the southern parts of Africa and brought back for his zoological gardens specimens of curious fauna. Pliny in his *Natural History* (VI, 29: *qui Troglodyticen primus excussit*) is authority for the statement that Ptolemy II was the first to explore the coast of the Troglodytes, the cave-dwellers of Ethiopia.

Ptolemy II was a diplomat rather than a warrior. He never took the field in person, but gained his victories by political combinations and bribes from his enormous wealth. He had his emissaries and supporters everywhere. Besides this, he enjoyed the support and friendship of many kings (cf. v. 11). In 273 B.C., after the defeat of Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, by the Romans, he sent a friendly embassy to them. His ambassadors were received with great enthusiasm and accorded every distinction, for he was then the most powerful monarch in the world.

The late date of our psalm, the fact that the king mentioned therein is king of the Jews but a foreigner, who is favorable to them, and the extent of his kingdom—all unite in confirming our conviction that the psalm must refer to Ptolemy Philadelphus.

Both the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kings granted religious freedom and certain political rights to the Jews. Particularly...
in Egypt, the Jews played a prominent rôle in public life. The early Ptolemies were, in the main, favorably disposed toward them, and under some of the later Ptolemies, Jews attained to high positions of trust.

Shortly after the founding of Alexandria, Alexander the Great is said to have induced many Jewish colonists to come there by granting to them the right of citizenship, and even to have established Jewish settlements in Upper Egypt. Mahaffy thinks this hardly probable. At any rate, Ptolemy I Soter carried off great numbers of Jews as captives to Egypt. His lenient policy toward the captives, however, induced many of their co-religionists to come and settle there. During his reign, not less than 30,000 Jewish soldiers were stationed in garrisons throughout the land. Mahaffy thinks this hardly probable. At any rate, Ptolemy I Soter carried off great numbers of Jews as captives to Egypt. His lenient policy toward the captives, however, induced many of their co-religionists to come and settle there. During his reign, not less than 30,000 Jewish soldiers were stationed in garrisons throughout the land. 

Cf. Letter of Aristeas, § 13: "Of which number he armed about thirty thousand picked men and settled them in the fortresses in the country".

No other Ptolemy, however, in fact, no other king, carried his kindness toward the Jews so far as Ptolemy II Philadelphus. He figures in Jewish tradition as the liberator of all the Jewish captives in his realm (Jos. Ant. XII. 2) and the patron of the Temple, to which he sent a number of costly presents (Jos. Ant. XII. 4). It may have been part of the diplomacy of Ptolemy II to make friends with the Jews in order to win and hold at least the southern part of Syria. Probably because of the growing numbers and importance of the Jewish population in Egypt, he is said to have authorized a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek. This version is known as the Septuagint from a tradition recorded in the Letter of Aristeas that it was a translation made all at once by seventy or, more exactly, seventy-two officially appointed translators. The tradition runs as follows: 31

In the early years of the reign of King Ptolemy II Philadelphus, the librarian Demetrius Phalereus, who was in charge of the famous Alexandrian Library, suggested to the king that he should have prepared for the Library a Greek translation of the Jewish law-books. For this purpose, Ptolemy sent to Palestine

for translators. Seventy-two men, six from each of the twelve tribes, were sent to Alexandria by the high-priest Eleazar of Jerusalem and put by twos in thirty-six cells on the island of Pharos. They are said to have completed their task in seventy days to the entire satisfaction of the king and his librarian, and to have been sent back to Palestine with expensive gifts and high acknowledgment of their services.

This story is no longer regarded as historical in all its details, but is undoubtedly so far correct, that at least the Pentateuch was translated during the reign of Ptolemy II and possibly under royal patronage. A. Bouché-Leclercq, however, in his work, Histoire des Lagides (Paris, 1903), I, p. 223, thinks that the Septuagint version was not made by the orders of Ptolemy II, nor in his time, nor for the Library, but that it was the voluntary effort of Alexandrian Jews, who were working for the large number of their co-religionists who did not know Hebrew.

Ptolemy III Euergetes is said to have offered sacrifices in the Temple at Jerusalem. On an inscription found in Lower Egypt and given by Schürer GJV, 3, 66, n. 27, Ptolemy III is represented as granting the right of asylum to a proseuche, or oratory. Some of the synagogues also seem to have enjoyed the same right. This is of interest as showing that the Jewish houses of worship were placed on an equality with the heathen temples.

Ptolemy VI Philometor showed his kindness toward the Jews in permitting them to build a temple at Leontopolis. According to Josephus (c. Ap., II. 5), Ptolemy VI and his consort Cleopatra "entrusted their whole kingdom to Jews, and the commanders-in-chief of the army were the two Jews Onias and Dositheus". Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy VI, in a war against her son, Ptolemy Lathyrus, appointed two Jews, Helkias and Ananias, sons of the high-priest Onias, who built the temple in

Note the curious coincidence between the number of translators and the number of our psalm in the Psalter.

The Letter of Aristeas, from internal evidence and its tendency to laud the Jews, shows that it is not contemporary with the events it narrates but is the work of an Alexandrian Jew, writing about 200 a. c. (so Schürer). Wendland, Willrich and Thackeray put it even later. See literature cited in n. 26.
at Leontopolis, as generals in her army (cf. Jos. Ant. XIII. 10 and 13).

