

Critical Discussions. Isaiah 26; 25 1-5; 34 12-14.

By Dr. G. Buchanan Gray, Professor in Mansfield College Oxford.

In one of his latest contributions to this *Zeitschrift* the late editor re-asserted in passing a well justified claim for the value to textual criticism of the Greek version¹ of Isaiah, and in particular cited several passages in proof of the too little recognized fact „daß LXX selbst in sonst sehr übel übersetzten Zusammenhängen erwägenswerte Lesarten bringen“ (XXVI [1906] p. 108). My own conviction is that many such noteworthy readings still await discovery: for owing to the special characteristics of the Greek version of Isaiah, the Hebrew text lying behind the version frequently requires far more laborious search than in many other parts of the OT. The double consequence is that valuable readings are neglected and readings are cited on the authority of G which never had any real existence. What is needed is a systematic reconstruction of the entire Hebrew text of G such as has already been undertaken in this *Zeitschrift* by LIEBMANN for c. 24—27² and by ZILLESSEN for c. 53³. Of course any such reconstruction must itself be frequently criticized and emended before the fullest possible certainty is reached. Meantime a thorough discussion of particular passages may serve some purpose. In the first of the three passages discussed below I hope I have shewn that a neglected reading of G renders both improbable and unnecessary a conjectural emendation which has commanded a wide and almost general assent for several generations; in the second I believe I have recovered if not the correct text, yet an „erwägenswerte Lesart“, perhaps two; in the third I feel certain that I have shewn a prevalent reconstruction of the Hebrew text of G to be wrong and that I have recovered what G actually read. In the course of the discussion I have had to draw attention to certain methods of translation which may prove of service in interpreting other passages: and each discussion has some bearing on a matter

¹ Cited henceforward as G.

² See ZAW XXII 1—56, 285—304; XXIII 209—286; XXIV 51—104; XXV 145—171.

³ XXV 261—284.

of interest indicated in the titles, but which it was in no case my purpose to discuss exhaustively.

I.

Isaiah 2 6.

Magicians or Merchants?

כי נמשתה עמך בית יעקב⁶
 כי מלאו מקדם ועגנים כפלשתים
 ובילדי נכרים ישפיקו
 ותמלא ארצו כסף וזהב
 ואין קצה לאצרתיו
 ותמלא ארצו סוסים
 ואין קצה למרכבתיו
 ותמלא ארצו אלילים
 למעשה ידיו ישתחוו

I propose to discuss the text of the second and third only of the foregoing lines, but the sequence of thought in the entire passage. The text of the first line is uncertain, and, in the last, we should doubtless read *ישתחוו* for *ישתחוהו*; but with regard to these lines I have nothing fresh to suggest.

That the present Hebrew text (cited henceforward as H) of lines 2 and 3 is corrupt was recognized by LOWTH in the eighteenth century and is now so generally admitted that I can abstain from proving it afresh. The only question is how ought H to be emended. Hitherto LOWTH's emendation, or some variant of it, has held the field: either, so it is conjectured, (a) *מקדם* is a corruption of *מקסם*, or (b) *קסם* or *מקסם* or *קסמם* or *קסמי* dropped out before *מקדם*.

But the objections to these conjectures are serious: (1) they are based on a disregard of G; (2) they assume an improbable use of *מלא*; (3) they fail to restore a well-balanced distich such as the following verses lead us to expect here.

As to (2): can a person or persons be said to be full of other persons, or even of divinations? It seems to me improbable, and I know of no real parallel use of *מלא*; the following passages are perhaps the nearest parallels — Rt 1 21 Dtn 33 23 Ex 15 9 Job 36 17; but an examination of them will rather serve to show that the use of *מלא* in the Hebrew text of v. 6 is peculiar and improbable.

But a far more serious objection to the current emendations of Is 2 6 is that they disregard the existing evidence. What is now represented

17. 3. 11.

in H by *כי מלאו מקדם ועננים כפלשתים* and *ובילדי נכרים ישפיקו* is rendered by G as follows: *ὅτι ἐνεπλήσθη ὡς τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν κληδονισμῶν, ὡς ἡ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων καὶ τέκνα πολλὰ ἀλλόφυλα ἐγενήθη αὐτοῖς.*

The Hebrew translated by G read as follows:

(1) *כי מלא(ה) כמקדם ארצו עננים כפלשתים וביילדי נכרים ישפיק(ו)ק*

I note the following points:

(1) *ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν = ארצו*, not *ארצם*; this is shewn by the equivalence *ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν = ארצו*, in v. 7. A singular pronoun in H referring to a collective noun is, as frequently elsewhere, rendered in G by a plural.

