

occurrences of עָרַב may to some extent be dissipated, and a truer sense of the passages obtained, by postulating that a root עָרַב in the sense given above may have been current in Hebrew as well as in Arabic.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

A NOTE ON נָפַח IN PS. CXXVII 2

THIS verse has yet to be satisfactorily explained by the commentators. The sentiment of the last clause, as generally translated, is so surprising in the present context that resort has been made to several unwarranted guesses. Some, relying on the plain meaning of the word, have made it mean 'in sleep'¹; others have held that the text is corrupt, and have postulated many alternatives.

Such remedies, however, are to be used with caution, particularly when the present text can be intelligently rendered. And although, as Driver pointed out, the Septuagint is not our panacea for all Massoretic ills, it certainly helps in the instance under consideration. Here the LXX reads ὑπνον which, besides meaning sleep, *de concubitu dicitur*²; for other instances of this meaning we may refer to the Book of Wisdom, where it is twice so used.³

Now there is considerable divergency of opinion as to the precise date of this book, but if with Thackeray⁴ we date it towards the close of the second century B.C. owing to its linguistic peculiarities, we shall probably not be far from the date when the Psalm under discussion was translated into Greek.

It is probable therefore that a bi-lingual population (we may note that נָפַח is an Aramaism) would use the same euphemism in both languages.

This conclusion is further strengthened by rhythmical reasons. By adopting it we retain the *parallelismus membrorum*, which is otherwise destroyed; we shall also reject the hypothesis that we have two psalms and adopt the view that there are two strophes of the same psalm. We shall see this more clearly if we write out the psalm *in extenso*:

אִם-יְהוָה לֹא-יִבְנֶה בַּיִת שׁוֹאֵעַמְלוֹ בִּגְבוּיָ בּוֹ
אִם-יְהוָה לֹא-יִשְׁמַר עִיר שׁוֹאֵ-שִׁקָּר שׁוֹמֵר

¹ Kautzsch-Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, § 118 i; Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebrew Lexicon*, p. 446 a.

² Schleusner, *Lex. in LXX*, s.v. ὑπνος.

³ Wisdom iv 6 (ἐκ γὰρ ἀνόμων ὑπνων τέκνα γεννώμενα) and vii 2 (παγίς ἐν αἵματι ἐκ σπέρματος ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἡδονῆς ὑπναφ συνελθούσης).

⁴ *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, pp. 61-62.

⁵ Suggested *rhythmical causa* by G. R. Driver for M.T.'s בּוֹנֵי בּוֹ (cf. Zech. vi 15, Neh. iv 11).

שוא־לכם משכימ־קום מאח־י־שבת אכל־לחם העצ־בים
 בן י (יהוה) יתן לי־דוֹ שֵׁנָא
 הנה נחלת־יהוה בנים שֶׁכֶר פִּרְי־הבֶּטֶן
 ב(מו) חצים ביד־נְבוֹר בן בנ־הנְעוּרִים
 אֲשֶׁר־הִנְבֵר אֲשֶׁר־מֵלֵא אֶת־אֲשֶׁפְתוֹ מֵהֶם
 לֹא־יִבֹשׁ כִּרְיֹדְבוֹ אֶתוֹ אִיבִים בְּשֶׁעַר

This improved parallelism is obtained with very few alterations, and these are only in the weak letters. Furthermore the balance of the strophes is brought out more clearly :

1. There is the same rhythm throughout (3 + 2) ;
2. the psalm is composed of two equal strophes, each having four lines ;
3. the thought of the two strophes is balanced ;
 - a. בוני בו (in v. 11) is caught up by בנים (in v. 3) ;
 - β. שוא is balanced by אשרי ;
 - γ. יתן leads up to נחלה (' gift ', not ' inheritance ') ;
 - δ. שֵׁנָא (*ὑπνος*) is balanced by פרי הבטן .

If therefore we follow the hint afforded us by the use of *ὑπνος*, we derive a meaning for שֵׁנָא which abolishes all need for emendation and restores the balance of thought.

Since arriving at the above conclusion, Mr. G. R. Driver, to whom I owe many valuable suggestions in this article, has drawn my attention to Hitzig⁵ who advocated a similar view and who adduced Wisdom vii 2 in support of his thesis. No subsequent commentator, however, seems to have followed him.