Under the earlier Ptolemies, the Jews formed so large a portion of the population of Alexandria that a separate section of the city, east of the palace, was assigned to them. Of the five districts, into which the city was divided, two were known as Jewish districts, because inhabited mostly by Jews. Josephus tells us (B. J., II. 18, 8) that the fourth, or “delta”, district was populated by the Jews. Although even at this time the Jews were isolated, this isolation was not strictly enforced, for synagogues and Jewish dwellings could be found all over the city. The Alexandrian Jew enjoyed a greater measure of political independence than his co-religionist elsewhere. In Alexandria the Jews formed an independent political community, ruled by an ethnarch. Here they occupied a more influential position in public life than anywhere else in the ancient world. They held public offices and positions of honor, and by their riches and education constituted a large and influential portion of society. So great was their wealth that they were able to make frequent pilgrimages to Jerusalem and send many rich gifts to the Temple.

Neither Olshausen nor Hupfeld found any regular stanzas in our psalm. Hengstenberg divided it into two stanzas: I a, vv. 1-5; I b, vv. 6-10; and II a, vv. 11-15; and II b, vv. 16-17. De Wette arranged it in five stanzas, vv. 1-4, 5-7, 8-11, 12-14, and 15-17. Delitzsch also has the same number, but a different grouping of the verses: vv. 1-4, 5-8, 9-11, 12-15, and 16-17 (so Cheyne, Book of Psalms, London, 1888). Ewald divided the psalm into three stanzas, vv. 1-7, 8-15, and 16-17 (so also Davidson, Biblical and Literary Essays, London, 1902, p. 161). W. E. Barton (The Psalms and Their Story, Boston, 1898, Vol. I, p. 175) has five stanzas, viz., vv. 1-5, 6-8, 9-11, 12-14, and 15-17. The arrangement by Zenner-Wiesmann (Psalmen, Münster i/W, 1861), according to Dr. Schürer's review in TLZ (1900), p. 567; Wilckens, Griech. Ostraka aus Ägypten u. Nubien (Leipzig, 1899); TLZ (1901), p. 66; and Max L. Strack, Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer (Berlin, 1897), esp. chapter 1: Mitherrschaff u. Samatherrschaff.


1906-7) is as follows: I a, vv. 1, 2, 3; I b, vv. 4, 5, 6; II, vv. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11; III a, vv. 12, 13, 14, 15; and III b, vv. 16 and 17.

Bickell makes the meter heptasyllabic throughout but cannot discern any arrangement in stanzas. Briggs in his Messianic Prophecy (Edinburgh, 1886), p. 138, footnote, considers the psalm a hexameter with occasional pentameters and tetrameters, and divides it into three strophes, or stanzas, omitting v. 12 as an interpolation. In his Psalms (1907) he arranges the psalm in two stanzas, vv. 1-7 and 13-17a, each of seven hexameters, and omits vv. 8-12 and 17b as a series of glosses, consisting of citations or adaptations of earlier writings, added in Greek or Maccabean times “to give the psalm a Messianic meaning and to adapt it for public worship”. Duhrm divides the psalm into nine stanzas, containing each four poetic stichs, or rather hemistichs, with three beats to each hemistich. Vv. 10 and 15a he omits as glosses.

Baethgen (Die Psalmen, 3rd ed., Göttingen, 1904) makes the prevailing meter double trimeter (Doppeldreier, i.e., 3 + 3 beats), vv. 3, 5, and 17c hexameters (Sechser, i.e., three dipodies), and v. 10 two pentameters (Fünfer, i.e., 3 + 2 beats). According to Cheyne (1904) the poem consists of trimeters, i.e., hemistichs of three beats each.

According to Professor Haupt’s arrangement of the text, our psalm consists of three stanzas, each of two couplets with 3 + 3 beats in each line. Verses 4, 12, 13, 7, 3, and 17a should be omitted as glosses and קְפָר יִדְרֹר v. 4 and מֶלַל v. 3 as tertiary glosses. V. 3 may have originally stood in the margin as a gloss to v. 16 but a copyist may have taken it as a gloss to v. 2 and put it immediately after it. Originally vv. 8 and 8 may have been grouped together, as both begin with תָּי. Verses 12 and 13 are simply a continuation of the gloss v. 4. The doxology, vv. 18-19, and the colophon, v. 20, form no part of the original poem and are not in metrical form.


37 According to Professor Haupt, the term strophe should be used only of quantitative, not of Hebrew accentual, poetry, cf. his article on “The Poetic Form of the First Psalm”, AJSL, 19, 132, n. 4.

The Hebrew text should be arranged as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 A i  | ☐
| 2      | ☐
| 3      | ☐
| 4      | ☐
| 5      | ☐
| 6 iii B| ☐
| 7      | ☐
| 8 v C  | ☐
| 9      | ☐
| 10 vi  | ☐
| 11     | ☐

The Hebrew text is not provided in the image.
This may be translated as follows:

Psalm 72

A i 1 "Give the king Thy justice, O Jahveh, and Thy righteousness unto the king's son!