(2) For the reason noted in (1) *πολλὰ ἐγενήθη αὐτοῖς* might = either *ישפיקו* or *ישפיק* but the singular suffix in *ארצו* makes it more probable that the verb was singular. It is also of course uncertain whether G read the second *י*; *שפק* to suffice, or *abound* is used in the Kal in the only other passage in the OT where it occurs; but *ספק* in the Hiphil is found in Ecclus. 39 16 42 17.

(3) *ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν* is not an *addition* made by the translator: for (a) were it such it would naturally have stood immediately after *ἐνεπλήσθη*;

(b) if G read, as H does now, *מלאו*, *ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν* would not have been suggested by the plural verb;

(c) the assumption would fail to account for the *ו* of the *ועננים* of H not being represented in G.

I now set the Hebrew original of G and the present text of H (down to *כפלשתים*) in parallel lines:

G *כי מלא(ה) כמקדם ארצו עננים כפלשתים*

H *כי מלאו מקדם ו עננים כפלשתים*

I submit that G is prior to H, and for the following reasons:

(1) The accidental loss of *ארצ* is much more easily understood than the deliberate insertion of *ארצ* in its present position. Were the *plus* of G *ארצו*, not *ארצ*, the possibility of a deliberate insertion would be greater, yet even then only on the supposition that the Hebrew text originally read *מלאה* or *מלא*, not *מלאו* as at present.

(2) The text of G contains the object of *מלא*, the lack of which in H has always been so seriously felt that the necessity of supplying it by conjecture has come to be generally admitted. Adopting G the need for this conjecture disappears. LOWTH's emendation, which has proved attractive for a century and a half, must be abandoned.

† Cp. the Targum, *מעון כמלקדמן, ארי אתמליאת ארעכן* where *ארעכן* doubtless is an insertion by the Aramaic paraphrast.

Zeitschrift f. d. alttest. Wiss. Jahrg. 31. 1911.

(3) Once the priority of G is admitted and עננים (without ו) is seen to have been the one and only object of מלא the necessity of justifying the וּעַנְנִים of H disappears: this too has always caused trouble to commentators; it has been explained, though quite unsatisfactorily, as a case of the participle containing its own subject (הם): see e. g. DILLMANN.

(4) The 3rd sing. masc. suffixes in v. 7 f., viz. in ארצו thrice, אצרתיו, מרכבתיו, מרכבתיו ידיו refer to the collective sing. עם or יַעֲקֹב in the first line of v. 6. In H the two lines that intervene between עם or יַעֲקֹב and the 3rd sing. suffixes that refer to one or other of those words are in the 3rd plural — מלאו and, if predicative, עננים. In G מלאו was certainly not read, but either מלאה or מלאה עננים is certainly not predicative, and instead of ישפיקו, ישפיק may have been and probably was read; the Hebrew text of G is in agreement, but H is awkwardly at variance, with the usage both in v. 6^a and in v. 7 ff.

G then is prior to H: but that even G is original seems to me improbable, for the line is obviously too long; the lines hereabouts contain three, or at most (v. 7^a), four words; probably then either כמקדם, or כפלשתים, or both words are intrusive. כמקדם is open to suspicion on account of its position, not to speak of the unsuitability of its meaning, whether we render *as of old* or *as from the East*. Possibly כמקדם is a corrupt dittograph of כמלאה (= כי מלאה); or, perhaps, it is a corrupt fragment of the opening distich of v. 6 which may be defective. כפלשתים also could be well-spared, for why the Philistines of all peoples should be represented as notorious for magic practices commentators quite fail to explain by their reference to I Sam 2 II Reg 1 2; these passages merely shew that the Philistines formed no exception to the peoples of antiquity, but in common with them possessed oracles and believed in symbolic magic. There is not the slightest evidence that the Philistines were pre-eminently given to magic practices. If good reason could be found for regarding כפלשתים as a gloss, it might safely be deleted. But for the moment I leave the question of its originality open, while I proceed to the further discussion of the remainder of the text which would unquestionably form a well balanced distich —

כי-מלאה ארצו עננים
ובילדי נכרים ישפיק

This we may render provisionally:

For his land is full of soothsayers,

And he concludes (bargains) with (?) the children of foreigners.

