

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

me correct. I will at any rate venture to put before the reader a rendering of the text which I now think defensible.

To thee let praise be chanted, | O Yahwè, in Zion;
To thee let vows be performed | in Yeru-shalem.

To thy holy place, [O Yahwè,] let all men repair;
When our transgressions weighed us down, | thou thyself didst cancel them.

רָמִיָּה is non-existent. Every passage which presents this word in MT. can, I believe, be shown to be corrupt. But רָמִיָּה will not do. The psalmist would have used נִאֲוָה (33¹) if he had wished to say 'is seemly.' 'Seemly for thee,' however, might mean 'seemly for thee to offer'; it is too vague. Read הִתְקַדַּם, although the Pual occurs nowhere else. רָמִיָּה passed into רָמוֹת.

There is much more to be said on this fascinating psalm, but time is wanting. Let me hope to be more fortunate on some other occasion. I will only remark that קָדַשׁ in vs.⁵ should certainly be בְּרָשָׁן (so Grätz). יִשְׂרָאֵל should as certainly be אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׂרָאֵל.

3. Some Supposed Archaisms in the Old Testament.

While acknowledging the reasonableness of König's arguments in his *Lehrgebäude* i. 294 f., respecting the non-syncope of certain verbal forms in the causative stems, I ought to state that I have great doubts as to the examples quoted by König on pp. 425, 585, by Driver in *Text of Samuel*, p. 113, and in Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 53 g.

(a) 1 Sam. 17⁴⁷ יְהוֹשִׁיעַ יְהוָה. Either this is a combination of two readings יְהוֹשִׁיעַ and יְהוֹשִׁיעַ, or, as Klostermann has suggested, יְהוֹשִׁיעַ may be due to a copyist who misunderstood the final ה in יְהוֹשִׁיעַ (so Klost. reads for יְהוֹשִׁיעַ יְהוָה, ἡ σωζεις κύριος). It is strange that Löhr should have contented himself here with appealing to the opinion of Driver expressed so long ago as 1890. Prof. H. P. Smith is silent.

(b) Jer. 9⁴ יְהִתְלַלּוּ should probably be pointed יְהִתְלַלּוּ. Isa. 52⁵, יְהִי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל will find few defenders. Read יְהִתְלַלּוּ (Ryssel, Grätz, Kittel).

(c) Ps. 28⁷ אֲדוֹנָי. Scarcely defensible, except indeed by the improbable supposition that אֲדוֹנָי in the Psalter was everywhere originally אֲדוֹנָי. Read אֲנִי אֲדוֹנָי. (Duhm's explanation of the common reading will hardly find supporters.)

(d) Ps. 45¹⁶ יְהוֹדוּהָ. Read יְהַלְלוּהָ.

(e) Ps. 116⁶ יְהוֹשִׁיעַ. Here ἡ gives σωσεν. The initial י is dittographic.

(f) Job 13⁹, תְּהַתְּלוּ בְּהַתְּלִי. But note Dagesh in the latter form, which should doubtless be read תְּהַתְּלוּ; therefore also בְּהַתְּלִי. Cf. Budde's note.

(g) Neh. 11¹⁷, יְהוּדָה לְתַפְלָה, which is supposed to mean '(who) raised the strain of "Hōdū" for the prayer.' But 𐤄^B has a shorter text, and 𐤄^L presupposes יְהוּדָה הַתְּהַלְּלָה. ראש הַתְּהַלְּלָה comes just before. For this 𐤄^S gives ἀρχηγὸς τοῦ αἴνου; 𐤄^L ἀρχων τοῦ αἴνου, i.e. תְּהַלְּלָה. It is extremely probable that יְהוּדָה was originally תְּהַלְּלָה, and that this was a correction of תַּחֲלָה. [ב]תַּפְלָה is probably a variant to תְּהַלְּלָה, which has intruded into the text (cf. Ps. 72²⁰, MT. תַּפְלוֹת; but 𐤄^S οἱ ὕμνοι = תְּהַלְּלוֹת).

(h) Ezek. 46²², מְהַקְצֹנֹת, "on account of: 1. its loose connection with the preceding word, 2. the silence of 𐤄, and 3. the *puncta extraordinaria* of the Masoretes, is undeniably a gloss," says König, i. 294. But though a gloss, he will not admit that it is a miswritten gloss. Rather it is a case of dittography; it is miswritten for מְקַצְנֹת. I am glad to read Professor Toy's pithy remark, 'copyist's error.' To this we may add:

(i) The unusual יְהוֹסֵף for יוֹסֵף in Ps. 81⁶. The improbability of this is extreme. בְּיוֹסֵף הַשְּׁמִיעַ follows. Read בְּיוֹסֵף הַשְּׁמִיעַ.

Of course, an absolutely conservative critic will reject all these remedies. But absolute conservatism has few, if any, representatives now. If any one will take the trouble to record and classify each example of corruption of the text that he meets with, he will not, I believe, call any of the above corrections rash or unjustified. I conclude that even the latest grammarians have been too conservative in their treatment of non-syncopated forms. The right method is (as Kautzsch fully admits) first to criticise the texts, and then to form acceptable theories to account for the phenomena.