2 He will govern Thy people with righteousness and rule Thine oppressed with justice. 8

i 14 "He will redeem their lives from oppression, in his sight their blood will be precious. 6

15 They will ever pray for him and bless him all the day.

B iii 6 He will descend like rain on the mown meads, like a shower that waters the land.

16 "In the land there will be a rich harvest, its crop will wave like Lebanon. 9

iv 16.17 His loins will sprout like grass, with him will all nations bless themselves. x

5 "His name shall endure with the sun and with the moon for ever and ever.

C v 8 May he rule from sea to sea, from the River to the ends of the earth.

9 Before him foes will bow and his enemies lick the dust.

(a) 1 By Solomon
(b) 4 He will rule the oppressed of the people, he will save the sons of the needy. oo
(c) 15 So that they live and give him of the gold of Sheba.
(d) 7 In his days shall righteousness flourish, and welfare thrive till the moon fade.
(e) 16 on the top of the mountains
(f) 3 The mountains will bear welfare, and the hills will run with righteousness.
(g) 16 of the land (h) 17 they will call him happy.
(h) 17 In sunshine his name will bud, his name shall be forever.

(o) 4 and crush the oppressor (ox) 8 to the people
11 All kings will bow before him, 
all peoples will do him service.

---

Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text

V. 1.—Five of Kennicott's MSS omit מַלְכֵי, cf. J. B. de Rossi, Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti (Parmae, 1788), p. 50. Cheyne, in the article "Psalms", EB, 3943-4, considers it an error for "Of Salmah", which he refers to the Salmaeans, whom he considers a North Arabian clan forming one of the divisions of the temple singers. It was probably prefixed because of מַלְכֵי v. 10. A scribe may have thought of the Queen of Sheba and her visit to King Solomon, cf. 1 Kings 10:1-11. Briggs considers it a "pseudonym of the author composing from the point of view of Solomon".

 metod is a redactional change and must be replaced by המלך. So also Baethgen. For a similar redactional change, cf. Ps. 14:2 and 53:3.

שֵׁם, and Hier. point to a singular פֵּרוֹת but מַלְכֵי isomns with מַלְכֵי agrees with M. Baethgen, Wellhausen (Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten, Berlin, 1899, VI, p. 178), Duhm, and Buhl (Kittel's Biblia Hebraica, 1909) read the singular.

On the poetic omission of the article with מַלְכֵי and פֵּרוֹת, even though definite kings are referred to, cf. Ps. 21:2 and 45:2 and GK, § 126, h. The monosyllables מַלְכֵי and פֵּרוֹת in the phrases מַלְכֵי פֵּרוֹת must be treated as enclitics and closely connected with מַלְכֵי פֵּרוֹת, both of which receive the tone because they are emphatic by contrast. Cf. Sievers' Metrisiche Studien, §§ 163, 1 and 263.

39 Cf. Wellhausen's and Winckler's readings of Cant. 1, 5: מַלְכֵי פֵּרוֹת Cheyne, in the new edition of his Book of Psalms (1904), vol. I, p. xlvi, § 13, suggests also as a preferable emendation "Of Ishmael".

may take two beats because of its length. Delitzsch and Cheyne (Origin of the Psalter, p. 156) consider this a catchword determining the relative position of Pss. 71 and 72, since it occurs both in 71:24 and 72:1. Cheyne (1904) suggests the reading נֶבֶר תִּירֵא יִזְכֹּר on the basis of Ps. 103:6.

V. 2.—Instead of יִרְאֶה, G undoubtedly read יִרְאֶה (κρίνειν). Buhl prefers to point יִרְאֶה.

For יִרְאֶה Briggs would read יִרְאֶה. For יִרְאֶה, L has popular in tua justitia (= יִרְאֶה) and H-P give two variants יִרְאֶה יִרְאֶה and יִרְאֶה יִרְאֶה.

Halevy proposes the reading יִרְאֶה for יִרְאֶה (Revue Sémittique, 1896, p. 333).

If we insert יִרְאֶה after יִרְאֶה, it gives us the necessary three beats to the hemistich and restores the poetic parallelism. It may have been omitted by haplography (so Briggs, who, however, would put it after יִרְאֶה).

V. 4 is a gloss to v. 2. V. 4a is in the same meter as v. 2 (3 + 3). יִרְאֶה in v. 4 is perhaps written with Pesilk to call attention to its omission in v. 2. יִרְאֶה is a tertiary gloss to v. 4. Duhm, Baethgen (1904), Briggs, Buhl, and Zenner-Wiesmann (Psalmen, Münster i/W, 1906-7) also omit it. Cheyne (EB, 3904, footnote 4) regards this clause and also יִרְאֶה as corruptions of "He shall crush the folk of Cusham" (יִרְאֶה יִרְאֶה). In 1904 he considers יִרְאֶה a variant to יִרְאֶה יִרְאֶה and emends v. 5 so as to read: "He will crush the folk of Cusham and destroy the race of Jerahmeel" (יִרְאֶה יִרְאֶה יִרְאֶה). G puts all the verbs in v. 4 in the imperative.