F. BUSSBY.

THE POEM IN 2 KINGS xix 21-28 (ISAIAH xxxvii 22-29)

In the *J.T.S.* for October 1933, pp. 369-372, F. C. Burkitt has controverted my article on this subject, written in 1892 (*ZAW* xii pp. 31-37), to defend Wellhausen's brilliant conjecture of לִפְנֵי קָמָה for לִפְנֵי קָמָה.

¹ Supplied by Schlögl ; perhaps once written as י and then lost before יתן .

² Suggested *rhythmica causa* by G. R. Driver ; cf. Bühl's suggested emendation in Ps. xlii 2.

³ M.T. יִבֹשׁ ; Gk. κατασχευθήσεται.

⁴ Suggested *rhythmica causa* by G. R. Driver for M.T.'s אֶת־אִיבִים .

⁵ In his *Psalmen* (1863), pp. 381-382.

(*ver.* 26) against my rejection of it. I must reckon the honour thereby done me all the higher, inasmuch as Wellhausen's conjecture stands in no need of defence, seeing that, as far as I know, I am the only one that has not accepted it, all others having formally agreed to his emendation.¹

But, as it seems, Burkitt laid less stress on the defence of the emendation than on the refutation of the ideas upon the rhythm or the metre of the passage, which were the grounds on which I felt I must reject it. It is only section 2 of his article (pp. 369-371) which is occupied with my theory, but how seriously he means his critique is clear from the last sentence: 'At least, there is little reason to sacrifice it [the emendation] at the altar of a metrical theory, which we have but small reason to suppose that Isaiah or his contemporaries would have ratified.' This sounds as if Burkitt's opposition extended to the whole scope of my 'metrical theory', but the details in section 2 shew that this is by no means the case. He not only recognizes the *Kīna*-metre or *Kīna*-rhythm (3+2 beats) as such, but also its occurrence in the poetically conceived utterance of the prophet 2 Kings xix 21 ff, with which my article was concerned: 'No doubt', says he, 'it [this rhythm] begins where the poetry begins, at xix 21 b. . . . That, no doubt, is *Kīna* rhythm, and it goes on similarly.' But as early as *ver.* 23a it appears to him to have another rhythm, and 'in any case the rhythm changes after *ver.* 26'. He considers it unproven, unprovable, as an unauthorized pretension, that Isaiah would be obliged to keep this rhythm to the end, and he observes further that this passionate outburst against the pretensions of the Assyrian is not an occasion where we ought to look for metrical finish.² Here Burkitt is deserted by the many witnesses that stood on his side in the matter of Wellhausen's emendation. All those who enter on a discussion of the rhythm, almost without exception, notice the line of five beats, whether as *Kīna*-rhythm or by other names³—I may name Duhm, Cheyne, Marti, Stade, Haupt, Kamphausen, Kautzsch—

¹ They include Duhm (*Jesaja*, 1892), Oort (*Het Oude Testament*, 1899), Cheyne (*Isaiah*, *Rainbow-Bible*, 1899), Benzinger (*Könige*, 1899), Kittel (*Könige*, 1900), Marti (*Jesaja*, 1900), Stade and Paul Haupt (*Kings*, *Rainbow-Bible*, 1904), Kamphausen (*Kautzsch*², *Könige*, 1909), Kautzsch (*Ibid.*, *Jesaja*), Ehrlich (*Jesaja*, 1912), Hans Schmidt (*Die Grossen Propheten*, 1915), Eissfeldt (*Kautzsch*⁴, *Könige u. Jes.*, 1922), Menge-Bibel, 1926, Kittel (*Biblia Hebraica*³, 1929).

² P. 371, end of section 2. That the poem does *not* come from Isaiah, but has been interpolated into the late history-book even later, is the opinion of nearly all recent expositors, an opinion grounded especially on the fact that *ver.* 24 takes into account the result of Sennacherih's Egyptian expedition, of which only his successors were aware, but also on the many reminiscences of Deutero-Isaiah.

³ Benzinger, however, notes on *ver.* 21: 'The metre of this poem is that by far the most commonly used by the Hebrews, a verse of 2+3 beats.' That is hardly to be understood after the publication of Duhm's *Commentary on Isaiah*: he did not need to have noticed my article.

and make this rhythm to be intended to be kept up right through to the end of the piece; most of them indeed attempt to reintroduce this rhythm, where it is faulty, by emending the text.¹

