

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

# JOURNAL

OF

## BIBLICAL LITERATURE

Volume XXVI

Part I

1907

### The Book of Nahum \*

PAUL HAUPT, LL.D.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

IN my address on Purim, which I delivered at our meeting last year,<sup>1</sup> I showed that the incidents related in the Book of Esther were suggested by the sufferings of the Jews during the Syrian persecution and their glorious victory over Nicanor on the 13<sup>th</sup> of Adar, 161 B.C. I have recently come to the conclusion that the Book of Nahum is a liturgical compilation for the celebration of that victory. *He that dashes in pieces is come up before thy face*, at the beginning of the second chapter of Nahum, refers to Judas Maccabæus; the Authorized Version gives the correct rendering *hammer*<sup>2</sup> in the margin. *The wicked counselor that imagineth evil against the Lord* (1 11) is Nicanor, and instead of the clause translated in the Authorized Version: *that no more of thy name be sown* (1 14) we must read: *thy remains shall be scattered*. Judas Maccabæus gibbeted the head and the right arm of Nicanor, and the tongue of this *thrice-guilty wretch* was cut up and given to the birds (2 Macc. 15 33).

The Book of Nahum is not a prophecy, but a liturgical collection of four poems. The first two poems are Maccabean, but the last two were written by a Hebrew poet who

\* President's address at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, New York, Dec. 27, 1906.

saw the fall of Nineveh in 606 B.C. The tradition that Nahum the Elkoshite was born and buried at *Elkôsh*, a large Christian village about 27 miles north of Môsul, cannot be traced beyond the sixteenth century. The fact that the tomb of Nahum is shown at Elkôsh, and that it is held in great reverence by Mohammedans and Christians, and especially by the Jews, is no more conclusive than the tradition that the prophet Jonah is buried in Nineveh on the top of the mound known as *Nabî Yânus*, south of the Acropolis of Nineveh, now called *Kouyunjik*, which contains the palaces of Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Sardanapalus with the famous cuneiform library which was discovered by Hormuzd Rassam in 1854.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, Nahum may have been in Assyria at the time of the fall of Nineveh. Wellhausen's statement that Nahum must have been a Judean is untenable; the references to Judah occur in the Maccabean sections. The line: O Judah! keep thy feasts! perform thy vows! at the beginning of the second chapter, emphasizes the fact that the Syrians, after the glorious victories of Judas Maccabæus, are no longer able to interfere with the observance of the Jewish rites. In the Maccabean sections *Nineveh*, the capital of Assyria, is a poetic designation of the *Seleucidan Kingdom*, just as Maccabean poets call Judea *Jacob* or *Joseph*,<sup>4</sup> or as Latin poets call the Romans *Dardanians* or *Teucrians*. Syria is nothing but a shortened form of *Assyria*, and Assyrian is merely an older local variety of Syriac. What we call Syriac is the dialect of Edessa in Northwestern Mesopotamia; see Crit. Notes on Judges (SBOT) p. 66, n. \*.

In several passages of the Old Testament the Seleucidan Kingdom is called *Assyria*. In Psalm 137s it is called a *Daughter of Babylon*,<sup>5</sup> and instead of Sons of Edom (v. 7) we must read *Sons of Aram*, i.e. *Syrians*, just as we must substitute *Bath-Ardm*, i.e. *Sons of Aram*, Syrians, for *Bath-Edôm*,<sup>6</sup> Edomites, at the end of the fourth poem in the Maccabean elegies commonly known as the Lamentations of Jeremiah.<sup>5</sup> The enemies addressed in Lam. 4:21 are said to dwell in the land of *Us*, the home of Job. Friedrich Delitzsch showed more than twenty years ago that *Us* was mentioned

in the Monolith Inscription of Shalmaneser (860–825) as a region near *Patín*, i.e. the district north of the Lake of Antioch. *Uz* must be the region of Antioch, the new capital of the Seleucids, which was founded about 300 B.C.<sup>5</sup> The pitiful condition of Jerusalem bewailed in the Book of Lamentations was the result of the destruction of the holy city by Antiochus Epiphanes' commissioner Apollonius in 168 B.C. (1 Macc. 1 31).

Josephus, who gives a paraphrase of Nah. 2 8-13 in his *Jewish Antiquities* (ix 11 3) believed that Nahum prophesied 115 years before the destruction of Nineveh; but Nahum's poem on the fall of Nineveh is the description of a contemporary, if not an eye-witness. The second part of the title of the Book of Nahum, *The Vision of Nahum the Elkoshite*, belongs to the fourth poem describing the fall of Nineveh, while the first part, *The Utterance on Nineveh*, should be prefixed to the third poem predicting the fall of Nineveh. The *Vision of Nahum* was composed after the fall of Nineveh in 606, and the *Utterance on Nineveh* was written after the invaders had begun the long siege of the great capital of Assyria—the strongest fortress of Western Asia.

The siege of Nineveh is said to have lasted for more than two years. The Assyrians were no doubt as brave as lions, and the statement in Nah. 3 13, generally translated *Thy people in the midst of thee are women*, is incorrect: instead of *našim*, women, we must read *naššim*, we will destroy (or *šaššimu*, they will destroy) from *šamám*, to destroy, as in the old song celebrating a victory over Moab, Num. 21 30, where the LXX renders: *ai yuvaikes*.

Diodorus of Sicily (2 23) states that Sardanapalus, the last king of Assyria, lived like a woman, and finally burned himself with his harem and his treasures on a huge pyre. But we know now that Sardanapalus (or *Aššur-bāni-pal*) was a warlike king who showed his valor in many a battle and in hunting fierce lions and other wild beasts. He died in 625, nearly twenty years before the fall of Nineveh. I pointed out more than twenty years ago (ZK 2 282) that this legend was due to a confusion of Aššur-bāni-pal with his rebellious

brother Šamaš-šum-ukin who perished in the flames of burning Babylon.

We know now from the stele of the last king of Babylon (555-538) Nabonidus, which Father Scheil discovered in 1895, during his excavations at Babylon, that Nebuchadnezzar's father, Nabopolassar (625-604) took no part in the destruction of Nineveh. He was allied with the *ummán-manda*, i. e. the northeastern barbarians, and helped to destroy the Assyrian empire; but the fall of Nineveh was due to the *ummán-manda*. This tallies with Herodotus' statement that the Medes captured Nineveh and subdued Assyria except the Babylonian portion. Nabonidus regards the destruction of Nineveh as a divine retribution for Sennacherib's devastation of Babylon (KAT<sup>8</sup>, 105).

According to Diodorus there was an old oracle stating that no one would be able to capture Nineveh, unless the river should turn against the city. After the Medes had besieged Nineveh for two years, there were incessant rains, so that finally the Euphrates flooded a part of the city and tore down twenty stadia of the city wall. Now we know, of course, that Nineveh was not situated on the Euphrates, but on the eastern side of the Tigris, although there are a good many college graduates who do not know whether Nineveh was situated on the Euphrates or on the Tigris, and whether the Tigris is east or west of the Euphrates. However, even the Tigris could not have submerged Nineveh, because the bed of the Tigris is too low. The Tigris may have flooded Calah, but not Nineveh.

Nineveh was situated in a plain enclosed by four rivers,<sup>7</sup> viz. Tigris, Upper Zâb, Khâzir, and Gômel. This plain of Nineveh resembles in some respects Manhattan Island. The North River would correspond to the Tigris, the East River to the Khâzir, Harlem River to the Gômel, and the Bay of New York, between the North and the East Rivers, to the Zâb. If we assume that Central Park represents *Nineveh*, Harlem would represent *Rehoboth Ir*, Trinity Church *Calah*, and Twenty-third Street *Resen*. Hoboken would correspond to the modern *Môsul* on the western side of the Tigris.

The length of Central Park is about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  miles, and Nineveh extended about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  miles on the river side of the Tigris. The eastern wall was nearly 3 miles long, the northern measured  $1\frac{1}{4}$ , and the southern about a thousand feet. The area of Central Park is about 840 acres, while Nineveh was more than twice as large, about 1800 acres. It had a circumference of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  miles and may have contained a population of 300,000.

According to Baedeker, it takes but four or five hours to go around the city; not three days, as stated in the Book of Jonah.<sup>8</sup> Jonah might have traversed the whole plain of Nineveh, from Rehoboth Ir to Calah, in one day. The plain of Nineveh was about 25 miles long and 14 miles wide, while the length of Manhattan is 14 miles, and its greatest width  $2\frac{1}{4}$ . *Nineveh*, *Calah*, *Rehoboth Ir*, and *Resen* never formed one city. There are no traces of a common wall for this tetropolis. *Rehoboth Ir* seems to be identical with *Dâr-Šarrukên* which Sargon, the father of Sennacherib, built about the end of his reign (722-705). Colonel Billerbeck's theory<sup>9</sup> that *Rehoboth Ir* is represented by the modern *Môsul* is not probable. *Dâr-Šarrukên*, the modern *Khorsabâd*, is about five hours north of Nineveh, and *Calah*, the present *Nimrâd*, south of Nineveh, may be reached in seven hours: *Khorsabâd* stands for *Khosrabâd*, i.e. *City of Khusrau* or *Chosroes*; see Max, Freiherr von Oppenheim, *Vom Mittelmeer zum Per-sischen Golf*, vol. ii (Berlin, 1900) p. 180; cf. Haupt, *Biblische Liebeslieder* (Leipzig, 1907) *Addenda* to p. 48, n. 18.