V. 3.—This is a prosaic explanatory gloss to v. 16. יִרְאֶה is a tertiary gloss. We must insert יִרְאֶה בָּלָעְנָה before יִרְאֶה. This may be a quotation from some other poem. The person who added this, probably a Palestinian glossator, may have been conscious of the double meaning of בָּלָעְנָה in v. 16, both "grain" and "purity". Cf. Arabic barr "pious, just, righteous, honest" and barr "wheat".

For יִרְאֶה G reads יִרְאֶה and is followed by L and £. Cheyne (1904) omits it as dittography for יִרְאֶה. For יִרְאֶה בָּלָעְנָה, Buhl suggests יִרְאֶה יִרְאֶה יִרְאֶה. According to G, בָּלָעְנָה, instead of standing at the end of
v. 3, is put at the beginning of v. 4: ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κρυπτά. Ἀρνί and Ἄρνι, however, read καὶ οἱ βουλαὶ, with which I and Hier. et collegae justitiam agree. Ἐσκί, as if it had read Ἁσκί. Houbigant (Notae Criticae, Frankfurt a/M, 1777, Tom. II, p. 58) considered the letter ב superfluous. J. B. Köhler in Eichhorn's Repertorium, XIII (1783), pp. 144-158, thought that ב was either pleonastic, or else we must supply mentally a verb like ἀνθρωπος from the preceding. Böttcher in his Neue exegetisch-kritische Åhruncuse (edited by F. Mühlau, Leipzig, 1864), Part II, p. 266, believing that there was something wanting between מִבְּרוֹנָה and מִבְּרוֹנָה, of which ב was a remnant, supplied מִבְּרוֹנָה. This Hupfeld considered quite superfluous. For בְּרֵקִים Graetz read בְּרֵקִים, supposing that ב had fallen out of the text before ב. Delitzsch suggested מִבְּרוֹנָה as the missing verb. Wellhausen, Cheyne (1904), Duhm, Briggs and Zenner-Wiesmann read simply מִבְּרוֹנָה. Briggs considers ב an interpretative gloss. Duhm cancels it as a scribal error caused by the similar expressions in v. 2. Halévy reads בְּרֵקִים.

Ehrlich takes מִבְּרוֹנָה to mean “security” as in Zech. 8:10, and considers the preposition מִבְּרוֹנָה as indicating the genitive relation, so that מִבְּרוֹנָה מִבְּרוֹנָה would mean “general security”. From the latter half of the verse he supplies ב as belonging to מִבְּרוֹנָה, explains the phrase ב מִבְּרוֹנָה as meaning “to partake of, share in” on the basis of Num. 11:17 and Job 7:13, and renders the verse as follows:

dass die Berge der herrschenden Sicherheit teilhaft werden, und die Hügel der Gerechtigkeit.

V. 4.—For general remarks on v. 4, cf. last paragraph of note on v. 2.


מִבְּרוֹנָה may be construed either with the accusative, as in Ps. 6:5, or with the dative (נ), as here and in Ps. 116:6. According to Duhm, the construction with the dative is an indication of late date.

V. 5.—The emendation מִבְּרֵקִים on the basis of מִבְּרֵקִים, and מִבְּרֵקִים permanebit for מִבְּרֵקִים was first suggested by Job
Ludolf in his edition of the Ethiopic Psalter in 1721 and has since been adopted by Houbigant, Lagarde, Bickell, Brüll (Jahr-
bücher für jüdische Geschichte u. Litteratur, 1885, p. 71), Cheyne (Book of Psalms, London, 1888), Nowack (Hupfeld-Nowack, Die Psalmen, 3rd ed., Gotha, 1888), Kautzsch (Beilagen, Frei-
burg i/B, 1896), Oort, Buhl, Baethgen, and Ehrlich. Most scholars construe this verb without an object in the sense of “to live long” and cite Eccles. 7 15. Hupfeld, Graetz, Well-
hausen, and Halévy read דודו.

Cheyne (1904) considers דודו, דודו, "a careless scribe’s three attempts to write דודו”.

Ewald thinks a verse has fallen out between vv. 4 and 5, cf. Jahrbiicher der Biblischen Wissenschaft, V (1853), p. 173. Beer (Individual- und Gemeindepsalmen, Marburg 1894, p. 59 f.) considers v. 5 a marginal gloss that has crept into the text. Baethgen regards it as a later insertion, breaking the connection between vv. 4 and 6. Duhm pronounces vv. 5-11 not genuine and as disturbing the connection between vv. 1-4 and v. 12 ff.

In view of גת in v. 17, the first part of which verse is a gloss to v. 5, we must insert גת, which has been omitted before גת, perhaps by haplography. We should read גת instead of גת, as the latter may be due to גת in v. 17. The first and second clauses of v. 17 should be transposed, and the second clause, גת, regarded as an incorrect poetic explanatory gloss to v. 5, and the first clause as a correct prosaic gloss to the same verse.

