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

D. WINTON THOMAS.

A NOTE ON נֵפֶשׁ 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’; 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 ὁνομιου which, besides meaning sleep, de concubitu dicitur; for other instances of this meaning we may refer to the Book of Wisdom, where it is twice so used.

Now there is considerable divergency of opinion as to the precise date of this book, but if with Thackeray 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 נֵפֶשׁ 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:

אִמְרַתָּהּ לַאֵלֶּהָ בַּתָּ יָמִים רָבִּים
אִמְרַתָּהּ לַאֵלֶּהָ בַּתָּ יָמִים מִשְׁלֵךְ רָבִּים

2 Schleusner, Lex. in LXX, s.v. ὁνομιου.
3 Wisdom iv 6 (ἐν γὰρ ἀνόμοις ὄνομα τίνα γενόμενα) and vii 3 (παραώς ἐν αἷματι ἐν στέρματος ἀνέφε καὶ ἑδονῆς ὄνομα συνελθοῦσα).
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. ליעל ב (in v. 11) is caught up by ליעל ב (in v. 3);
   β. מ is balanced by מ;
   γ. נו leads up to ליעל (‘gift’, not ‘inheritance’);
   δ. מ (בְּּוָ֣וָּו) is balanced by מ.

If therefore we follow the hint afforded us by the use of בְּוָָו, we derive a meaning for נו 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 Hitzig 1 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 ליעל מ for נו ליעל מ. 1

1 Supplied by Schlugl; perhaps once written as מ and then lost before ליעל.
2 Suggested rhythmica causa by G. R. Driver; cf. Bühl’s suggested emendation in Ps. xlii 2.
3 M. T. מ; Gk. κατασχωρυκαί.
4 Suggested rhythmica causa by G. R. Driver for M.T.’s מ for נו ליעל מ.
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 emenda-
tion 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 emenda-
tion] 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 Kina-metre or Kina-
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 Kina rhythm,
and it goes on similarly.' But as early as ver. 23 a 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 Kina-rhythm or by other names³—I may
name Duhm, Cheyne, Marti, Stade, Haupt, Kamphausen, Kautzsch—

¹ They include Duhm (Jesaja, 1891), 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), Kamp-
phausen (Kautzsch³, Könige, 1905), Kautzsch (Ibid., Jesaja), Ehrlich (Jesaja, 1912),
Hans Schmidt (Die Grossen Propheten, 1915), Eissfeldt (Kautzsch³, Könige u. Jes.,
1922), Menge-Bibel, 1926, Kittel (Biblia Hebraica³, 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 Sennacherib'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.

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). 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 Herze 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 קינה-rhythm absent
only in ver. 23a, 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 קינה-verses which the best authorities ascribe to
the poem: certainly no great fraction of it. We shall presently see in
ver. 23 how the קינה-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 9, the decisive pronouncement of
Jahwe, makes up a קינה-verse of the most unexceptionable kind:

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

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

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 יאנא into the first member of the verse, as Stade wishes, is certainly
If then the poem ends with two קינה-verse, 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 קינה-verse.

In 22a my proposed omission of אֶעֱלֵי (accepted by Stade) is inferior to Haupt's omission of הָלוֹק; for הוֹרָת is neither the same as הָרוֹסֶה (Dan. xi 36) nor should we silently supply י as its supplement. But in any case I should like to suggest that אָלָמְי might originally have been a marginal correction to אָלָמְי at the beginning of the verse and ought to be substituted for it. That is a possibility in any case, even though אָלָמְי and אָלָמְי do not elsewhere occur with an object with י. — 22b is a good קינה-verse. In 23a one may take the book of Isaiah in preference to לְהֶלֶךְ מֵעַלְכֶּךָ without altering the metre: the sentence can be read, as I pointed out in 1892 (p. 33), according to the קינה-pattern, with the end at אָלָמְי and the break at אָלָמְי, but I still regard the whole line as a later insertion to mark the beginning of the words of Sennacherib. Haupt thinks so also. — 23a b. Here I had felt the need of a missing three-beat line before אֶרְכָּת לֹא (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:

עָרְכָּת לֹא. Here the אֵטְפֵּי אָדָמִים 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 בֵּית הַיִּשָּׁר (Prov. xxxi 29, Ruth iv 11). It is quite understandable that they should have dropped out before אֶרְכָּת 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 קינה-verse:

בַּעַר רְכֹב אָנִי | עַשָּׁהָ יָיִל

and to the end of the half-verse (to לֹא) 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 נֶאְרָי at once suggests another hand.
NOTES AND STUDIES

one. Stade has rightly taken the new verse as the Lucianic text attests it. The 1 of the insolent Assyrian king stands in the most emphatic position; Haupt's transposition of רבverige to the second half of the verse only weakens the expression. A better proof for the correctness of our rhythmic assumptions and for defence of our reconstruction could hardly be imagined. Burkitt's suspicions about ver. 23a are thereby definitely laid.—23b. Two good Kina-verses. For רַבְגֵּר we should, with Stade, read יְהוּדָא (Isaiah); on the reading of the Imperf. cons. in vv. 23–25 (יהוה etc.) all experts are agreed.—24. Two good Kina-verses. In leaving out כל כיו Stade and Haupt agree with me, but a חָלַק (with מַעֲפֵץ) 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 Kina-verses, ending נֵבְרֵה and גֵּרָהוֹד and נְעָרִים —sic; without 1 (LXX of Isaiah xxxvii 26), with Stade, Haupt, Burkitt—and ונע. 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 מ to והי. The יְהוּדָא, 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.—26a and b a form two good Kina-verses, faultless as they stand: only b 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 חָלַק יְהוּדָא should be transferred, as emended to יְהוּדָא דֵּרֶךְ, 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 רֹסֶה. 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 רֹסֶה: it is, according to Gen. xli 6, 23, 27, fully attested for the withering of plants, the meaning here required. The reading חָלַק in Isaiah xxxvii 27 may very well be caused by the rarity of the root רֹסֶה, 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 חָלַק into לַעַנָּה (לַעַנָּה), made by Thenius and Delitzsch, is not to be regarded as a mere free conjecture, but is shewn by the occurrence of לַעַנָּה (Gen. xli 6, 23) to be a standing expression: in usage the desert wind belongs to the stem רֹסֶה, it is
from the desert wind that the withering comes. Without the alteration of a consonant one might read נָ֣שׁ 'before its growth', but this would be certainly inferior. It is more rational to believe that the נָ֣שׁ is derived from the נָ֣שׁ that follows, the eye going from the first נָ֣שׁ to the second, and that then the נָ֣שׁ was changed into ע by analogy with עַלָּמִּים. In the omission of נָ֣שׂ the reading נָ֣שׂ is the correct, and here probably is a slight indication in favour of that reading. For נָ֣שׂ the traditional pointing נָ֣שׂ (‘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 נָּשׁ, which seems to imply נָּשׁ fem., instead of masc. as otherwise five times attested. If this be regarded as inadmissible, we must read נָּשׁ, or נָּשָׁה. In sense and rhythm this all comes to the same thing. No further emendations are needed, particularly not the נ prefixed by Bickell and Haupt, nor the transposition which Haupt here again prefers. So ver. 26 is shewn to have three faultless Kina-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 the first נָּשָׁה 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 נָּשָׁה ver. 27 as far as נָּשָׁה makes a good Kina-verse, the half being at נָּשָׁה. The נָּשָׁה before נָּשָׁה 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 נָּשָׁה was necessarily to be linked on to what follows. But the point is of little importance.—A new line must now begin with נָּשָׁה, 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 נָּשָׁה before the following נָּשָׁה, but for a Kina-verse the end is a whole word too short. Marti here has perceived the true solution, viz. that נָּשָׁה only came into the text as a substitute for the lost נָּשָׁה, and that when this word has been restored נָּשָׁה is no longer required. And further he maintains, also with Stade and Haupt, that

1 So Haupt, reading נָּשָׁה.
2 In this Stade and Haupt agree with him.
the נַעֲרֵה 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 נַעֲרֵה, it should be simply
omitted.—28 a. The single קִנְתָה-line that this half-verse must give us
can be reconstructed in various ways. My omission of נַעֲרֵה is approved
by Stade and Haupt, and for the first line they retain, not very plausibly,
the נַעֲרֵה of ver. 27. Marti keeps נַעֲרֵה and connects my conjecture
נַעֲרֵה, accepted by Stade and Haupt, with נַעֲרֵה. I am sure that
the נַעֲרֵה at the beginning of the verse, which they all reject, must be
retained: it is taken up by the נַעֲרֵה of the apodosis. If then we leave
out the נַעֲרֵה as a supplement, the קִנְתָה-verse is there, the division coming
at נַעֲרֵה.—About נַעֲרֵה I have spoken already; the two קִנְתָה-lines of
which it consists need no emendation. Thus the poem consists of 20
קִנְתָה-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 sup­
position 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 קִנְתָה-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 recon­
struction 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.