*Dâr-Šarrukên* in the north was close to the sources of the *Hâsur*. It covered the road to Nineveh and protected the water-supply of the capital. Nahum says in 3 14: *Draw thee waters for a siege!* This does not refer to boiling water to be poured down on the besiegers, as Col. Billerbeck supposes;<sup>9</sup> nor does it mean: *Fill the moats* protecting the city!<sup>10</sup> We must remember that the water of the Tigris is not drinkable; even the water of the wells within the city and outside is brackish and full of gypsum. The water of the *Hâsur*, on the other hand, is excellent. Sennacherib (705-681) states in the inscription on the rocks of Bavian

(a Kurdish village northeast of Khorsabâd) that before he built the *pâti Šin-ahê-êrba*,<sup>11</sup> the Sennacherib conduit (which may be compared to the *Croton aqueduct*) the people of Nineveh depended on the rain water: *ana sunnê tiq îamê turruçâ inâšun*.

The Hûsur, now called *Khûsar*, flows in a southward direction from Khorsabâd to the middle of the eastern wall of Nineveh; <sup>7</sup> thence it passed westward through the centre of Nineveh, emptying into the Tigris on the south side of the Acropolis now known as *Kouyunjik*.<sup>7</sup> Most of the buildings disinterred at *Kouyunjik* have suffered from fire; several of the cuneiform tablets from the library of Sardanapalus are half burnt and blistered, *e.g.* some of the fragments of the cuneiform account of the Deluge, especially the greenish-yellow fragment R<sup>M</sup> 616, published on p. 120 of my edition of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic. Nahum says in 3 15: *tôkh-lekh êsh*, fire will devour thee !

The besiegers, it may be supposed, came from the north. They defeated the Assyrians in a pitched battle; then they captured *Dâr-Šarrukên* and the other fortified places north and east of Nineveh. There is no evidence of any destruction at Khorsabâd; the strongholds may have fallen, as Nahum says, *like figs* which fall into the mouth of the eater when they are shaken; so *the gates of the land were open unto the enemies*. The besiegers were, of course, unable to invest the entire city; the western side of the Tigris could hardly be blockaded, and the fortified city of Calah prevented any operations from the south. The besiegers seem to have directed their main attack against the northwestern corner of Nineveh. This is the highest point in the area of Nineveh, commanding the waterworks from which most of the moats were fed. The northern sections of the moats were supplied with water by a canal which entered the city from the north, while the moats south of the Hûsur were filled from this river. The moat between the wall and the eastern outworks was nearly 150 feet wide. It was cut in the shell-limestone rock,<sup>12</sup> with vertical sides. Even now the depth is about 13 feet. There is a great breach at the northern

end of the eastern wall, and more than 2000 feet of the moat are filled with rubbish.

After having captured *Dār-Šarrukēn* and the other fortified places north and east, the besiegers could cut off the water supply of Nineveh. At the point in the eastern *enceinte* where the *Hûsur* enters the city there are three great dams. If these flood-gates were destroyed by the enemy, the *Hûsur*, swelled by the melting snow in the spring, and not diverted into the moats and ditches, may have flooded the city, so that Nineveh, as Nahum says, was *like a pool of water*. The *Hûsur* with its unchecked spring-floods may have undermined the southern portion of the Acropolis, the mound of *Kouyunjik*, so that, as Nahum says, *the palace was tottering*. This catastrophe was not unprecedented: Sennacherib states that the stream had once damaged the southern side of the Acropolis, where he afterwards erected his palace, so that the coffins of the kings who had been buried there were exposed.

I must omit a number of comments on the fortifications of Nineveh and the final capture.<sup>9</sup> I will give, in conclusion, a new metrical translation of the four poems contained in the Book of Nahum.<sup>13</sup>

The first poem is an alphabetical psalm which originally consisted of 11 couplets or 22 *mēshalīm*, i. e. *hemistichal pairs*, with three beats in each hemistich. The last seven *mēshalīm* were not quoted by the compiler of this festal liturgy for the celebration of the great victory of Judas Maccabæus over Nicanor in 161, probably because they did not suit his purpose. The first part of the psalm describes the irresistible power of JHVH who is kind to those who believe on Him, but who wreaks vengeance on His foes. JHVH manifests Himself in thunder-storms. He whirls up thunder-clouds, just as the march of an army is marked by clouds of dust. The Cherubim personify the thunder-clouds, and the Seraphim the flashes of lightning.<sup>14</sup>

It is interesting to note in this connection that Xenophon states, the besiegers could not capture Nineveh, but Zeus terrified the inhabitants by a thunder-storm, and thus

the city was taken. Xenophon's account is very inaccurate. He does not mention the name of Nineveh, only *Larissa* and *Mespila*.<sup>15</sup> Moreover, he says that the city was inhabited by the Medes and besieged by the Persians; but he refers to the Queen of the besieged king, just as Nahum does, and alludes to some cataclysm which brought about the fall of Nineveh. Xenophon (*Anabasis*, iii 47) speaks of a great city in ruins, situated on the Tigris, formerly inhabited by the Medes. The King of the Persians could not capture it; but there appeared a cloud which veiled the sun and frightened the inhabitants so that they left the city. A day's journey from *Larissa* there was a large castle (*τείχος* = Assyr. *dāru*) in ruins, near a city called *Mespila*.<sup>15</sup> The Queen of the King of the Medes fled there when the Medes were subdued by the Persians. The King of the Persians besieged the city for a long time, but could not capture it. Finally Zeus frightened the inhabitants by a thunder-storm, and thus the city was captured.

The introductory alphabetic psalm in the Book of Nahum may be translated as follows:

### THE BOOK OF NAHUM

#### I

- |     |     |                |  |
|-----|-----|----------------|--|
| i   | ⌘ 1 | 2 <sup>a</sup> | A jealous God is JHVH,<br>a revenger, <sup>8</sup> and full of wrath;                          |
|     | 3   | 3 <sup>b</sup> | Through whirlwind and storm is His path, <sup>14</sup><br>the clouds are the dust of His feet. |
| ii  | 3   | 4              | He scolds at the sea — it is arid,<br>and all the rivers He empties;                           |
|     | 7   |                | (Even) Basan and Carmel languish,<br>the blossoms of Lebanon wither.                           |
| iii | 7   | 5              | The mountains quake before Him,<br>the hills (at once start to) totter;                        |
|     | 7   |                | The earth before Him crashes, <sup>16</sup><br>the world and all therein dwelling.             |

- iv י 6 Who can endure His fury,  
withstand the heat of His anger?  
פ His wrath fuses (all things) like fire,  
the rocks are even set blazing.
- v ד 7 Kind is He to those who trust Him,  
a bulwark in days of trouble;  
Of those turning to Him He is heedful,  
8 He saves them in floods overwhelming.
- vi כ He exterminates all who oppose Him,  
His foes He thrusts into darkness;  
כ 9<sup>b</sup> Not twice upon foes wreaks He vengeance,  
His work is not done by halves!<sup>17</sup>
- vii ד 9<sup>a</sup> What do ye devise against JHVH?  
3<sup>a</sup> γ He<sup>δ</sup> never condones an offense!  
ז 2<sup>b</sup> On His foes He ever wreaks vengeance,  
to enemies He ever bears hatred.
- viii ד 10 Soaked\* though they be as toss-pots,<sup>ε</sup>  
like stubble the fire shall consume them!<sup>18</sup>  
ו \* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \* \*
- ix ד \* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \* \*  
כ \* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \* \*
- x ט \* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \* \*  
י \* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \* \*
- xi ט \* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \* \*  
ח \* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

---

(α) 1 2 that is, a revenger (β) is JHVH  
 (γ) 3<sup>a</sup> Long-suffering but powerful is JHVH, and (δ) 3<sup>a</sup> JHVH  
 (ε) 10 if they soak (ζ) tangled (thorns)<sup>18</sup>

The second poem, which describes *the overthrow of the Seleucidan Kingdom*, consists of three six-line stanzas with 8 + 2 beats in each hemistichal pair. The *city* addressed is *Antioch*, the capital of the Seleucidan Kingdom. The *bewitching seductress* is *Hellenic culture*.

## II

- i 3 1 O woe to the city of blood,<sup>19</sup>  
of lies and outrage! <sup>a</sup>  
4 Because of the many seductions  
of the <sup>b</sup> charming seductress <sup>v</sup>  
5 Behold! I fall upon thee,<sup>19</sup>  
says JHVH Sabaoth:  
I uncover thy skirts to affront thee,  
exposing <sup>c</sup> thy shame; <sup>e</sup>  
6 Disgrace I'll cast upon thee,<sup>c</sup>  
I'll make thee a show! <sup>v</sup>  
7 They'll cry: Laid waste is Nineveh,<sup>19</sup>  
but who bemoans her? <sup>e</sup>
- ii 1 11 From thee,<sup>19</sup> behold, there came  
{a plotter of mischief,} <sup>20</sup>  
Devising harm against JHVH {}  
14 who <sup>d</sup> decreed against him: <sup>20</sup>  
[<sup>a</sup>Thy burial will I make vile,]  
thy remains shall <sup>a</sup> be scattered! <sup>a</sup>  
In the temples of thy gods I'll ruin  
idols carved and molten. [ ]  
2 1 A Hammer <sup>21</sup> came up against thee,  
now guard the fastness! <sup>22</sup>  
Watch the way, make strong thy loins,  
fortify thee well!
- iii 1 12 <sup>v</sup>How high the tide was soever,<sup>23</sup>  
<sup>e</sup> it has ebbd and subsided. <sup>e</sup>  
15 Behold there strides o'er the mountains <sup>v</sup>  
the herald of peace! <sup>e</sup>  
O Judah! keep thy feasts!  
perform thy vows!  
<sup>e</sup> He'll nevermore pass <sup>v</sup> through thee,  
cut off and ended. <sup>23</sup>

- 2 2 The glory of Jacob v reblossomed,<sup>24</sup>†  
 Israel's vine,<sup>25</sup>  
 However much wasted the wasters  
 destroying their branches.