I have set forth briefly my right to the proceeding in question in the beginning of my paper of 1892; for the English reader I may refer for further consideration to my article 'Poetry (Hebrew)' in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* (1901).² Here I am in a position to call in another expert witness, who expresses exactly what I would say in the foregoing case. The passage is in Johannes Meinhold's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed., 1932, p. 37: 'If, for example, a prophet begins a lament and uses a metre which has a long line of three beats followed by a shrill abrupt sigh of two beats, he is then using the well-known form and melody of the Death-chant, as the women-mourners were accustomed to raise it over the corpse. It is not probable that he would abandon this metre in the course of his lament. He who is using the tune "*Jesus, meine Zuversicht*" will not immediately for the same poem run into the lilt and measure of "*Fröhlich soll mein Herz springen*". When therefore in Isaiah i 21 ff or Amos v 1 ff, or in Lamentations, simple transpositions, excisions, or additions are made on metrical grounds, such emendations are well justified.'

But let us now consider the text, on which Burkitt's far-reaching and fundamental objection is founded. He finds the *Kīna*-rhythm absent only in *ver.* 23 a, which seems to him to have another rhythm, and in *vv.* 27 and 28, with which the poem ends. That makes up a quarter of the whole, 5 out of 20 *Kīna*-verses which the best authorities ascribe to the poem: certainly no great fraction of it. We shall presently see in *ver.* 23 how the *Kīna*-verse can easily and securely be restored on grounds of documentary testimony. But in *vv.* 27, 28, Burkitt cannot have overlooked the fact that 28 b a, the decisive pronouncement of Jahwe, makes up a *Kīna*-verse of the most unexceptionable kind:

וְשָׁמְתִי חַחִי בְּאִפְךָ | וּמְתַנִּי בְּשַׁפְתֶּיךָ
| | | | |

Even Burkitt must acknowledge this for a *Kīna*-verse free from suspicion. Scarcely less satisfactory is 28 b β, with which the poem closes:

וְהִשְׁכַּחְתִּיךָ בְּדַרְךָ | אֲשֶׁר-בָּאתָ בָּהּ
| | | | |

Duhm and Haupt are certainly right in giving, as I do, two beats to the first word and in reading the אֲשֶׁר (followed by *Maḳḳeph*) as a proclitic.³

¹ This right Kamphausen recognizes also, when he remarks (on *ver.* 21): 'In any case the original rhythm is in the existing text clearly faulty in several places.'

² See sections 2d, 2e (5), of that article, and 'The Poetry of the Prophets' (towards the end).

³ To draw אֲשֶׁר into the first member of the verse, as Stade wishes, is certainly

If then the poem ends with two *Ḳīna*-verses, how can one urge that at *ver.* 27 the rhythm has been consciously and definitely changed by the poet? With inevitable necessity we find ourselves rather directed to attempt the restoration of the faulty verses 27 and 28a with all the means at our disposal.

With these remarks I can go on to a new piece of work of my own. I am grateful to Burkitt for having called my attention to that article of 1892 which I had not looked at again for forty years: I have now got much to improve it and bring it to a more consistent solution of the problem. For 21b there is nothing to change: two good *Ḳīna*-verses.—In 22a my proposed omission of ועלמי (accepted by Stade) is inferior to Haupt's omission of קול; for הרימת is neither the same as החרוממת (Dan. xi 36) nor should we silently supply יד as its supplement. But in any case I should like to suggest that אחרמי might originally have been a marginal correction to עלמי at the beginning of the verse and ought to be substituted for it. That is a possibility in any case, even though נרף and נרף do not elsewhere occur with an object with על.—22b is a good *Ḳīna*-verse.—In 23a one may take the עבריך of the book of Isaiah in preference to מלאכך without altering the metre: the sentence can be read, as I pointed out in 1892 (p. 33), according to the *Ḳīna*-pattern, with the end at ותאמר and the break at תרפת, but I still regard the whole line as a later insertion to mark the beginning of the words of Sennacherib. Haupt thinks so also.¹—23aβ. Here I had felt the need of a missing three-beat line before ירבותי לבנות without being able to supply the words: I had overlooked what Grätz had first noticed, and then Stade and Haupt made use of, viz. the Lucianic text, which fills up the gap otherwise in full justice to what is required. Here *ver.* 23 reads: ἐν τῷ πλῆθει τῶν ἀρμάτων ἐγὼ ἐποίησα δύναμιν· ἀνέβην εἰς ὕψος ὀρέων καὶ εἰς τὰ ὕψη τοῦ Λιβάνου. Here the ἐποίησα δύναμιν is not found either in the present Hebrew or the LXX B or A. That these words go back to a Hebrew original cannot be doubted: they are a literal rendering of חיל עשיתי חיל (Prov. xxxi 29, Ruth iv 11). It is quite understandable that they should have dropped out before עליתי in the MT and the text underlying LXX B and A. By reinserting them we get not only an excellent sense, but also a faultless *Ḳīna*-verse:

ברב רכבי אני | עשיתי חיל

and to the end of the half-verse (to לבנות) there follows an equally good

mistaken, but it would be allowable to regard it as an explanatory insertion. It is better, however, to retain it.