In the phrases גת and גת in v. 5, גת in v. 6, גת in v. 7, גת in v. 8, גת in v. 13, and גת in v. 12, the monosyllabic prepositions גת, and ע, and the conjunction גת are proclitic and throw the tone on the following word, cf. Sievers, §§144-5 and 149, 2.

v. 6.-א' renders גת by א' גת. ב' ג and the other Greek versions give ב' ג, with which ב, ב in vellum, and Hier. super vellum agree. Graetz proposed the emendation ג. Cheyne (1904) emends ג to ממא and ג to Maacath and Amalek (!).

On the authority of ג and ג והשא והשא and ג והשא והשא, we may change the traditional division of the consonantal text, as at the time the text of our
psalm was written there was *scriptio continua* and no *matres lectionis*, join the final מ of מִסְרֵי בְּרֵאשִׁית with the dvarka leyqemenv הָרִים, point it as *תַּמָּלֹך* and read the sg. מִרְבֵּי. Cf. Prof. Haupt's paper "Lea und Rabel," *ZAT*, 29, 286, n. 5, where the participle מִרְבֵּי is referred to a stem מִרְבֵּי, which is identified with the stem מִרְבֵּי and is found also in the Syriac *zurīta", "shower of rain". The word מִרְבֵּי, because followed by מִרְבֵּי, has recessive accent and should be accented on the penult, cf. *GK*, § 29, e, and Sievers, §§ 169-176, particularly § 174, 1 and 2.

Baethgen, who retains מִרְבֵּי as a noun in the sense of "shower" or "sprinkling", gives examples of similar quadriliteral, or pluriconsonantal, forms in ancient and modern Syriac with the repetition of the first radical in the third place.

Wellhausen thinks a verb is concealed in מִרְבֵּי. Hupfeld proposed the emendation מִרְבֵּי, which was adopted by Bickell and Cheyne (1888). Graetz, following Krochmal, read מִרְבֵּי (befruchten). Halévy suggests מִרְבֵּי "saturates, waters", and Duhm proposes the reading מִרְבֵּי. So also Buhl, who gives also alternative readings מִרְבֵּי and מִרְבֵּי, and compares Syr. מִרְבֵּי to Heb. מִרְבֵּי. Briggs reads מִרְבֵּי and regards the " in מִרְבֵּי as transposed. Cheyne (1904) emends the second clause to *Rehobothites and Zarephathites*. Ehrlich retains מִרְבֵּי and considers מִרְבֵּי a predicate noun and מִרְבֵּי in the accusative depending upon the idea of motion expressed in מִרְבֵּי.

V. 7.–With the majority of modern commentators, including Hare, Street, Lagarde, Oort, Graetz, Krochmal, Wellhausen, Duhm, Baethgen, Cheyne (1904), Ehrlich and Buhl, we must read מִרְבֵּי for מִרְבֵּי, on the authority of the ancient versions ה, ח, Hier., and ח and three MSS. Briggs suggests either מִרְבֵּי or מִרְבֵּי with a preference for the latter, as in v. 2 it is also מִרְבֵּי.

Cheyne (1904) emends מִרְבֵּי to מִרְבֵּי בִּכְפָּה מִרְבֵּי to מִרְבֵּי which, together with v. 8, he regarded as a quotation from Zech. 9.10. Halévy thinks the second hemistich of v. 7 is corrupt and reads מִרְבֵּי for מִרְבֵּי, an emendation also suggested by Lagarde. Cheyne (1904) considers vv. 7b and 8 glosses to v. 6 and emends 7b to מִרְבֵּי וּרְכָּב המִרְבֵּי and v. 8 to מִרְבֵּי. Ehr-
lich reads רְבִּי and renders Und volle Sicherheit herrsche auch in mondloser Nacht. Briggs omits רְבִּי as an interpretative gloss to נָחָלָן. Buhl suggests נָחָלָן or נָחַל. The former emendation is to be preferred.

For נָחַל Buhl would read נָחַל as in Isa. 5:14.

This verse is an explanatory gloss to v. 6. The monosyllable נָחַל is proclitic, because of its close connection with נָחָלָן, and gives it the tone, cf. Sievers, § 162, 1b.

V. 8.—Giesebrecht, Baethgen,Beer and also Duhm consider vv. 8-11 a later insertion. Briggs adds also v. 12 and v. 17b. According to Duhm and Baethgen, v. 8 is taken almost word for word from Zech. 9:10. Duhm considers נָחַל a scribal error caused by נָחַל at the beginning of v. 6, and substitutes נָחָל from Zech. 9:10.


In the phrase יְאַף יָאֵף, because of the proclitic preposition נָחָל (cf. Sievers, § 145), we should expect the tone to rest on the final syllable of יָאֵף. But then we should have two accented syllables following each other, as יְאַף יָאֵף. According to GK, § 29, e, the tone could not rest on the first syllable of יָאֵף, because it is closed, but we know from GK, § 29, g, that our rule is not without its exceptions. On the question of the recession of the accent, cf. also Sievers, §§ 169-176, particularly § 174, 1 and 2. Sievers suggests in § 175 changing the accent of the second word, in this case יָאֵף to יְאַף, but this is impossible as יָאֵף is a monosyllable (cf. GK, § 84, a). It is only fair, however, to Professor Sievers to state that he considers the segholates dissyllabic,41 cf. Metrische Studien, § 193, 6.