- 
- (α) 3 1 preying does not cease (β) 4 graceful  
 (γ) 4 With seductions cheating the nations and clans with her charms.  
 (δ) 5 to the nations (ε) that is, thy disgrace to the kingdoms  
 (ζ) 6 that is, I vilify thee  
 (η) 7 All who see thee will flee from thee  
 (θ) Whence shall I for thee seek the mourners?  
 (ι) 1 14 JHVH (κ) yea (λ) not 2 5 be mentioned (μ) 1 14 again  
 (ν) 12 Thus says JHVH : and so (ξ) and so  
 (ο) I humbled thee, but ne'er again !  
 13 His sceptre<sup>xx</sup> now will I break, his bonds I'll burst !  
 (π) 15 he who brings good tidings  
 (ρ) 2 14 and no more will be heard the voice of thy envoys  
 (σ) 1 15 Mischief (τ) again  
 (υ) 2 2 through JHVH (φ) 3 on the day He restored it
- 

(xx) 1 18 over thee

The third poem, entitled *The Utterance on Nineveh*, and composed of two seven-line stanzas with 2 + 2 beats in each hemistichal pair, was written by Nahum, an Israelitish poet in Assyria, after the Medes had begun their long siege of Nineveh, about 607 B.C. The hundred-gated Thebes (*No-Amon*) in Egypt fell in 663, although her position on the eastern bank of the Nile was just as strong as the great fortress on the eastern side of the Tigris, and although Thebes was aided by Egypt, Ethiopia, Libya, &c. Assyria has no allies. The doom of Nineveh is sealed, even if she plies the brickmold to strengthen her bulwarks. Her water-supply is cut off; she must drink the cup of fury.

## III

- 1 1<sup>a</sup> The Utterance on Nineveh  
 i 3 8 Art thou better than No<sup>a</sup>  
 on the banks of the Nile,<sup>b</sup>  
 v Whose rampart the River,  
 whose wall the water ?

- 9 With Cush to abet her,<sup>s</sup>  
 'and Libya ' to aid ?
- 10 Even she had to go  
 into exile and bondage;  
 ' Her babes were shattered  
 at the corners of ' streets;  
 And for her nobles  
 lots were cast;  
 And all her great ones  
 were shackled in chains.
- ii 11 Thou also shalt drink  
 until overcome! '   
 14 The water for a siege  
 draw for thyself!  
 {{Go into the mud,<sup>m</sup> \*  
 and handle the brickmold!}}<sup>^</sup>
- 15<sup>b</sup> Though as thick as locusts,<sup>u</sup>  
 as many as ' grasshoppers: <sup>f</sup>
- 15<sup>a</sup> Fire will devour thee, [°]  
 the sword destroy! [ ]
- 12 ' Thy forts will be figtrees,  
 {° thy people} firstripe figs, °
- 13<sup>b</sup> Thy bars burnt with fire, °
- 13<sup>a</sup> {{they'll make havoc within thee!

The following four hemistichal pairs are a Maccabean appendix alluding to the overwhelming defeat of the Syrians on Nicanor's Day in 161 B.C. The entire Syrian army was annihilated. The leaders and heroes of the King of Assyria, i.e. Syria, sleep the sleep of death. The Maccabean poet says:

- 18 *Thy leaders slumber, °*  
*thy worthies sleep,*  
*Thy men are scattered, †*  
*and no one rallies them.*
- 19 *Thy wreck is hopeless,*  
*thy wound is fatal.*  
 x *Who hears thy fate,*  
*claps hands with joy! †*

- (a) 8 Amon (β) water around her (γ) she  
 (δ) 9 and Egypt, and there is no end (e) Put  
 (f) was there (η) 10 even (θ) all  
 (i) 11 Thou too, shalt seek shelter from foes!  
 (κ) 14 Tread the clay! <sup>26</sup> (λ) strengthen thy bulwarks!  
 (μ) 16<sup>b</sup> the locusts shed <sup>27</sup> and fly  
 (ν) 17<sup>b</sup> They alight in hedges when cool grows the day;  
 When arises the sun, <sup>28</sup> their place <sup>29</sup> is not known.  
 (ξ) 16<sup>a</sup> Thy traders outnumber the stars in the sky;  
 17<sup>a</sup> Like grasshoppers thy like crickets <sup>27</sup> thy scribes.  
 [charmers, <sup>28</sup>  
 (o) 15<sup>a</sup> Like locusts will it devour thee!  
 (π) 12 all (ρ) 13 lo!  
 (σ) 12<sup>b</sup> If shaken, they drop into the mouth of the eater!  
 (τ) 13 The gates of the land are <sup>28</sup> open to foes  
 (υ) 18 O King of Assyria (φ) on the hills (χ) 19 every one  
 (ψ) for whom has thy wickedness not continually affronted?
- 
- (aa) 17 they flee (ββ) where they are (γγ) creators <sup>28</sup> (δδ) 13 wide

The last poem, entitled *The Vision of Nahum the Elkoshite*, was written after the fall of Nineveh in 606. It consists of nine couplets, which may be grouped in three sections, with 3 + 2 beats in each hemistichal pair, just as in the second Maccabean poem. The enemies are not named; the besiegers are referred to as *their heroes, their warriors, their worthies* (cf. Jer. 4 13 8 16). The poem describes the final assault. The hemistich *the mantlets are set up* shows that the storming-party is close to the fortress. The *mantlets* (or *pavises*) were large rectangular screens with a small horizontal cover on top. They were more than six feet high and broad enough to cover two or three warriors. These standing-shields were made of planks or thick wickerwork. They also used a curved form, shaped like the tusk of an elephant; this was made of osiers or reeds, and was covered at the bottom and at the top with leather or thin metal plates. The *mantlets* were very heavy and were not used in battle; they were used exclusively in sieges when the besiegers had come close to the fortress, not more than 600 feet from the wall.<sup>9</sup> Nahum describes the final assault as follows:

## IV

- 1 1<sup>b</sup> The<sup>a</sup> Vision of Nahum the Elkoshite
- A i 3 2 Hark! The whip! List! Wheels are rumbling,  
the steeds are neighing;  
The chariots bound onward,  
3 the horsemen leap!<sup>h</sup>
- ii Swords flash, and spears are glittering!  
v in heaps lie corpses!<sup>h</sup>
- 2 3<sup>a</sup> Red<sup>h</sup> are the shields of their<sup>a</sup> heroes,  
encrimsoned<sup>h</sup> their<sup>a</sup> warriors.[<sup>c</sup>]
- iii 5 But their<sup>a</sup> worthies make haste to her<sup>h</sup> wall  
with mantlets set up.  
8<sup>b</sup> ‘Ho! Stand! Ho! Stand! they yell;<sup>h</sup>  
none<sup>a</sup> faces about.
- B iv 6 The gates of the River<sup>h</sup> are opened,  
the palace<sup>h</sup> is tottering!  
8<sup>a</sup> A lake of water is Nineveh,  
the flood overwhelms her!
- v 7 Brought out, a captive, deported  
is the King’s (fair) consort,  
Like doves her maidens moaning  
and beating their breasts.
- vi 9 Pillage silver! Pillage the gold!  
endless the store!  
Bear off the heavy booty  
of stuff that is precious!
- C vii 10 Void is she, empty, and wasted,  
all courage is melted;  
The knees are knocking, and trembling  
pervades the loins.
- viii 11 Where {now} is the lair of the lions,  
the den { } of the cubs?  
v Where<sup>h</sup> once the lion found shelter,  
and none affrayed him?

- ix 12 " That prowled to feed his whelps,  
strangled food for his lionesses,  
And filled his caves with prey,  
his dens with rapine ?

The Maccabean compiler of this festal liturgy for the celebration of Nicanor's Day has appended to this thrilling old poem a final couplet apostrophizing the Seleucidan Kingdom:

- x 13 *Behold! I fall upon thee,  
says Jahveh Sabaoth,  
Thy lodge<sup>α</sup> I'll burn with fire,<sup>λ</sup>  
and cut off thy rapine! <sup>μ</sup>*

---

(α) 1	1 <sup>b</sup> book of the		
(β) 2	3 <sup>b</sup> Like fire the chariot flashes,	the horsemen are frenzied, <sup>ν</sup> <sup>ξξ</sup>	
	4 <sup>b</sup> Their aspect is like torches,	they flash like lightnings. <sup>αα</sup>	
	4 <sup>a</sup> The chariots rage in the streets,	rush over the places.	
(γ) 3	3 there is a multitude of slain	(δ) there is no end of carcases	
(ε) 3	10 the faces of all are aglow <sup>αα</sup>	(ζ) 8 <sup>b</sup> while they flee	
(η) 11	the place (θ) the lion	(ι) whelp of the	(κ) 12 the lion
(λ) 13	and the sword will devour thy cubs!	(μ) from the land	

---

(ν) 2	5 they stumble in their courses	(ξξ) 3 8 they stumble over their carcases <sup>αα</sup>
-------	---------------------------------	---

---

## NOTES

(1) Published in the Johns Hopkins contributions to Assyriology = *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (BA) edited by Friedrich Delitzsch and Paul Haupt, vol. vi, part 2 (Leipzig, 1906). Owing to the 155 notes appended to that address I could not send the manuscript to the Corresponding Secretary before May 2, and this was too late for publishing it in the first part of vol. xxv of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, which was issued about the beginning of September, 1906. The references to JBL xxv in AJSL xxii 252, n. 8 and AJP xxvii 155, n. 1 were premature.