The text and meaning of the second line are unfortunately not beyond

suspicion; and neither the translation just given, nor the far less probable alternative, „And he abounds with children of foreigners“, gives a particularly good parallel to the first line. It is not surprising therefore that MARTI having adopted a modification of LOWTH's emendation, and concluding that v. 6 already contained *two* allusions to magic practices, suspected that a *third* reference to such practices underlay the words וּבִילְדֵי נָכְרִים יִשְׁפִּיקוּ and tentatively suggested rather extensive conjectural emendations with a view to obtaining such a meaning¹.

But one of the supposed references to magic practices rests on a conjectural emendation which has already been shewn to be in the highest degree precarious and improbable. Does the other reference stand examination? Is עֲנִיִּים, *soothsayers*, the term that was used in the original text? Certainly if the second line above refers to bargain-driving, the preceding line might be expected to refer to *traders*, rather than to soothsayers. But the meaning of that second line is not sufficiently certain to determine the sense of the whole verse. To reach the probable purpose of these obscure lines in v. 6, we must look beyond to the wider context; this is clear and unambiguous, and is admirably compatible with a reference to trade, far less so with a reference to soothsaying.

For what is the sequence of thought in v. 6-8? It is this: God has rejected his people, because their land is full of something in consequence of which (וּתְמֵלָא) they have grown rich and so have been able to buy horses and chariots and to lavish money on idols. Having secured cavalry in abundance and manufactured idols, they trust in these things to the neglect of Yahweh. What is this something that has brought wealth to Judah and all that follows in its train? Surely not magic practices; but it well might be trade, of which there is reason to believe there was a notable expansion in Judah during the prosperous reign of Uzziah².

The wider context then strongly suggests that the last line of v. 6 does actually refer to traders, and that the translation „They drive bargains with the children of foreigners“, if in detail philologically uncertain, approximates to the general sense of the original.

¹ CHEYNE in *Critica Biblica* also obtains three references to magic by extensive textual changes; he proposes

כִּי מָלְאוּ יְרֵחַמָּאִלִּים
וַיִּנְאֲמוּ כַפְלֵשְׁתִּים
וּבְהִיכְלֵי יְרֵחַמָּאֵל יִכְשֹׁפוּ

and explains that „יְרֵחַ“ is here used in the sense of soothsayers“.

² Cp. G. A. SMITH in *Encyclopedia Biblica* 574.

May we then go further and attempt to recover a further allusion to trade in the preceding parallel lines? Is עננים the corruption of a word denoting traders? Was the original word כנענים, meaning *traders* or *merchants* as in Prov 31 24 Zech 14 21, and, probably (cp. G), 11 7 11; cp. כנען in Zeph 1 11 Ezek 16 29 17 4?

If this be correct כפלשתים may be a gloss, or, if original, the Philistines might far better be cited as notorious traders than as notorious magic-mongers; Judah, such might be the thought, is becoming a second Philistia, Jerusalem, like Gaza, a busy and famous mart — for such Gaza certainly was both before and after Isaiah's day¹.

I give a translation of v. 6—8 embodying the suggestions I have made and completing the first part of v. 8 in accordance with a suggestion of DUHM's:

For Thou hast rejected thy people, the house of Jacob;
 Because his (i. e. Jacob's) land is full of merchants,
 And he concludes bargains (?) with the children of foreigners;
 And so his land has become full of silver and gold,
 And there is no end to his treasures;
 And so his land has become full of horses,
 And there is no end to his chariots;
 And so his land has become full of idols,
 (And there is no end to his images):
 To the work of his hands he bows down,
 To that which his fingers have made.

I attach widely different degrees of probability to the various suggestions which I have made in this note, and to emphasize this I briefly summarize my points:

(1) In v. 6 the text of G is prior to H; instead of מלאו ועננים (H) G, and certainly as far as ארצו the original text also, read מלא(ה) ארצו עננים.

(2) The substitution of מקדם for מקדם, or its insertion before מקדם, and all variations of such emendations are conjectures that fail to take account of the evidence of G and are on all grounds to be rejected.

(3) At the end of v. 6 ישפיקו is an error due to dittography (ותמלא follows) for ישפיק.

(4) Possibly both מקדם and כפלשתים intruded into the text before the time of G.

¹ Cp. G. A. SMITH *Historical Geography* c. 9.

(5) Probably the last line of v. 6 refers to trade, the busy pursuit of which in Judah had led to the increase of wealth (v. 7).