V. 9.—יְאַף יָאֵף points to a reading יְאַף for יָאֵף. Cheyne (1904) reads יָאֵף יְאַף and for יָאֵף יָאֵף. Olshausen’s emendation יְאַף יָאֵף restores the parallelism and is to be preferred. This has been adopted by Graetz, Hupfeld, Halévy, Dyserinck, Bickell, Cheyne (1888), Oort, Siegfried-Stade, Wellhausen.

41 They are dissyllabic in certain modern Arabic dialects, cf. kellb or kalb.
Duhm, and Briggs. Because of the preceding יִּלָּלֹת, it is not necessary with Buhl to read יִּלָּלֹת.

V. 10.—Cheyne (EB, 4899, article “Tarshish”) emends Tarshish to 'Aššūr or 'Aššūr and defines it as “a N. Arabian district of somewhat uncertain extent, also known perhaps as Geshur”. In 1904 he reads Jerahmeelites and Asshurites for מֵלֵי תָּרְשִׁישׁ and omits Jerahmeelites as an incorrect variant to an Asshurites.

Bickell and Cheyne regard מֵלֵי as a later insertion, cf. EB, 4342, article “Seba”, and Cheyne (1904), where he reads מֵלֵי.

Hitzig considered מֵלֵי as a corruption of מֵלֶס, which occurs in 2 Sam. 6:19 and 1 Ch. 16:3. The meaning of מֵלֶס, however, is doubtful. For מֵלֶס, Cheyne (1904) reads מֵלֶס as a later insertion, considers it a gloss on מֵלְיָשׁוֹר, and omits מֵלֶס עָסֹה v. 10 as a dittography.

We must omit מֵלֶס עָסֹה as a prosaic explanatory gloss to מֵלֶס עָסֹה v. 11, as well as לֶס עָסֹה before מֵלֶס עָסֹה as glosses.

V. 11.—Instead of מֵלֶס עָסֹה, לֶס read omnes reges terrae, with which לֵּס and לֵּס agree.—Cheyne (1904) regards v. 11 as a gloss to v. 10.

The monosyllabic pronominal forms ל and ב in the phrases מָשֵׁק v. 11, מְשַׁק v. 12, and מָשֵׁק or מְשַׁק v. 13, and מָשֵׁק v. 17 are enclitic and throw the tone on the preceding syllable, cf. Sievers, §165.

V. 12.—Beer (op. cit., p. 59 f.), following Giesebrecht and Baethgen, thinks this verse is most naturally connected with v. 7.

לֶס, Hier., לֶס read מָשֵׁק for מָשֵׁק. So also Ehrlich, in the sense of “magnate”. Cheyne (1904) reads מָשֵׁק.

This and v. 13 are to be omitted as mere repetitions of the thought of v. 14. Briggs omits v. 12 as a gloss and a mere variation of v. 4. Vv. 12-13 may be illustrative quotations from some other poem, added by a later hand.

V. 14.—Duhm considers מֵלֵי and מֵלֶס variants and omits the latter (so also Buhl). Cheyne (1904) thinks that מֵלֵי probably represents Maacath and מֵלֶס is a corrupt form of Cusham, which is a gloss to Maacath. We must, however, point מֵלֵי.
is an explanatory gloss to the more unusual word מֶמְשָׁלַח, with Waw explicativum, which frequently accompanies glosses (so also Baethgen and Briggs).

Instead of וּמַר, we should point וּמַר with Olshausen and compare 2 Kings 11:3. a' καὶ τιμήθησεν αὐτόν seems to point to a reading מַנְחָל in

For מַמְשָׁלַח, Θ'£3 read מַמְשָׁלַח. 6Χ and 6Y have τό δόμομα αὐτοῦ.

V. 15.—Cheyne (1888) considers this verse a quotation from an intercessory prayer for the king, which was written by one scribe in the margin and incorporated into the text by another. Baethgen adopts this view for the first clause only and in his third edition (1904) finds a confirmation of his view in the different meter (Vierer = tetrameter, i.e., 2 + 2 beats) in this clause from that of the rest of the verse (Doppeldreier = double trimeter, i.e., 3 + 3 beats). Buhl omits this clause as a later addition and Beer as a marginal gloss incorporated in the text. Duhm finds in it two distinct glosses, the first of which, מַמְשָׁלַח, he thinks is taken from Ps. 49:10 (Heb.) and refers to the poor man, while the second has the king or the Messiah as its subject. Briggs inserts the words מַמְשָׁלַח לְעִילָה after מַנְחָל: "It is probable that an ancient copyist used מַנְחָל for the longer formula, and that a later scribe misunderstood his abbreviation".

Cheyne (1904) considers מַנְחָל a variant to מַנְחָל v. 16, and "they give him of the gold of Sheba" a paraphrase of v. 10b. For מַמְשָׁלַח, he reads כלְיוֹת מִבְּיוֹת מָאָדֹת and for מַמְשָׁלַח בְּיוֹת מָאָדֹת מִרְחָסָא וְיוֹלְקֵה בְּיוֹת מָאָדֹת.