(2) For the name *Maccabee* see note 18 to my paper on Psalm 23 in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages* (AJSL) vol. xxi, p. 140.

(3) See R. W. Rogers, *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*, vol. 1 (New York, 1901) p. 174; cf. Delitzsch's *Assyrian grammar*, second edition (Berlin, 1906) p. 2.

(4) Cf. e.g. Obad. 18 and Psalm 76; see note 22 to my paper *Eine alttestamentliche Festliturgie für den Nikanortag* in vol. lxi of the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (ZDMG) p. 287.

(5) See my paper on Psalm 137 in Peiser's *Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung* (OLZ) February, 1907.

(6) *Edom* is a dialectic variation of *Adam*, *Man*, and *Esau* a dialectic variation of *Osai* (Heb. 'šāš) *Maker*, *Creator*. *Aram* is a phonetic modification of *Adam*; cf. Lat. *arbiter* = *ad-biter*, etc. See my paper *Die Etymologie von Aram* in vol. lxi of the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, p. 194.

(7) See Map I in Col. Billerbeck's paper cited in note 9.

(8) The addition *mahlākḥ šēlōšēth šāmm* at the end of Jon. 3: is a gloss. V. 5 of this chapter must be inserted after v. 8; the original sequel of v. 4 is v. 5 of chapter 4.

(9) Cf. the remarks of Col. Billerbeck in Delitzsch and Haupt's *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, vol. iii, pp. 107-188; also Geo. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, vol. ii (London, 1898) pp. 98-102.

(10) Assyr. *xirōtika mē nulli*; see Delitzsch's *Assyr. Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1896) p. 290<sup>a</sup>.

(11) See Delitzsch's *Handwörterbuch* (HW) p. 555<sup>b</sup>.

(12) Xenophon says of *Mespila*: ἦν δὲ ἡ μὲν κρητὶς λίθου ἕσπεθ κογχυλάτου, τὸ εἶρος πενήκοντα ποδῶν καὶ τὸ ὕψος πενήκοντα. This does not refer to the wall of the city, but to the moat; cf. Herod. 1 us 2 170. The term *κρητὶς* (Lat. *crepido*) means here, not *base of the wall*, but *embankment*, *revetment*; it refers to the walls of the moat and corresponds to the Assyr. *kāru* (HW 849<sup>b</sup>) *revetment*. According to Xenophon the width (of the moat) was 50 feet, and the depth (τὸ ὕψος) 50 feet; for the first 50 we must substitute 150; the width of the moat is still 150 feet, while the depth is now but 13 feet; but at the time of Xenophon it may have been 50 feet. See my paper *Xenophon's Account of the Fall of Nineveh* in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (JAOS) vol. xxviii.

(13) The rhythm of my translation has been much improved in a number of passages by the kind assistance of the distinguished co-editor of the Polychrome Bible, Horace Howard Furness.

(14) See the abstract of my lecture on *Bible and Babel* in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* (JHUC) No. 163 (June, 1903) p. 48<sup>b</sup>.

(15) *Larissa* seems to be a corruption (with *l* for *n* and transposition) of *Resen* = Assyr. *Rēs-īni*, *Fountain-head*, and *Mespila* may represent an Assyr. *mušpilu*, built of shell-limestone (Assyr. *pilu* = *τῶπος*). See note 3 to my paper cited above in note 4. In Esth. 1: Heb. *dar* apparently denotes *shell-marble*; *baḥē* may be *verd-antique*, and *sōhērth* = *onyx-marble*, while *šēf* means *white marble*.

(16) Cf. Hor. *Carm.* iii 37: *Si fractus ilabatur orbis.*

(17) The annihilation of Nicanor and his army was complete. The literal translation of this hemistich would be: *He works to completion* (or *Antich*).

(18) The Syrians were toppers; both Antiochus Epiphanes and his nephew Demetrius as well as Alexander Balas were habitual sots. Therefore we read in Eccl. 10 15:

Woe, thou land whose king is a boy!	whose princes feast in the morning.
Hail, thou land whose king is a highborn!	whose princes feast at due seasons.

(with the gloss for *strength*, and not for *drinking*). Heb. *strim* means both *jars* and *thorns*; in the present passage it denotes *jars*. Tangled thorns burn just as well as disentangled thorns; even better. But barrels full of wine do not burn so easily, unless the wine is poured out. See Haupt, *The Book of Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905), p. 16,  $\kappa$  and  $\xi$  (also  $\tau\tau$  and  $\nu\nu$ ).

(19) The capital of Assyria = Syria, i.e. the Seleucidan Kingdom.

(20) Nicanor.

(21) Judas Maccabæus; cf. above, note 2.

(22) The *Acra* or *citadel* of Jerusalem, which was occupied by the Syrians until it was finally starved into surrender (in May, 142) by Simon, whose triumphant entrance is glorified in Psalm 118; see my remarks in note 43 to my paper cited above in note 2.

(23) Also the *floods*, *billows*, and *waves* in Jon. 2 s refer to the tide of the Syrian persecution; see my interpretation of the psalm in the second chapter of the Book of Jonah in my paper on the cuneiform name of the sperm-whale, *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xxiii, p. 258, n. 3; cf. my paper *Jonah's Whale* in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 1907.

(24) Literally *returned*, i.e. *recovered*.

(25) Cf. Psalm 80 s 10 15 (Heb. 9 11 15).

(26) The explanatory gloss added to *Go into the mud* explains this hemistich to mean: *tread the clay*, i.e. *Knead the clay* for making bricks by mixing it with water and working it *with the feet*.

(27) Cast (*exuviate*) their skin.

(28) Enchanters, conjurers, exorcists.

(29) *Cricket* means *creator*, *chirper*.

(30) That is, *bespattered with blood*.

(31) Lit. *his*, i.e. of the enemy besieging Nineveh.

(32) Nineveh.

(33) The captains of the Ninevites.

(34) Of the Ninevite warriors.

(35) The flood-gates of the Hûsur.

(36) The Acropolis of Nineveh, i.e. the mound now known as *Kowyunjik* with the palaces of the Assyrian kings.

(37) That is, a covered place of shelter in which wild beasts lurk. It alludes here to the *lair* (= German *Lager*, camp; cf. 1 Macc. 4  $\omega$ ) of the beasts of prey, i.e. the Syrians; see ZDMG, vol. lxi, p. 286.

(38) The first line of gloss  $\beta$  is a variant to the second hemistich pair of stanza 1; 2  $a^b$  is a gloss to the first hemistich of 2  $a^b$ , and 2  $a^c$  a gloss to the second hemistich of 2  $a^b$ . The glossator understood *parašim* in 2  $a^b$  to mean *horses* (of the chariots) not *horsemen*.

(39) A misplaced incorrect explanation of *en crimsoned*.

(40) An incorrect explanation of the hemistich *the horsemen are frenzied*, lit. *staggered*, i.e. they make their horses *run like mad*, as though they had the (blind) staggers.

Further explanations are given in the subjoined Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text and in the 116 notes to my paper cited above in note 4.

### Critical Notes on Nahum

#### א

(1<sup>1</sup>) The first part of the title, **מִשְׁמָא נִינְדָה**, is not *evidently late* (EB 8259) but belongs to section 1; the second part, **חֲזוֹן נְחוֹם הָאֱלֹקִישׁ** (ספֵר) should be prefixed to section 7.

The following verses (1 2-10) contain the first fifteen lines of an alphabetic psalm; the last seven lines (beginning with the letters, ט, ז, ב, ק, ר, ש, ט, respectively) are wanting; they were, it may be supposed, not quoted by the compiler of this festal liturgy for the celebration of Nic-anor's Day, because they did not suit his purpose. This Maccabean psalm originally consisted of eleven couplets; each couplet is composed of two **מִשְׁלִיִּים** (AJSL 20 100, n.\*) i.e. hemistichal pairs, and each hemistich has three beats (3 + 3). The first syllable of a line is, as a rule, unaccented, unless the word is especially significant; cf. **מִוֹב**, v. 7; **מִדָּה**, v. 9<sup>a</sup>; **מִי**, 3 14; **שְׁמֵשׁ**, 3 11<sup>b</sup>. Even at the beginning of the second hemistich an accented syllable is generally avoided. Therefore we find **יָדוּ** instead of **יָדוּ** in 3 10, just as we have **נָמִי** instead of **נָמוּ** in 3 12; and we may read **מִי מִנְּדָר שְׂאֵבִי לָךְ**, 3 8, and **מִיִּם**, 3 8, contrast **מִיִּם** **שְׂאֵבִי לָךְ**, 3 14. It is not necessary to read **וְשָׂמֵשׁ וְשָׂמֵשׁ וְשָׂמֵשׁ**, or **מִיִּם** instead of **מִי**.

(2<sup>a</sup>) The addition of **וְנָקָם** after **קִטְמָא** is due to scribal expansion derived from the second hemistich.

After **נָקָם**, at the beginning of the second hemistich, omit **יָדוּהָ**. 6 omits **וְבִעַל חֲמָה** before **נָקָם יָדוּהָ**.

V. 2<sup>b</sup> belongs to couplet vii; also v. 3<sup>a</sup>.

(3<sup>b</sup>) The emendation **וְאָבָק** instead of **וְאָבָק** is not good.

(4) We need not restore the form **וְיִקְשְׁרוּ**; *yaiiabbēšēhu* (cf. *Kings* 210, n.\*; contrast ZDMG 58 22) is contracted from *yaiiēiabbēšēhu*; **וְיִקְשְׁרוּ** was pronounced *yaiiabbēšēhu* (not *yaiiavšēhu*). The uncontracted form *yaiiēiabbēšēhu* would have four unaccented syllables, which is unrhymical. The emendation **וְיִבֵּשׁ** is gratuitous.