(6) If (5) holds good, the parallel line not improbably referred to trade also and, therefore,

(7) *Possibly* כנענים is a corruption of an original reading עננים.

II.

25 3—5.

„The City of Nations“?

The phrase קרית גוים in 25 3 is translated by DUHM and MARTI „die Stadt der Völker“, and identified with Rome. Is it certain that this phrase stood in the original text, or if the two words are original, that they were intended by the author to be taken in this sense? The point is of sufficient importance in relation to the entire question of c. 24—27 to be worth careful examination: and for this reason, though I do not see my way to a complete restoration of 25 3—5 I criticize in some of its details the reconstruction of some of those who are rightly agreed that the passage is very corrupt and has been expanded by the intrusion of glosses.

The Hebrew text of these verses together with the two that precede reads as follows, the division into lines of course being due to myself:

1 יהוה אלהי אתה
 ארוממך אודה שמך
 כי-עשית פלא עצות
 מרחוק אמונה אמן
 2 כי-שמת מעיר לגל
 קריה בצורה למפלה
 ארמון זרים מעיר
 לעולם לא יבנה
 3 על-כן יכבודך עמ-עו
 קרית גוים עריצים ייראוך
 4 כי-היית מעוז לדל
 מעוז לאביון בצר-לו
 מתסה מזרם
 צל מחרב
 † כי רוח עריצים כורם קיר כחרב בציון †
 שאון זרים תכניע † תרב בצל עב †
 זמיר עריצים יענה

I do not propose to discuss the obelized words in the closing lines; for even if DUHM, with whom MARTI and CHEYNE agree, be wrong in rejecting these clauses as glosses, I see no way of bringing them into the scheme of the poem, or giving them any intelligible meaning as part of it. I content myself here with a reference to the commentaries and discussions of these writers. Whether, or to what extent, even the 3rd and 4th lines of v. 4, rejected by KITTEL, are part of the original text will be briefly considered later.

I note without discussion certain readings (based on G or conjectural) that are already familiar and, as it appears to me, correct, though it is immaterial to the following discussion whether they be admitted or not. In v. 2^a read עיר instead of מעיר; in v. 2^b and in v. 5 read זרים for זרים. I doubt whether מעיר (G πόλις) in v. 2^c is correct: I suspect that a noun similar in sense to גל and מפלה in the previous lines or, more probably, a verb parallel to לא יבנה stood originally where מעיר now stands. If the last line of v. 5 is an original part of the poem יענה is doubtless a corruption of תענה (KITTEL).

I now come to the crucial verses — 3—5. In dealing with these it seems reasonable to expect that they will be of the same rhythmical character as the verses that precede. Now v. 1 2 consist of four distichs, each distich of two lines of three accents, and in each distich moreover the lines are parallel in sense: The second half of v. 1 might form an exception, if the Massoretic accentuation (followed by CHEYNE) which places the athnah under פלא be correct: but we may take פלא עצות together in the first line of the distich (DUHM, MARTI), or perchance אמן is a dittograph or variant of אמונה. It may further be claimed that the four distichs of v. 1 2 fall into two strophes of two distichs each.

I observe now that v. 3 and 4 (down to בצרילו) are, arranged as above, two further distichs of precisely the same character as those in v. 1 and 2, except that the second line of v. 3 appears to contain one word too much — four instead of three. This alone seems to me to afford a strong presumption in favour of the substantial correctness (at least as regards length) of the present Hebrew text; and certainly if there should prove to be independent reasons for eliminating one and not more than one of the four words in v. 3^b the case becomes stronger still, as strong indeed as it well could be. The 3rd and 4th lines of v. 4 give a distich of parallel lines; but (1) the lines contain but two accents each, and (2) they could not form the beginning of a strophe.

Omitting the obelized words at the end of v. 4 and in v. 5 we find

another distich exactly similar in character to the four distichs of v. 1 2, and also to the distich at the beginning of v. 4.

I now come to consider the view taken of v. 3 by BICKELL, DUHM, CHEYNE, MARTI, viz. that v. 3 contains a distich and half of another distich of which the last line has vanished entirely from the Hebrew text, except that, according to BICKELL and CHEYNE, the כִּי at the beginning of v. 4 may be part of it. The v. with the words conjecturally supplied is thus arranged in CHEYNE's Hebrew text¹:

על כן יכבדוך
עם עז קרית גוים
עריצים ייראוך
כי [גודעה ימינד]

DUHM gives the first three lines in the same form and postulates without supplying a fourth; and MARTI also postulates a fourth line, but rightly emphasizes the purely conjectural character of BICKELL's and CHEYNE's restoration.