¹ The repetition of נרף at once suggests another hand.

one. Stade has rightly taken the new verse as the Lucianic text attests it. The *I* of the insolent Assyrian king stands in the most emphatic position; Haupt's transposition of **נרַב רַבִּי** to the second half of the verse only weakens the expression. *A better proof for the correctness of our rhythmical assumptions and for defence of our reconstruction could hardly be imagined.* Burkitt's suspicions about *ver.* 23 a are thereby definitely laid.—23 b. Two good *Kīna*-verses. For **מַבְחֹר** we should, with Stade, read **מִבְּחַר** (= Isaiah); on the reading of the Imperf. cons. in *vs.* 23-25 (**וְאַכְרַת** etc.) all experts are agreed.—24. Two good *Kīna*-verses. In leaving out **כֹּל** Stade and Haupt agree with me, but a **כֹּל־** (with *Maḳḳeph*) might be kept in without harming the rhythm.—25. The speech of the Assyrian ends with *ver.* 24: here Jahwe's answer begins. According to my arrangement we have three *Kīna*-verses, ending **עֲשִׂיתִי** and **הַבִּיאֲתִיה** and **בְּעָרוֹת**, with the half-verses at **לְמַרְחֹק** and **יִצְרַתִּיה**—*sic.* without **ו** (= LXX of Isaiah xxxvii 26), with Stade, Haupt, Burkitt—and **נָצִים**. Haupt's transposition in the first member is not an improvement, but weakens the harder but more effective order; the same is true of his prefixing a **ו** to **עָתָה**. The **וְיָתֵהוּ**, that I formerly wished to cut out, had better be retained, because with its 'and so thou didst come to' it emphasizes the idea that the Assyrian is nothing else but Jahwe's instrument. The fourth beat in the longer limb of the verse makes no difficulty, as indeed I always knew.—26 a and b a form two good *Kīna*-verses, faultless as they stand: only **ב β** makes a difficulty, not in the rhythm (which is excellent), but in the meaning and in the verse-division. According to Wellhausen the last two words **לְפָנַי קָטָה** should be transferred, as emended to **לְפָנַי קָטָה**, to *ver.* 27. In that case *ver.* 26 ends with a line of three beats, with the shorter half-verse missing. We are both right, I not less than Wellhausen: he that *ver.* 27 needs the two words as emended, I that *ver.* 26 cannot do without them and that there is the very best application for them; only this latter assertion needs proof. The uncertainty begins with **וְשָׂדֵה**. In 1892 I left several points open, because I was only occupied with the rhythm. Now I must first of all point out that there is no reason to raise difficulties with the stem **שָׂדֵה**: it is, according to Gen. xli 6, 23, 27, fully attested for the withering of plants, the meaning here required. The reading **שָׂדֵה** in Isaiah xxxvii 27 may very well be caused by the rarity of the root **שָׂדֵה**, but this more common word, which is always used of fertile vineyards or orchards, has no sense here. Further, it must be pointed out that the change of **קָטָה** into **קָרִים** (**קָרִים**), made by Thenius and Delitzsch, is not to be regarded as a mere free conjecture, but is shewn by the occurrence of **שָׂדֵה קָרִים** (Gen. xli 6, 23) to be a standing expression: in usage the desert wind belongs to the stem **שָׂדֵה**, it is