Instead of **אֶמְלֵל** 1<sup>o</sup> read **רָאֵב** (not **רִבְאֵוּ**, **רִלֵוּ**). We find a similar careless repetition of the same expression instead of a synonym in 2<sup>o</sup> (**נִאֲזָר** instead of **נִמָּן**) and in 3<sup>12</sup> (**וְרִרְבִּי** instead of **וְרִרְבִּי**). Cf. also **וְקָמַת**, Ps. 76 11 (instead of **וְקָמַתָּה**) influenced by **וְקָמַתָּה** (1 Macc. 2 40 3 etc.) and **וְרִרְבִּי** 1<sup>o</sup> instead of **וְרִרְבִּי** in Ps. 68 12; see AJSL 23 227.

(5) The article must not be prefixed to **וְרִרְבִּי**; we frequently find the article omitted before the first word, while it is used before the second, the contrast making the second word more definite. Similarly **אֲזָרֵד** is used instead of **וְרִרְבִּי**, but the cardinal number is not substituted for **שְׁנֵי**;

cf. in the cuneiform incantatory legend of the Descent of Ištar (KB 6<sup>ea</sup>, ll. 42 and 45) *išlên bâba*, one gate, but *išânâ bâba*, a second gate, etc. When a word is repeated in the same hemistich, the first occurrence is often not accented, while the repetition is stressed; cf. e.g. 2<sup>10</sup>: **בִּזְרָכְתָּ יִרְבֵּה זָהָב**, *Bozzu-késf u-vózzu zaháv*, or the first hemistich of Jer. 50<sup>11</sup>, quoted in the notes on **יָדָה**, Nah. 3<sup>2</sup>; also Hag. 2<sup>8</sup>: **לִרְהֹבֶתָּ וְלִי** **לִרְהֹבֶתָּ**, and Ps. 60<sup>9</sup>: **וְלִי מִנְשָׂה**.

The verbal form **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** has two beats; so, too, **וְלֹאֲבִיז**, v. 2<sup>b</sup>; **וְעַל־נִבְכְּרִיהָ**, 3<sup>10</sup>; **וְיִרְכָּבָהּ**, 3<sup>2</sup>; **בְּלִפְיָיִם**, 2<sup>8</sup>; cf. n. 71 to my paper on Ps. 23 in AJSL 21<sup>148</sup>.

For the recessive accent in pause of **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** cf. **מְלֵאָה**, 3<sup>1</sup>; **כְּרָא**, 3<sup>8</sup>; **וְנִמְלֹו**, **וְנִמְלֹו**, 3<sup>11</sup>; **נְעֻלְמָה**, 3<sup>10</sup>; **בְּשָׁבִי**, 2<sup>8</sup>; **שִׁחַתוּ**, 1<sup>12</sup>; **וְעִקְרוּ**, 1<sup>14</sup>; **מִסְכָּה** and **שִׁלְמָךְ**, 3<sup>12</sup>; **וּמִבְלִקָּהּ**, 2<sup>10</sup>; **לַחֲבוּנָה**, 2<sup>8</sup>; **הַקְּלִתָּהּ**, 3<sup>2</sup>; **מִטְרִיקָהּ**, 2<sup>7</sup>; **נִמְתַּחוּ**, 3<sup>11</sup>; **וְחִלְחָלָהּ**, 2<sup>11</sup>; **וְסָרְפָהּ**, 2<sup>18</sup>; **וְהִרְשָׁלוּ**, 2<sup>18</sup>; **וְהִזְמַנְנוּ**, 2<sup>8</sup>. Cf. notes on vv. 8 and 3<sup>a</sup>.

For **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** read **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** = **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, Is. 6<sup>11</sup>, where we must read:

עֲרֹאשֶׁר אֲמִשְׂאוּ שָׁרִים מֵאֵן יִשָּׁב  
וְקִיּוֹם מֵאֵן אֲרִים הִאֲרָמָה תִּשְׁאָה

The emendation **תִּשְׁאָה** instead of **תִּשְׂאָה** is gratuitous; **שִׁמְמָה** is an explanatory gloss; **אֲמִתְשָׂאָה תִּבֵּל** = *si fractus illabatur orbis*. The verb **שָׂאָה** means *to crash*, i.e. *to fall down and break with a crash*; **שָׂאֵן** means *crash*, French *fracas*. The form **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** in **וְהִתְמַנֵּן שָׁרִים אֲמִשְׂאוּ** must be derived, not from **שָׂאָה**, but from **שָׂאֵן**; cf. **יֹם שָׂאָה וּמִשְׂאוּהָ**, Zeph. 1<sup>18</sup>. Is. 6<sup>18</sup> and 10<sup>1</sup> (**וְהָשָׁב וְהִתְמַנֵּן . . . שִׁמְמָה שִׁמְמָה**) consists of six lines with 2 + 2 beats.

The prefixed **וְ** in **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** is due to dittography.

The final **וְ** in **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** is enclitic; cf. **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, v. 7; **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, v. 9<sup>b</sup>; **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, v. 2<sup>b</sup>; **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, 3<sup>7</sup>; **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, 2<sup>2</sup>; **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, 2<sup>1</sup>; **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, 3<sup>7</sup>; **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, 1<sup>12</sup>; **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, 3<sup>10</sup>; **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, 3<sup>8</sup>; **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, 2<sup>12</sup>; **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, 2<sup>12</sup>. See my remarks on Cant. 6<sup>9</sup> in AJSL 19<sup>7</sup>.

(6) The first word, **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, must be inserted after **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, and be combined with the **וְ** of the following **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**: read **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** instead of **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**; contrast *Kings* 61<sup>9</sup>.

The **וְ** in **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** may be due to dittography of the **וְ**; cf. **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, v. 3<sup>a</sup> for **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, and **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, 2<sup>1</sup> for **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**; see Haupt, *Purim*, p. 51, l. 22.

The verb **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** is not Niphal, but Piel; it means *to liquefy, fuse*.

For **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** read **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, from **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, *to burn*. W, on the other hand, has *burn* in the first hemistich, and *melt* in the second.

(7) Between **וְ** and **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** we must, with W, insert **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** (cf. Lam. 3<sup>18</sup>) following **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**. This word does not mean *refuge*, but *strength, stronghold, strong place of defense, or security, fort, fortified place*; cf. our terms *strong room, strong box*. **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** (cf. 3<sup>11</sup>) is a place whose *strength will laugh a siege to scorn* (Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, V 5<sup>2</sup>). The noun is not derived from **וְהִתְמַנֵּן** (Arab. *'āda* = *iltāja'a*, *lāda*) but from **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**; it stands for *ma'uzz*, just as **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, shield = *majinn* (Arab. *mijánn*) from **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**. The lengthening of the *a* in **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, **וְהִתְמַנֵּן**, etc.,



stead of תִּקַּם, and מִצָּרָו instead of צָרָה; the reading צָרָה may be due to צָרָה at the end of the first משל of couplet v, and יָקוּם (instead of יָקוּם) which afterwards became תִּקַּם, may have been suggested by יָקוּם in v. 6; cf. the remark on מִצָּרָו instead of מִצָּרָו (Ecc. 9 14) in the notes on 2 a. If v. 2<sup>b</sup> had not been misplaced, מִצָּרָו would probably not have been corrupted to צָרָה. The omission of the prefixed מ after מִצָּרָו was due to haplography (*Kings* 245 a). The two expressions צָרָה מִצָּרָו and מִצָּרָו מִצָּרָו sound almost alike; cf. the remark on מִקְרָבָה for מִקְרָבָה in v. 8.

The first and the third clause of v. 9 must be transposed: <sup>א</sup> <sup>ב</sup> instead of <sup>ב</sup> <sup>א</sup>.

(3<sup>a</sup>) The second hemistich to 9<sup>a</sup> is 3<sup>a</sup>; but instead of וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה שֶׁן it is better to read וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה שֶׁן יְהוָה.

The preceding clause, וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה, is scribal expansion; the addition of וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה was suggested by the Decalogue (Ex. 20 7 Deut. 5 11); cf. the remarks on the gloss מִכָּשֶׁר in 2 1; וַיִּקְרָא, 3 a. The gloss וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה after וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה certainly belongs to the preceding clause, not to the following, בְּמִוֶּסֶר וּבְשִׁטְרָה דְרָבּוֹ; contrast Ges.-Kautzsch, § 143, a.

After the gloss וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה had been prefixed to וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה, the conjunction וַיִּקְרָא was inserted before וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה.

The prefixed adjectives in וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה (אֵרֶךְ, *erck*, monosyllabic; וְגֵרָל, *uḡdol*, dissyllabic) are proclitic; cf. כֹּחַשׁוֹרֶק and דִּירְעִד in 3 1; קוֹלֶשׁוֹט וְקוֹלֶרֶעַשׁ, 3 2; אִכְלֵה־אֵשׁ, 3 11; אֶצְוֶה־דָוִד, 2 2; נֹאם־יְהוָה, 3 4 2 14; לְהִבְחָרֵב, 3 2; מַעֲלִיכְלִי and מִרְבֶּכֶם, 2 2; בְּקוֹל־יִזְוִים, 2 4; אֲנִשְׁחָלֵל, 3 2; תֹּאכַל־חֵרֵב, 2 14; cf. my remarks on the Song of Lamech, *AJSL* 20 164.

The וַיִּקְרָא in וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה may be due to dittography of the וַיִּקְרָא; cf. יַעֲמֹד, v. 6 and לְעַבֹּד, 2 1.