Ehrlich reads for מַנְחָל the Piel מַר "may he live!" and compares German leben lassen and Arabic یراخ "to greet, salute". He considers the subject of this verb as well as the suffix in ל ו the subjects of the verbs בְּיוֹת מָאָדֹת וּבְיוֹת מָאָדֹת as indefinite.—Graetz puts all the verbs in this verse in the plural and emends מַנְחָל to לָמֵא.

Max L. Strack in his Dynastie der Ptolemäer (Berlin, 1897),

42 On a similar use of מַנְחָל for מַנְחָל, cf. 2 Sam. 1:24 and Professor Haupt's paper "David's Dirge on Saul and Jonathan", JHUC, No. 163, p. 57a, n. 27.
pp. 12-17, considers as an explanatory gloss, added by an orthodox Jew to prevent the preceding clause from being taken to mean divine worship of the king.

We must omit the first part of v. 15 as an explanatory gloss, appended to v. 14 by some reader, in the same style as הַלָּוָּד הַלָּוָּד הֵבִּית v. 4.—For the sgs. מַלְיָא and מַלְיָא, we should in each case read the plural.

V. 16.—For מַלְיָא we should read מַלְיָא. —For the אָבַד וְאָבַד מַלְיָא המָלְיָא, Lagarde, Graetz, Cheyne and Wellhausen propose "fullness". Hupfeld cites this emendation with approval. cf. Hupfeld-Nowack Die Psalmen (3rd ed., Gotha, 1888), p. 205. Duhm's conjecture of מַלְיָא "sufficiency" on the basis of the Syriac מַלְיָא מַלְיָא "contentment" (1 Tim. 6 e) is unsatisfactory. Cheyne (1904) reads מַלְיָא מַלְיָא. מַלְיָא has been referred to the stems מַלְיָא (Arabic faṣā, Mishnic מַלְיָא) and מַלְיָא to spread out but it is probably phonetic reading for מַלְיָא from a stem מַלְיָא, akin to Assyrian napāšu "to be abundant", Aram. מַלְיָא "to be numerous", and Arabic nafīsa "great riches". Cf. Peshitta מַלְיָא מַלְיָא = Assyr. napāš ebūri "abundance of grain" and the footnote by Professor Haupt in BA, 5, 471 f. The form מַלְיָא, then, which we should perhaps read instead of מַלְיָא, may be referred to this verb, or, as verbs Primaе Nun and Primaе Waw frequently interchange, to a stem napāšu (for yapāšu). מַלְיָא, then, would be formed from a biconsonantal theme מַלְיָא, just as Heb. מַלְיָא, which is usually referred to מַלְיָא (for מַלְיָא), and Syriac מַלְיָא with the same meaning, cf. Nöld., Syr. Gr., § 105. If we retain the pointing מַלְיָא, we may compare with it the analogical post-Biblical word מַלְיָא "drop" from מַלְיָא in מַלְיָא מַלְיָא and מַלְיָא מַלְיָא v. 17a receive the tone after their constructs, which are regularly proclitic, cf. Sievers, §§ 158 and 159, 2. Cheyne (1904) considers מַלְיָא מַלְיָא miswritten for מַלְיָא מַלְיָא and reads מַלְיָא for מַלְיָא מַלְיָא. מַלְיָא מַלְיָא must be omitted as a gloss by a Palestinian reader, as there are no mountains in Egypt. For מַלְיָא מַלְיָא Cheyne (1904) reads מַלְיָא מַלְיָא.

Ewald, assuming a hypothetical stem מַלְיָא (gipfeln) as identical with מַלְיָא, emended מַלְיָא מַלְיָא to מַלְיָא מַלְיָא, cf. Jahrbücher d. Bib. Wissenschaft (Göttingen, 1853) 5, 173. Graetz proposed the emendation מַלְיָא מַלְיָא "may it be rich (or abundant)". Duhm reads.
SEIPLE: THE SEVENTY-SECOND PSALM

For מ for מ, Wellhausen reads מ as a genitive depending on מ and renders it a Lebanon of fruit “a hyperbolical plural of fruit-tree — a vast number of fruit-trees”. Baethgen (Die Psalmen, 1897) emends it to מ “may they be fruitful”, connects it closely with what follows, and thinks that מ was perhaps originally a gloss to מ. In his third edition (1904), he gives up the idea that מ was a gloss. For מ, Cheyne (1904) reads מ, supposing that מ has fallen out, owing to the resemblance of מ to מ.

For מ, Graetz proposed the emendation מ, צי, צי, צי. For מ צי צי צי, Cheyne (1904) reads מ צי צי צי צי, omitting מ צי צי צי צי as a corruption of מ צי צי צי צי, which he considers a variant to מ צי צי. For מ צי, Ehrlich reads מ צי צי צי. — מ is probably haplography for מ צי צי צי. We may omit מ צי צי צי as a gloss.

Briggs (Psalms, 1907) omits מ for מ, regarding it as probably representing מ “may sheep pasture”, of which מ then would be an explanatory gloss to מ, and renders the first part of the verse: May there be an aftergrowth in the land, on the top of the mountains sheep. For מ he reads מ kine on Lebanon, basing his emendations on מ וְּפֶרֶפֶּר — מ and that מ is “often error for מ”. He changes to מ וְּפֶרֶפֶּר and renders the last clause of the verse: And may flowers bloom out of the forests as herbs of the field.