from the desert wind that the withering comes. Without the alteration of a consonant one might read קָמָה 'before its growth',¹ but this would be certainly inferior. It is more rational to believe that the קַמ is derived from the קָמָך that follows, the eye going from the first לַמְּנִי to the second, and that then the ך was changed into ה by analogy with שְׂדֵה. In וְשָׂדֵה the omission of ך seems to me what is called for. It is not a new object of comparison that is required, but a description of the fate of this or the other objects just named. Only for the alternative reading שְׂדֵה־קָמָה is the ך correct, and here probably is a slight indication in favour of that reading. For שְׂדֵה the traditional pointing שְׂדֵה־קָמָה ('blasting') may stand, *abstractum pro concreto*, for 'a blasted crop', as often in Hebrew (*Kautsch* § 83 c). Further, the form attested in Gen. xli pleads for שְׂדֵה־קָמָה, which seems to imply קָמָה־קָמָה fem., instead of masc. as otherwise five times attested. If this be regarded as inadmissible, we must read שְׂדֵה־קָמָה, or קָמָה־שְׂדֵה. In sense and rhythm this all comes to the same thing. No further emendations are needed, particularly not the ך prefixed by Bickell and Haupt, nor the transposition which Haupt here again prefers. So *ver.* 26 is shewn to have three faultless *Ḳina*-verses.—27. It has been shewn that the two last words of *ver.* 26 should be repeated almost exactly, so that the eye of a transcriber would easily pass from one לַמְּנִי to the second, thereby suppressing one of the pairs of words. I had overlooked this in 1892, and so had rejected Wellhausen's emendation notwithstanding all its brilliancy. Wellhausen also had overlooked this point, but only to the prejudice of *ver.* 26. The right understanding I find first in Haupt, only that, by a transposition which he makes, the origin of the original mistake is obscured. Dillmann (*Jesaja*, 1890) was already on the right way, and Burkitt now is willing to accept this explanation. With Wellhausen's קָמָה־לַמְּנִי *ver.* 27 as far as וְבֵאֵךְ makes a good *Ḳina*-verse, the half being at וְשָׂדֵה. The ך before וְשָׂדֵה should be omitted (though against all authorities), so that the short line should be given a sharper emphasis. It was not till the loss of the initial words of the verse that וְשָׂדֵה was necessarily to be linked on to what follows. But the point is of little importance.—A new line must now begin with יְדַעְתִּי, while now it is at the end of a half-verse: to gain this new position for it nothing more is required than to delete ך before the following אֵת, but for a *Ḳina*-verse the end is a whole word too short. Marti here has perceived the true solution, viz. that יְדַעְתִּי only came into the text as a substitute for the lost לַמְּנִי and that when this word has been restored יְדַעְתִּי is no longer required.² And further he maintains, also with Stade and Haupt, that

¹ So Haupt, reading קָמָה־קָמָה.

² In this Stade and Haupt agree with him.

the *הַתְּרַנֵּן אֵלַי* should only be read once. At present it forms a ditto-graphy, which has been adapted in the usual way to the context. For *ver.* 27, therefore, together with the preceding *וַאֲמַת*, it should be simply omitted.—28 a. The single *Ḳīna*-line that this half-verse must give us can be reconstructed in various ways. My omission of *עֲלֶה* is approved by Stade and Haupt, and for the first line they retain, not very plausibly, the *יִרְעוּתִי* of *ver.* 27. Marti keeps *עֲלֶה* and connects my conjecture *שְׂמִינֵךְ*, accepted by Stade and Haupt, with *הַתְּרַנֵּן אֵלַי*. I am sure that the *עַן* at the beginning of the verse, which they all reject, must be retained: it is taken up by the *וַשְׂכַּחֲתִי* of the apodosis. If then we leave out the *עֲלֶה* as a supplement, the *Ḳīna*-verse is there, the division coming at *אֵלַי*.—About 28 b I have spoken already; the two *Ḳīna*-lines of which it consists need no emendation. Thus the poem consists of 20 *Ḳīna*-verses, or of 21 if we reckon in *ver.* 23 a a. It will not be easy to find so long a poem with the same structure, which can be so securely restored.

A beautiful and poetical piece, notwithstanding its late date! For, as has been already indicated, there can be no possibility of ascribing it to Isaiah, as Hans Schmidt and Burkitt still do. In using the rhythm of a lament for the announcement of calamities on foreign foes the poets Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah had led the way, and in the supposition that the enemy should have insight into the omnipotence and the plan of Jahwe Deutero-Isaiah seems to have served as the model.

The opinion of Burkitt, that from *ver.* 27 the rhythm changes and that as early as 23 a there is another rhythm perceptible, cannot in my opinion be disproved with greater certainty: so that we have the right so to emend the passages, as to restore the *Ḳīna*-verse rhythm, recognized in the rest of the piece, in these verses also. But his protest has done good service, in that it has led to a surer and more satisfactory reconstruction of the poem. I venture to hope that Burkitt himself will be convinced of it.

KARL BUDDE.

CORRIGENDUM

APRIL No., p. 162, l. 29, for F., Apr. 10 read Th., Apr. 10 as on p. 158.