We must not, with N, substitute חָסֵד for כֹּחַ, following Ex. 34 a. Num. 14 18 Neh. 9 17 Joel 2 18 Jon. 4 2 Psa. 103 2 145 2; נִרְלֵחַסֵד would not have been corrupted to נִרְלֵחַסֵד. The glossator meant to emphasize the fact that if JHVH does not wreak vengeance at once, it is not lack of power which prompts Him to defer the punishment, but His patience. He is all-powerful, but long-suffering.

(2<sup>b</sup>) The second משל (AJSL 20 150, n. \*) of couplet vii was inserted in the Received Text after the opening line of this psalm, because the second hemistich of 2<sup>a</sup> begins with נִקַּם; cf. the remarks on the misplacement of 3 2 (see p. 23). The clause וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה was transposed along with 2<sup>b</sup>, and the gloss וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה וַיִּקְרָא לְאַיִןקָה was added in order to supply a corresponding hemistich.

The stem נָמַר is not identical with נָמַר, to watch = נָמַר, just as שָׁמַר, to be angry, is not identical with שָׁמַר, to watch; cf. *Kings* 129 a. Heb. שָׁמַר, to be angry, corresponds to Assy. *šamāru*, and נָמַר to Assy. *našāru* which is generally read *nadāru* (HW 452). The stem שָׁמַר is a Šaphel (see p. 24, below) of שָׁמַר, and נָמַר is a Niphel of נָמַר (see BA 1 150, below). Both שָׁמַר and נָמַר mean originally to be embittered; נָמַר is connected with Arab. *mušir* (مُضِر) bursting out (of wrath).

(10) The first two words, *כִּרְעָד*, belong to *בְּקִלְהוֹא עֵשָׂה*, v. 9<sup>b</sup>.

The noun *כִּרְעָד* means both *pot* and *thorn*; cf. Eccl. 7<sup>s</sup>. The glossator who added *סְבִיבִים* (instead of *סְבִיבִים*) understood *סִירִים* to mean *thorns*, whereas *סִירִים סְבִיבִים* means *wine-jars*, lit. *jars wined*, i.e. *filled with wine* (cf. *toss-pot, swill-pot, swill-bowl, swill-tub*, etc.). After *סִירִים סְבִיבִים* we must add *כִּרְעָדָה*, although they. The *כִּי* is perhaps preserved in *קִלּוֹת כִּי* at the end of this chapter. After *כִּי* had been erroneously inserted before *קִלּוֹת*, this noun was changed into the verbal form *קִלּוֹת*. The *כִּי* before *קִלּוֹת* might be retained, if we read: — *כִּי־קִלּוֹת אֲשֵׁים קִבְרָד*. In that case *כִּי* would introduce the *oratio directa* as in Ruth 1<sup>10</sup> etc. *קִלּוֹת אֲשֵׁים* may represent the Aramaic noun *קִלּוֹת*; cf. AJSL 23<sup>225</sup>, n. 46.

The gloss *וּבְסִבָּאם* before *סִירִים סְבִיבִים* means *even if they drink* (tope). It is the infinitive *Qal*, and the prefixed *כִּי* is concessive, as in *בְּקִיָּים כִּי*, 2<sup>s</sup>; cf. JAOS 25<sup>72</sup>, n. 2. The meaning is *Even if they be wine-jars (wine-bags, i.e. soakers, toppers, drunken sots) they will be burnt like dry stubble*. Even if they be full of wine as wine-jars, we will cause their wine (Gen. 9<sup>24</sup>) to evaporate. Both Antiochus Epiphanes and his nephew, Demetrius I, were habitual drunkards; see Haupt, *Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905) p. 38, below. Polybius states that Demetrius (whose friend Nicanor was defeated by Judas Maccabæus at Adasa; see Haupt, *Purim*, p. 4, l. 42) was drunk most of the time; cf. Willrich, *Judaica* (Göttingen, 1900) p. 31; see also Judith 12<sup>20</sup> and Haupt, *Purim*, p. 29, ll. 10. 17. We read in 1 Macc. 8<sup>s</sup> that Judas Maccabæus *τοὺς τραπεζοσταντας τὸν [λαδὸν] αὐτοῦ ἐφλόγισεν*.

The reading *סִירִים סְבִיבִים* is not good: thorns burn just as easily when they are tangled, even better; but full wine-barrels do not catch fire as a rule.

For *כִּי* read *בִּשְׁבִי*. This may be again, not a graphic, but a phonetic corruption; cf. the note on *בְּקִיָּים* for *בְּקִיָּים*, v. 8 (*בְּקִיָּים* was pronounced *בְּשִׁי*; see ZA 2<sup>22</sup>; Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, 3<sup>22</sup>, below; cf. also *עִי* = *עִי*, etc.).

The last word of the verse, *מִלֵּא*, may be a corruption of *הִלֵּא*, introducing the following *יִצְאָה מִמֶּךָ* at the beginning of v. 11; or *מִלֵּא* may be a misplaced correction to *וְכֵן אִם שְׁלֵמִים* and *אִם מִלֵּאִים*, in v. 12, just as *יִצְרָה* (point *יִצְרָה*) at the beginning of 2<sup>s</sup> is a misplaced correction of *יִצְרָה* in 1<sup>14</sup>, or as *בִּיּוֹם הַבַּיִת* in 2<sup>s</sup> is a misplaced gloss to the first clause of 2<sup>s</sup>. Similarly *בְּהִלְכָתָם* in 2<sup>s</sup> and *יִשְׁעוּ בְּנִיתָם* in 3<sup>s</sup> are misplaced glosses to *יִדְרְעוּ* at the end of 2<sup>s</sup>, and the last clause of c. 2 is a misplaced gloss to the beginning of that chapter. The last clause in 2<sup>11</sup>, *אֲנִישֵׁיחַל מִלְּעֵים* וּפְנֵי כֵלָם קִבְּצוּ פִּאֲרוֹד, 2<sup>4</sup>. Cf. also the remarks on *כִּי קִלּוֹת* at the end of c. 1.

## ב

The second section of the Book of Nahum is composed of three six-line stanzas with 3 + 2 beats in each line. We find the same meter in section 7. For the misnomer 'קִינֵי meter' see AJSL 20<sup>122</sup>, n. 9.

(31) The term *עיר* refers here to Nineveh; cf. v. 7. But *Nineveh* in this Maccabean section is a poetic name for *Assyria* = *Syria*, just as the Seleucidan Kingdom with its new capital Antioch is called *Daughter of Babylon* in Pa. 137 s; see my remarks in OLZ 10<sup>oo</sup>, n. 13. The term *עיר* may mean, not only *city*, but also *state*, just as Lat. *civitas* means both *city* and *state*. The Heb. word *בְּרִיטָה*, *province* (originally *judicial district*) means in Aramaic and Arabic: *city*. Arab. *bdlad* means both *land* and *city*; Assyr. *mātu*, *land*, appears in Syriac as *ܩܬܢܐ*, *native land, country, birthplace, domicile, home*; the plural means *little towns*. In the cuneiform texts, *Damascus, Tyre, Sidon, etc.*, have either the determinative *āl*, *city* (= Heb. *אודל*, *tent*, originally *domicile*; cf. AJSL 22 100, § 10) or the determinative *mât*, *land*. Judah, Edom, Moab, Ammon, Haurân have occasionally the determinative *āl*, *city*, although the names of these countries are not identical with the names of their capitals; see E. Schrader, *Keilschriften und Geschichtsforschung* (Giessen, 1878) p. 95; Friedrich Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* (Leipzig, 1881) p. 288, ll. 2. 5; pp. 294, 295, etc. In a popular German poem *Doctor Faust* we read: *Die grosse Stadt Portugal, | Gleich soll abgemalet sein; see Des Knaben Wunderhorn*, ed. by Ed. Grisebach (Leipzig, 1906) p. 143.

Nineveh symbolizes the Assyrian empire and its daughter, the Seleucidan Kingdom, just as the City of Rome represented the Roman Empire. A poet could call Antiochus Epiphanes a *Ninevite*, just as Ovid calls Romulus and Remus *Iliadae fratres*, or as Scipio Africanus is called a *Dardanian*, or as we find *Teucrian* or *Ilian* instead of Roman, or *Erichthonian* instead of Athenian. Similarly the Maccabean poets call the Jews *Jacob* or *Joseph*; cf. Obad. 13; 1 Macc. 1:23 37 42.

For the reason why this first line of ב has been placed after 2 14 see the note on 2 14, below, p. 29.

The two nouns *בְּחַשְׁמֵיךָ* form a copulative compound like Assyr. *cizir-rabi*, *young and old* (HW 565 s; cf. Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gr.*, § 199) or *בְּחַשְׁמֵיךָ* in Pa. 45 s (see the translation in Haupt, *Ecclesiastes*, p. 37). The vocalization *בְּחַשְׁמֵיךָ* instead of *בְּחַשְׁמֵיךָ* is due to the recession of the accent before the following *בְּחַשְׁמֵיךָ*: *'ānuāh* became *'ānuāh*; contrast ZAT 21 228 and Duhm, *ad loc.* The preceding *בְּחַשְׁמֵיךָ* must be read *'al-dvar-émth* instead of *'al-dvar-eméth* (for *emett, ement, amint*).