Baethgen (1904), for metrical reasons, thinks a foot is lacking after מ at the close of the verse and that we must supply some word like מ or מ (sprosst).

V. 17.—For remarks on the first two clauses of v. 17, cf. first paragraph of note on v. 5.
The last clause of v. 17, with the insertion of the article before בְּנֵי and the omission of יִנְהָרָיו as an explanatory gloss to the preceding, should be put after the last clause of v. 16 to form the first line of the second couplet (vv. 17 and 5) of the second stanza (vv. 6, 18, 17, 5) of the poem.

Cheyne (1904) omits מְנַשֶּׁה and considers it a distortion of מְנַשֶּׁה, written too soon. For מְנַשֶּׁה, he reads גֵּרֵט (so also Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Graetz, Ehrlich, and Briggs on the authority of 6, 3, 1 and one Heb. MS), and renders: Before Thee let his name endure. Duhm thinks we have a confabulate reading in מְנַשֶּׁה, for which 6 shows the original text. He accordingly substitutes מְנַשֶּׁה for מְנַשֶּׁה (Buhl מְנַשֶּׁה for מְנַשֶּׁה) and considers מְנַשֶּׁה a mistake for מְנַשֶּׁה from a stem. Cheyne (1904) considers this latter emendation “an improbable Aramaism”. Buhl in Gesenius-Buhl’s Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterbuch (15th ed., 1910), s. v. מְנַשֶּׁה, infers from מְנַשֶּׁה the reading מְנַשֶּׁה, “remain” from מְנַשֶּׁה on the basis of Gen. 6:3. Nestle conjectures a form from מְנַשֶּׁה or מְנַשֶּׁה, see ZAT, 25, 201.

For the second מְנַשֶּׁה, which Briggs omits as a copyist’s error, Ehrlich conjectures מְנַשֶּׁה and interprets it as meaning “his lucky star”, comparing Jer. 15:9 and Kiddushin 72b: נַשְׂאֶה סֶל מֶנֶשֶׁה סֶל מֶנֶשֶׁהרְחַבִּים סֶל מֶנֶשֶׁה סֶל מֶנֶשֶׁה סֶל מֶנֶשֶׁה סֶל מֶנֶשֶׁה “before Eli’s star was extinguished, Samuel’s star rose”.

Beer considers the whole of v. 17a a marginal gloss, incorporated into the text, and Briggs v. 17b a gloss based on Gen. 12:18 and 22:18.

On the authority of 6, Kautzsch, Cheyne (1888), G. Buchanan Gray (JQR, 7, 679, n. 2), Duhm, Briggs and Buhl supply מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה, the latter putting it after מְנַשֶּׁה, Graetz מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה, and Wellhausen, Baethgen and Ehrlich מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה. Cheyne (1904) supplies simply מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה מְנַשֶּׁה.

With Wellhausen we may omit מְנַשֶּׁה as a gloss to the preceding מְנַשֶּׁה.

V. 18.—Verses 18 and 19, which form the doxology and are no part of the original poem, have no metrical form as they stand. In order to give them a regular meter, we should have

...
to omit וֹהְיוֹת אֲלֹהִים v. 18a, בָּשָׁם 19a, and כֹּבֵּד 19b. Zenner-Wiesmann omit vv. 18-20.

ארְבַּא is omitted by five MSS, ג and ח. Briggs considers it a "conflation of Elohistic and Yahwistic editors".

V. 19.—It is perhaps better with Duhm, GK, § 121, e, and Cheyne (1904), following י Num. 14 21 to read קָלָלָל יִשְׂרָאֵל instead of נִפְח,al.

V. 20.—The colophon is wanting in seven MSS. On the form נָמְפֵל, Pu'al with ב for י, cf. GK, § 52, q.

It is not necessary with Graetz, T. K. Abbott in Hermathena VIII (1893), p. 76, Cheyne (1904) and Ehrlich to read נָמְפֵל for נָמְפֵל.

According to Cheyne (1904) נָמַש רֹא אתן has come from Arab-Ethan the sons of Ishmael. He considers נָמַש a corruption of בְּנֵי שִׂמְעָת, which he makes a gloss or variant on נָמַש, derived from נָמַש. In his opinion, the colophon, which originally referred to what he terms the "Ethanic Psalter", a collection of the earlier psalms entitled "Of Arab-Ethan", was transferred to the end of Ps. 72 to include it also, although it was originally entitled "Of Ishmael", and later on the words, "the sons of Ishmael", were appended to "Arab-ethan".

B. Jacob, in an article entitled "Die Reihenfolge der Psalmen", ZAT, 18, 100, n. 1, maintains that נָמַש should be translated Ended are prayers of David (i.e., there now follows a series of others), not the prayers of David, but, as Nöldeke has shown in ZAT, 18, 256, it can only be rendered the prayers of David, as the construct is made definite by the following proper noun. Prayers of David would have to be expressed by נָמַש אַלְמָנָה רוֹא יִשָּׂע, cf. a son of Jesse בִּלְיָאִם, GK, § 129, c.