But the objections to this view of the text are not confined to the fact that those who hold it are compelled to assume that a line has been lost, though nothing whatever but strophic regularity, if even that, points to such a loss. Observe (1) that not more than one of these four lines is of the length that is consistently maintained throughout the eight lines of v. 1 2; (2) the first and second lines balance badly; (3) in neither distich are the lines parallel in sense — another marked contrast to v. 1 2; (4) but on the other hand the parallel terms עם עז and קרית גוים (עריצים) which really cry out to be distributed among two parallel lines are crowded into one. These considerations taken together seem to me to cast the strongest possible doubt on the view that v. 3 contains three lines — a distich and a half — and in favour of the view that it contains a distich, amplified perhaps by a single word. But if so, the phrase „The City of Nations“ was not used by the writer, though he may, so far as we have seen at present, have spoken of „the city of awe-inspiring nations“; as a matter of fact, I think it can be shewn to be unlikely that even that phrase was his; what he wrote was *the city of the awe-inspiring*. This at least appears to have been the text as read by G².

¹ T. K. CHEYNE, *The Book of Isaiah* (1899) in P. HAUPT's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*; subsequent references to CHEYNE are to this book.

² I present my argument as above partly to make clear that the hypothetical phrase קרית גוים is exposed to grave suspicion for two independent reasons, and partly because it accords with the order in which I myself came to perceive what I regard as the true text. It was not until after I had convinced myself that v. 3 consists of a

The first line of v. 3 was read by G with two slight variations from H, which require no discussion, viz. יכבדוך without ו and עני for עו. The second line קרית גוים עריצים ייראוך is rendered και πόλεις (v. 1. πόλις) ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων εὐλογήσουσίν σε. At first sight this may seem to indicate that G had the same text as H, that πόλ(ε)ις = קרית, ἀνθρώπων = גוים and ἀδικουμένων = עריצים. On further examination this is seen to be most improbable. ἄνθρωπος occurs nearly ninety times in Isaiah, but never as the equivalent of גוי; it occurs many hundred of times in the rest of the Old Testament, but never, if I may trust my consultation of HATCH and REDPATH, as the equivalent of גוי. Twice in Isaiah and twice elsewhere, it is true, ἄνθρωπος renders the synonymous עם; in Is 36 11 ἄνθρωπος plural = עם sing., and in 44 11 ἄνθρωπος sing. = עם sing., in the corrupt phrase משומי עם עולם where, if עם had any meaning at all, it would be synonymous with אדם. Similarly in Job 12 2 עם sing. readily, even if incorrectly, taken to mean אדם is rendered by ἄνθρωπος plural. A similar interpretation of עם probably accounts for the rendering in Eccl 12 9. The conclusion that ἀνθρώπων in Is 25 3 did not render גוים is surely justified.

Nor if we examine the methods of the translator of Isaiah need we doubt the real explanation of ἀνθρώπων in 25 3. On several occasions in Isaiah a Hebrew adjective or participle is rendered in G by an adjective or participle *with the addition* of ἄνθρωπος; thus, in addition to two or three instances in v. 4 5 (see below), we find ידע in 29 11 rendered ἀνθρώπων ἐπισταμένω (cp. 29 12 ἀνθρώπου μὴ ἐπισταμένου = אשר לא ידע); אדנים קשה in 19 4 ἀνθρώπων κυρίων σκληρών; מרעים in 31 2 ἀνθρώπων πονηρών and in 8 2 ἀνθρώπων is not a rendering of עדים (HATCH and REDPATH), but πιστοὺς ἀνθρώπους is the equivalent of נאמנים.

The second line of v. 3 then, read in G's text thus:

קרית עריצים ייראוך

and since this line is of the same length as the other nine lines of v. 1—3 and makes with the first half of v. 3 a distich exactly similar in character to the distichs of v. 1 2, and since קרית עריצים is a better parallel to עם עו than קרית גוים עריצים, G's text is more probably correct than H.

CONDAMIN¹ therefore is right in resisting the tendency to follow

distich only and not a distich and a half, that I realized what was the real text of G. At first I was inclined to think the superfluous word in v. 3b was קרית or עריצים both of which occur in the neighbourhood.

¹ A. CONDAMIN, *Le Livre d'Isaïe*, Paris 1905.