The third hemistich, *לְאַרְבַּע שָׁרָה*, is a scribal expansion based on the preceding verses at the end of c. 2 (7, ix). For the unaccented verbal form after *לְאַרְבַּע* cf. n. 70 to my paper on Pa. 23 in AJSL 21 100. Assyr. *mātu*, *night* (cf. Heb. *אָרְבַּע*) is connected with *אָרְבַּע*, just as Syr. *ܩܬܢܐ*, *evening*, is derived from *ܩܬܢܐ*, *to turn, to decline* (ܩܬܢܐ ܩܬܢܐ). Cf. my remarks on the etymology of *crepusculum* in my paper cited above, p. 16, at the end of n. 12.

(2, 3) Verses 2 and 3 belong, not to section ב, but to 7, where they have been displaced by a gloss (7, β). They may have been inserted in ב owing to the similarity of *חֵיב חֵלֶל* in 3 s and *חֵיב חֵלֶל* in 3 4, just as

the 2-line in \* (1<sup>b</sup>) has been inserted after the \*<sup>a</sup>-line (1<sup>a</sup>) owing to the beginning נקם. Cf. also the conclusion of the note on 2 11<sup>b</sup> (p. 29).

(4) The clause בַּעֲלָה כְּשֵׁפִים is a gloss to the following שׂוֹבֵת הוֹן שׂוֹבֵת, and the line after בַּעֲלָה כְּשֵׁפִים is a gloss to the entire מַשֵּׁל.

The verb מָכַר means here, not *to sell*, but *to cheat, deceive, cozen, beguile, entice*. Arab. *maktâr* means *swindler*. Cf. also BA 1 14, n. 7; contrast HW 456<sup>a</sup>; see also AJSL 23 22. For the original meaning of *cheat* (and *shyster*) see my paper *Some Germanic Etymologies*, AJP 27 100, below.

The allusions and כְּשֵׁפִים are the allurements of Hellenic culture; cf. 1 Macc. 1 11 22 2 Macc. 4 12.

The hemistich אַחַר מִסּוּק סוּף בְּכִשְׁפֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים should stand after דַּוָּה צְבֹאֵת in v. 5.

After רִגְנֵי the meter requires the insertion of נָסַל, and instead of אֶלֶךְ we must read עֲלֶיךָ; so, too, in (the Maccabean appendix to 7) 2 14 and Jer. 51 22. For אל instead of על cf. the notes on 1 9. It is possible that the author of the late passage Jer. 51 22 read אֶלֶךְ רִגְנֵי instead of עֲלֶיךָ רִגְנֵי; cf. the note on נָשִׂים וְנָשִׂים, Nah. 3 12. The רִגְנֵי הַמְּשֻׁחָה Jer. 51 22 is the Seleucid Kingdom; cf. n. 22 on Ps. 68, AJSL 23 22.

(5) The primary meaning of נָלָה is *to remove* (German *wegziehen*). This may mean *to remove from one place to another* or *to remove the covering, to uncover*.

The hemistich עֲלֶיךָ שׂוֹלֵךְ עֲלֵי־פָנֶיךָ does not mean *I will pull up thy skirts over thy face*, but *I will uncover (lift up) thy skirts to affront thee*; עֲלֵי־פָנֶיךָ means (as an insult) *to the face, as an affront*; cf. Job 1 11 Is. 65 2. Hugo Grotius explains: *Tracto te non ut matronam, sed ut meretricem*; cf. Ez. 16 7 Is. 47 2 2. In the late passage Jer. 13 22 we find שׂוֹלֵךְ עֲלֵי־פָנֶיךָ.

אֶת־הַמַּלְאָכִים after רִאֲיוֹנֵי is a gloss, also the hemistich קִלְוֹךְ קִלְוֹךְ at the end of the verse.

(6) The hemistich עֲלֶיךָ שִׁקָּצִים does not mean *I will cast abominable filth upon thee*, but *I will cast abominations, i.e. indignities, upon thee*. The primary meaning of שִׁקָּץ is *to excite disgust*; it is, as Hupfeld suggested long ago, a Šaphel of קָץ; just as the שׁ in שָׁמַיִם, שָׁקַל, שָׁבַר, שָׁמַל, שָׁמַר, שָׁבַל, שָׁמַר, שָׁמַר, שָׁמַר, שָׁמַר (see note on 8 2) etc., is a causative prefix (cf. JBL 19 7, below) which may be connected with Arab. *sdbab*, cause, or some similar word, just as the *sa* prefixed to the future in Arabic (Wright-De Goeje, 2 2) is shortened from *sayfa*, in the end; cf. also Syr. הֶשֶׁה, now = הֶשֶׁה, Syr. אֲשִׁתְּךָ, last year = קָרִים + שָׁנָה;

† The verb שָׁלַח often means *to cause to transmit or deliver a message*, e.g. Hagg. 1 12: 'כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁלַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם אֱלֹהֵיהֶם . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁלַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם אֱלֹהֵיהֶם, they listened to the words of the prophet Haggai (which were) in accordance with what their God, Jahveh, had caused him to deliver to them. Nor does Is. 37 4 mean *The words of the Rab-shakeh whom the King of Assyria has sent* (Ges.-Kautzsch, § 138, 2) but *The words of the Rab-shakeh, which the King of Assyria has caused him to transmit*. Also in 2 K 19 is the suffix in שָׁלַח refers to the Rab-shakeh; contrast Kings 277 22. Cf. 2 S 11 22 1 K 14 2 Is. 55 11 Jer. 42 2 21 43 1.

see AJSL 22 21 23 22. The reflexive  $\text{ח}$  of the  $\text{החטת}$ , on the other hand, represents  $\text{חח} = \text{חח} = \text{חח} = \text{חח} = \text{חח}$ ; see *Proverbs* 51 12. In Aram.  $\text{קנח} = \text{קק}$  the infixed  $\text{ח}$  was originally prefixed:  $\text{נקח}$ ; so, too, in Assy. *sāqu* = *sāqu*; see the note on  $\text{וקח}$ , v. 10. The noun  $\text{שקן}$  denotes something *disgusting, detestable, infamous, disgraceful, ignominious*. Cf. p. 21, below.

The following verb,  $\text{ונבלחך}$ , *I shall disgrace (insult, dishonor) thee* is a gloss; cf. Jer. 14 21:  $\text{אלהנאן למטן שמך אליהנבל כפא כבודך}$ , *Do not reject us for Thy name's sake, do not make vile the throne of Thy glory* (i.e. Jerusalem with the Temple).

(7) The first clause of v. 7,  $\text{והיה כל ראדך יחד ממך}$ , is an explanatory gloss to  $\text{כחאי}$  at the end of the preceding verse.

The last clause,  $\text{ומי ינחלה במאן מבקש מנהמים}$ , is a gloss to  $\text{ומי ינחלה}$ . The participle  $\text{מנהמים}$  does not mean *providers of a funeral meal* (ZAT 22 22) but *comforters*, i.e. *sympathizers, mourners*; cf. Job 2 11:  $\text{וינחמו וינחמו}$ , also Is. 51 12. The primitive meaning of  $\text{נחם}$  is *to cause to stop sighing*; see my notes on Is. 40 in Drugulin's *Marksteine* (Leipzig, 1902) p. 46 and AJSL 22 21. Heb.  $\text{מנהמים}$  might mean also *avengers* (see Haupt, *Ecclesiastes*, p. 39, n. 8 on IV; *Kings* 187 20) but this meaning is not suitable in a gloss to  $\text{ומי ינחלה}$ .

For vv. 8-19 see section 1.

(1 11) Before  $\text{ממך זמא}$  we must insert  $\text{הלא}$ . As stated above (p. 22) the last word of v. 10,  $\text{מלא}$ , may be a corruption of  $\text{הלא}$ ; it is possible, however, that this  $\text{מלא}$  is a misplaced corrective gloss to  $\text{שלמים}$  in v. 12, and  $\text{שלמים}$  may be the original reading for  $\text{משמך}$  in v. 14 (see below). The omission of  $\text{הלא}$  may be due to the gloss  $\text{מלא}$ ; glosses often displace original readings of the text; cf. the note on  $\text{נחם}$  in 2 12 and my remarks on Cant. 5 15 6 in AJSL 19 12 12. Instead of  $\text{מלא}$  we must read  $\text{מלאים}$ , and for  $\text{שלמים}$  we must restore the singular,  $\text{שלם}$ . The plural ending may have been abbreviated so that  $\text{מלאים}$  was written  $\text{מלא}$ ; cf. *Kings* 80 2.

The final clause,  $\text{יען בליעל}$ , must be inserted after the first hemistich. In pentapodies the hemistichs are often transposed; cf. the remarks on v. 14 and the Maccabean Song of Derision (2 K 19 21-22) in *Kings* 278 22 22 22; also my restoration of the first couplet of Ps. 23 in AJSL 21 12 and couplet iv of the Maccabean psalm in the Book of Jonah, AJSL 23 22; see also below, the notes on 3 12 12 and 2 12 (7, β).

The fourth hemistich of this verse is the first clause of v. 14,  $\text{תנחך}$ , where we must read  $\text{עלי}$  instead of  $\text{עליך}$  (cf.  $\text{ערתך}$  instead of  $\text{עלך}$  in 3 12 and  $\text{עליך}$  instead of  $\text{עלי}$  in Is. 52 14, quoted in the note on v. 12; see also note 13, third paragraph, to my paper on Pa. 68 in AJSL 23 27; contrast  $\text{רובדך}$  for  $\text{רובדך}$ , 2 14) and omit  $\text{יהיה}$  as a gloss. The  $\text{סוף פסוק}$  of v. 11 should be placed after  $\text{תנחך עלי}$ ; but  $\text{תנחך}$  must be pointed as infinitive absolute,  $\text{תנחך}$ ; cf. *Kings* 182 2. V. 12 belongs to stanza iii; v. 12<sup>a</sup> and v. 18 are glosses.