BICKELL, and in treating v. 3 as a distich; right too in refusing to accept גוים קרית גוים as a genuine phrase, but wrong when he says that G joins גוים עריצים to גוים. BOX¹ again is right in perceiving that the first line of v. 3 extends down to יכבדוך, right too in demanding that a verb parallel to יכבדוך is required in the next line; but he is wrong in representing that verb as lost, in treating v. 3 as two lines and a half and consequently in his proposal to transpose v. 5^a and place it at the end of v. 3.

The first three strophes of the poem are now clear; they consist respectively of (a) v. 1, (b) v. 2, and (c) v. 3, together with v. 4 to בצרילו. In the third, as in the first strophe, the second distich introduced by כי gives the reason for what is affirmed in the first.

The fourth strophe of the poem is far more difficult to find and has perhaps been mutilated beyond recovery. DUHM, CHEYNE and MARTI are again in agreement: in CHEYNE's text the strophe reads:

היית מעוז לדל
מעוז לאביון בצרילו
מחסה מורם צל מחרב
וגאון זדים תכניע

BOX agrees as to the first three lines but constructs a fourth line out of the end of v. 4 and the beginning of v. 5 — clauses rejected by others as glosses — as follows:

מורם קר מחרב בציון

The first distich in both of these reconstructions really belongs to the preceding strophe, unless the second distich of that strophe has been lost. The alternative is of course possible; but this reconstructed fourth strophe would even then remain improbable, for the 3rd line is suspiciously long, it contains two parallel phrases which would rather have belonged to separate and parallel lines, and it is badly balanced in CHEYNE's reconstruction by the 4th line: moreover on this theory the final line of v. 5 in H has to be rejected as a gloss — for which certainly some reasons, though they are probably delusive, can be found. BOX's fourth line gives better parallelism and balance but in lines of the wrong length, and his reconstruction could only be admitted if the transposition of v. 5^a to follow v. 3 were justified — and it has already been shewn that it is not.

It is claimed by those who reject the last words of v. 5 עריצים ומיר עריצים as a gloss on שאון זדים תכניע that they are absent from G. But

¹ G. H. Box, *The Book of Isaiah*, London 1908.

this conclusion, or at least any further inference, must not be too hastily drawn. The actual facts are these; corresponding to שאון זדים תכניע חרב שאון זדים תכניע חרב all that G has is ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας; now ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν is the equivalent of מוֹדִים, but who is to say to which of the remaining words οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας corresponds? Possibly these words were suggested by תכניע, or some corruption of that word, but that is by no means certain. It is possible as LIEBMANN in a full discussion of this passage has already suggested in this *Zeitschrift* (1903, p. 263), that G's text was mutilated at this point and that the translator rounded off his sentence with a summary paraphrase. If so it would be hazardous to conclude from G that the words שאון זדים תכניע חרב are a gloss inserted in H after the date of G. But if we confine our attention to H then it is still less clear that the words are a gloss: for (1) זדים at least is a curious word with which to gloss שאון; and (2) it would be odd that the gloss should be rhythmically equal to the other lines of the poem and with שאון זדים תכניע חרב should form a distich exactly similar in quantity and parallelism to the other distichs of the poem.

I add a few notes on the relation of H to G in those parts of v. 4 and 5 not already discussed: H reads מחסה מזרם צל מתרב כי רוח עריצים כורם קיר כחרב בציון and G σκέπη ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν ῥύση αὐτοῦς· σκέπη διψώντων καὶ πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι διψῶντες ἐν Σειῶν. After מחסה read by G מוֹדִים and rendered ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν, G's Hebrew text probably continued תצלם צל חרבם and it appears to me not impossible (1) that מחסה is a correct but misplaced variant of the second מעון in the previous distich, and (2) that מוֹדִים תצלם is a fragment of the original fourth strophe: though this must remain a mere possibility unless and until the text at this point receives a fuller and clearer explanation than I am able to offer. The next word (חרבם) is = διψώντων as in v. 5, the כ of the Hebrew כי was read as מ and attached to חרב; the י of כי was read as ו = καί. The rendering of רוח עריצים is obvious and is another instance of the translator's otiose ἄνθρωπος; but then I suggest that כורם קיר was not read by G, but that ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι διψῶντες ἐν Σειῶν renders כחרב בציון, ἄνθρωποι being again otiose and ὀλιγόψυχοι and διψῶντες being a doublet, the former adjective explaining that διψῶντες is to be understood metaphorically.

BICKELL's reconstruction of this passage appears to me to have set subsequent critics on a wrong track; my chief purpose in this note,

beyond questioning the reality of the phrase „Die Stadt der Völker“ and illustrating a method of the Greek translator, has been to secure a return to the right starting point in the hope that others setting out from that point may find their way to a more complete solution of the difficulties of the last part of v. 4 and of v. 5 than has yet been obtained.

III.

Isaiah 34 12—14.

Was the Edomite Monarchy elective?

I do not propose to answer or even to discuss in detail the question at the head of this note; but my discussion may well serve to enforce the doubts that have been expressed by some, though they do not appear to have been even felt as yet by others, as to the evidential value of this passage with regard to the elective character of the Edomite monarchy. It is not fit even to turn the scales if they should seem to be evenly balanced by the consideration on the one hand that no successive kings in the list given in Gen 36 31f. came from the same place and on the other hand that there was a „seed royal“ of Edom (I Reg II 14).

The Hebrew text of Is 34 12—14^a reads as follows:

12 חריה ואין שם מלוכה יקראו
 וכל שריה יהיו אפס
 13 וועלתה ארמנותיה סירים
 קמוש וחוח במבצריה
 והיתה נוה תנים
 חציר לבנות יענה
 14 ופגשו ציים את איים
 ושעיר על רעהו יקרא

I concern myself in this note primarily with the first and second of the foregoing lines. I have cited the remainder partly to exhibit the prevailing lengths of the lines here and so to shew the rhythmical dissimilarity of the first, and partly that the last line with its reference to the שעיר may be before the reader.

Not only is the first line rhythmically abnormal: but the construction is intolerable. I start from the assumption that the line is corrupt, for this is generally admitted, and turn at once to my purpose of criticising some current emendations and the erroneous reconstruction of the Hebrew text of G which is used to support them.

It is curious that those even who admit the corruptness of the v.

retain the really very questionable line *ואין שם מלוכה יקראו*; and merely dispute whether this strange sentence means (1) *there is no one there whom they might call to the kingdom*, i. e. to be king, or (2) *None shall exist there who can proclaim a kingdom* (BOX), or (3) *There will be no royalty there to proclaim* — namely by means of heralds (CHEYNE).

Of these (1) would, as DILLMANN points out, require *למלכה* or *למלך*, (2) fails to account for the emphatic position of *מלוכה*, not to speak of other objections, and to both (2) and (3) it is an objection that it would be curious in such a connection to single out for mention an occurrence that was never frequent. DUHM feels this objection and so far himself casts suspicion even on the rendering which seems to him least objectionable — *und kein Königtum gibt's dort, das sie ausrufen*. No king or no one fit to be king — that is a feature which might well appear in a picture of disaster and desolation; but no proclamation day — that is far less natural.

The emendations of Isaiah 34 12 which find favour are due to BICKELL, though subsequent writers have somewhat modified the form in which BICKELL proposed them. It is common to all emendations of this type that they rest on the assumption that v. 12 originally contained two distichs, that *חריה* is the sole remnant in H of the first of these, but that G preserves the rest of the lost distich.

I give the hypothetical double distich in the form in which CHEYNE, agreeing with DUHM, presents it:

ושעירים ישבו בה
יהיו כאין חריה
ואין שם מלוכה יקראו
וכל שריה יהיו אפס

and which he renders

Satyrs will dwell therein,
And its nobles will disappear;
There will be no royalty there to proclaim
And all Edom's princes will be no more.

In his note CHEYNE claims without hesitation that the first two lines are the text of G; KITTEL in his *Biblia Hebraica* offers with equal assurance as the text of G two lines similar in sense but different in form, viz.

ושעירים ישבו בה
ולא יהיו חריה

I propose to shew that G read neither what CHEYNE, nor what KITTEL offers. But even if it did we could not readily admit that this was the original text; it is quite improbable that Satyrs would be mentioned here when they are mentioned again just below in v. 14 and *there with a suitable parallel*. DUHM it is true asserts „daß die Satyre später noch einmal vorkommen, fällt bei unserm Vf. gar nicht ins Gewicht“. But this simply evades without invalidating the objection. Again the first distich, as restored, certainly is a case of the cart before the horse: first the disappearance of the nobles, and then, in the desolate spot, the satyrs would be the natural order. Yet this particular objection cannot be very strongly urged: since the writer in any case mentions animals frequenting desolate spots in v. 11 before he mentions the disappearance of the nobles, he might within the same distich mention the two facts in the unnatural order. But further if חריה means *nobles* its most probable place is in the line parallel to שריה: an emendation which divorces two such obviously parallel terms and produces such unsatisfactory parallels instead cannot be considered happy.

Some, not all, of the objections raised in the last paragraph are avoided by BICKELL who proposes as the original form of the first line בה ושעיר מישבי *and Seir shall be without inhabitants*, and by CONDAMIN who takes חריה in the sense of *holes* and conjectures that two words have been lost; this would give a distich somewhat as follows:

The satyrs shall there have their dwelling,
And the . . . their holes.

But these variations have their own difficulties and rest on the assumption that the *plus* of G represents the original text.

As against אפם שריה וכל שריה יהיו אפם of H, G has καὶ ὀνοκένταυροι οἰκήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς οὐκ ἔσονται· οἱ γὰρ βασιλεῖς (αὐτῆς) καὶ οἱ μεγιστᾶνες αὐτῆς ἔσονται εἰς ἀπώλειαν. It will be seen at once that G shews both a *plus* and a *minus*; the emendations already noticed are obtained by adding to H the *plus* of G and entirely disregarding the *minus* of G — in itself a questionable proceeding.

But further, the foregoing emendations assume that οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς οὐκ ἔσονται rendered either חריה כאין יהיו or יהיו לא חריה; it rendered neither, but, as should be obvious once G and H are closely compared, it rendered either אין חריה or חריה אינם; cp. οὐκ ἔσται = איננו Job 8 22 with the latter alternative, and with the former אין = οὐκ ἔστιν

in Is 59 11 and = οὐκ ἔσται in 41 17. Seeing that οἱ ἄρχοντες = חריה is followed by οὐκ ἔσονται which according to the methods of the Greek translators might = אין and this in the form ואין follows immediately in H, it is most unreasonable to assume that G left ואין following חריה untranslated, but reading יהיו כאין or יהיו לא before חריה, which clauses must in that case have disappeared from H without leaving a trace, represented those words by οὐκ ἔσονται after οἱ ἄρχοντες = חריה. Such a combination of improbabilities rarely obtains the truth.

Assuming that γάρ as not infrequently in the Greek version of Isaiah is merely a translator's stylistic addition (cp. e. g. 1 27, 2 12 20) we may restore the Hebrew text that lay before G as follows: (or ושעירים ישבו (ישכנו) ופסם מלכ(י)ה ושריה יהיו אפס (or אינם) אין ביה חריה אין. In the last line the only variation is that G omits the כל before שריה: in this it may be true to the original text. For the further consideration of the earlier part of the v. I place the two texts in parallel lines:

ושעירים ישבו בה חריה אין (מ) מלכ(י)ה	G
חריה ואין שם מלוכה יקראו	H

Once the Hebrew text of G is correctly restored, the simple plan of adding the *plus* of G to H, while neglecting its *minus*, becomes not only questionable but impossible.

I do not see my way to a satisfactory reconstruction, but I suspect that Is 34 12, instead of being a fragment of two distichs is a single distich of which the first line has been corrupted. Certainly this would disturb the strophic division that DUHM carries right through the chapter, but as I believe, and hope elsewhere to prove, that c. 34 is not a single poem this has no weight with me.

I think it probable that the *plus* of both G and H is due to the intrusion into the text of marginal notes. The opening words of G ושעירים ישבו בה is most easily explained as such a note. The plus of H is more difficult; I suggest as a bare possibility that a corrupt form of a variant of the same note found its way into the text at a date later than that of the Greek version. On the margin of the text stood first שעירים ישבו בה and this was incorporated with the text in G: later this marginal note was corrected out of regard to Is 13 21 into שעירים וירקרו; subsequently שעירים mutilated into שם found its way into one, and וירקרו in the form יקראו into another place in H. But this is speculative and other equally probable explanations might be offered. My object has been to criticize a rather widely accepted emendation rather than to propose another; the sense of the verse is sufficiently clear from the last

line; and a distich such as the following will probably approximate to both the form and the contents of the original of the whole verse —

Her nobles are no more

And her princes shall cease to be.

In any case the word יקרוא is unrepresented in, and in all probability was not read by, G. Consequently the theory that Is 34 12 refers to the elective character of the Edomite monarchy rests on an improbable interpretation of a badly attested reading.

[Abgeschlossen den 12. November 1910.]