The  $\text{יען בליעל}$  and  $\text{על-יהיה רעה}$  is the prototype of Haman in the

Book of Esther, Nicanor who threatened to burn JHVH's Temple on Mount Zion; see 1 Macc. 7:23-24; cf. 2 Macc. 14:15-16. In 2 Macc. 15:1 he is called a *τρισαλιτήριοσ*, cf. Haupt, *Purim*, p. 5.

(14) In v. 14 the final hemistich כִּרְקִלֹת קִבְרָךְ אֲשֵׁים must be transposed; כִּי may be omitted, and instead of קִלֹת we may read קִלָּן, as suggested by W. The כִּי may be a misplaced remnant of the concessive clause כִּי רַמְזָה, which must be inserted after סִרְיִים סְבוּאִים in v. 10; it is improbable that כִּי is merely due to dittography of the preceding suffix ך; contrast note on מִלֹאכְכָה, 2:14. As stated above, p. 22, כִּי may be retained before קִלָּן, if we read: קִלָּן אֲשֵׁים קִבְרָךְ. לא יֵרָע מִשְׁמֵךְ עוֹד.

The clause לא יֵרָע מִשְׁמֵךְ עוֹד, *no more of thy name shall be sown*, is meaningless and unmetrical. Instead of יֵרָע we must read יֵרָדָה, and for מִשְׁמֵךְ we must substitute שְׁלֵמֵךְ, *thy corpse*, while לא and עוֹד must be omitted. The verb יִזְכֵּר at the beginning of 2:16 is a misplaced corrective gloss to יֵרָע; it should be pointed יִזְכֵּר; cf. Ἐ μνησθήσονται, ἢ recordabitur. But the clause לא יִזְכֵּר מִשְׁמֵךְ עוֹד, *anything of thy name shall no more be mentioned*, suits neither the meter nor the context; Nicanor's name was often mentioned in later years. The insertion of a negative to explain an obscure passage is not unparalleled; cf. e.g. Eccl. 11:1 (see below, ad 3:15) in Ἐ (καὶ μὴ ἐν ὄρασει ὀφθαλμῶν σου) or the tertiary gloss in Eccl. 6:1, etc. On the other hand, Ἐ has canceled the negative in 2 K 6:17; cf. Kings 209:72-73. In some cases (e.g. לא אֲשִׁיבֶנּוּ, Am. 1:11, etc.) לא is *scriptio plena* of the emphatic ל (see AJSL 22:101, § 15, end, and my paper in OLZ, June, 1907) but לא יֵרָדָה מִשְׁמֵךְ, *verily, thy spoil will be scattered*, is unsatisfactory.

The noun שְׁלֵם, *corpse*, means originally *ended*, i.e. *one whose life has been brought to an end*. In Syriac, the verb שְׁלַם means *to come to an end*, *to be complete*, but also *to die*; שְׁלַם יוֹמָתָהּ or שְׁלַם חַיָּוֶיהָ, *he ended his days* or *his life*, means *he died*. In Arabic, *salima* often has just the opposite meaning, *to remain alive*, *to survive*, *to be saved*; but it is used also as an euphemistic antiphrastic expression for *he is dead*; cf. BA 3:17, l. 32 and K. J. Grimm's dissertation, *Euphemistic Liturgical Appendices in the OT* (Baltimore, 1901) p. 5, l. 6. In Assyrian we find *šalmu*, *corpse*, and the feminine *šalamtu*, with reciprocal assimilation: *šalandu*, just as we have *mundāzcu*, *fighter*, for *mumtāzicu*, from מִזְרָע; cf. Kings 112:15. I showed more than 25 years ago that *šalandu* (= *šalamtu*) passed into Aramaic as שְׁלַמָּא and with ר for ל (as in שְׁלֵמֶלָה, *chain* = שְׁרָשָׁרָת; חֶרֶץ, *hip* = חֶלֶץ; see p. 45, below, and ZDMG 61:106) שְׁלַמָּא, a diminutive form with repetition of the final consonant as in Assyr. *suqāḡu*, Syr. *suqāḡā*, Arab. *zuqāḡ*; cf. BA 3:102, n. 10; Kings 121:15; Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*, § 134.

The noun שְׁלֵם, *corpse*, may be restored in the present passage, just as מִקְבֵּר, *grave*; מַבְרָא, *benefactor*; נְחָתוּ (= נְחָתוּ = Assyr. *nakamātu*) *his treasures* have been restored in 1 K 10:15 2:21; 2 K 12:20 15:20. We might, of course, substitute עֲצָמֶיךָ (cf. נִסְחָדֵי עֲצָמֵינוּ, Ps. 141:7; also Jer. 8:1) for שְׁלֵמֵךְ; but עֲצָמֶיךָ would hardly have been corrupted to מִשְׁמֵךְ.

The rhythm is improved by reading  $\text{קָהַל}$  instead of  $\text{קָהַל}$ ; see the conclusion of the notes on 1 i, above, p. 18.

(2\*) On the other hand, it is better to read, with J. D. Michaelis,  $\text{מַרְטֵל}$ , *martel*, *war-hammer* (cf. Jer. 51 20) instead of  $\text{מַרְטֵל}$ , *scatterer*. The incorrect spelling  $\text{מַרְטֵל}$  instead of  $\text{מַרְטֵל}$  is found also in Prov. 25 18. For the erroneous insertion of a *mater lectionis* cf. Kings 301 18. A  $\text{מַרְטֵל}$  (*martel*) is larger than a  $\text{מַקְבֵּת}$  (*mallet, beetle*). Judas received his surname Maccabæus while he was a boy; see AJSL 21 140, below. Both *martel* and *mallet*, however, are diminutive forms: *martel* (Lat. *martulus* for *marculus*) is derived from *marcus*, and *mallet* from *mall* or *maul* (Lat. *malleus*).

For the feminine suffix in  $\text{עַל־מִצְדָּה}$  we may substitute the masculine form  $\text{עַל־מִצְדָּה}$ ; but this change is not necessary:  $\text{עַל־מִצְדָּה}$  would refer to Nicanor; and  $\text{עַל־מִצְדָּה}$ , to the  $\text{עַד רְמִים}$  at the beginning of this section, i.e. the capital of the Seleucidan Kingdom; cf.  $\text{מִצְדָּה}$  in v. 11. Even in the preceding line (v. 14) we may read  $\text{מִצְדָּה}$  instead of  $\text{מִצְדָּה}$ .

For  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$  read  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$ , *mountain-fastness, stronghold*. This refers to the *ἀκρᾶ*, the citadel of Jerusalem, which was held by a Syrian garrison until this last outpost of the Seleucids in Judea was starved into surrender in May, 142 B.C. Simon's triumphant entrance into the Acra is glorified in Ps. 118; see AJSL 21 146, n. 43. For  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$  cf. 2 S 5 7 9 1 Chr. 11 8. The reading  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$  is better than the reading  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$ , *watch a watch* (W). But instead of  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$  we had, perhaps, better point  $\text{מַצְדָּה} = mēcādāh$ , the fem. of Arab. *maçād*. In Eccl. 9 14, on the other hand, it is better to read  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$  instead of  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$ . The term  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$  denotes *bastiles*, i.e. *movable towers* used by the besiegers of a strong place (BA 3 170 and 183). The *mound of earth* or *rampart* built by the besiegers is called  $\text{סִלְלָה}$ ; *battering engines* are termed  $\text{בָּרִים}$ ; see Ezekiel 47 16. The reading of the Received Text in Eccl. 9 14 is due to  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$  in Eccl. 9 12, just as  $\text{צִדָּה}$  instead of  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$  in Nah. 1 9 may be influenced by  $\text{צִדָּה}$  in 1 7. Judas Maccabæus besieged the Acra in 163 B.C. (see 1 Macc. 6 20; cf. also 1 8 3 4 4 2 4). After his great victory over Nicanor in 161 B.C. Judas Maccabæus would no doubt have undertaken a new attack on the Acra, if his meteoric career had not been ended by an untimely death.

The forms  $\text{צִדָּה}$ ,  $\text{צִדָּה}$ , and  $\text{צִדָּה}$  are infinitives like  $\text{קָטַר}$  in the preceding line; the inf. abs. Piel may have *e* in the final syllable instead of *o*.

For  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$  we must read  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$ ; the preceding  $\text{מַצְדָּה}$  is unaccented; cf. the notes on 1 8. For  $\text{מַצְדָּה} = \text{מַצְדָּה}$  see my lecture on Ecclesiastes in *Oriental Studies* (Boston, Ginn & Co., 1894) p. 247; cf. Kings 274 19 and  $\text{הַצֵּב}$  for  $\text{הַצֵּב} = \text{הַצֵּב}$ , Nah. 2 8.

(1 12) The first line of the third stanza is very corrupt.

The introductory clause,  $\text{כִּי אָמַר יְהוָה}$ , is a gloss.

Instead of  $\text{שְׁלֵמִים}$  we must read  $\text{מְלֵאִים}$ ;  $\text{מְלֵאִים}$  is preserved at the end of the preceding verse, while  $\text{שְׁלֵמִים}$  is the correct reading for  $\text{שְׁלֵמִים}$  in v. 14; see above (p. 25) *ad* 1 11. The last three consonants of  $\text{שְׁלֵמִים}$  may



retain ך before ךַּעֲנֵה, it must be taken as ך explicative; cf. Haupt, *Purim*, p. 15, l. 30.

For the explanation of the imagery in v. 12<sup>a</sup> by the prosaic gloss in v. 12<sup>b</sup> see my remarks on יִנְחֵי בַמַּעֲלֵי צָרֶךְ (Ps. 23 3) in AJSL 21 122 (cf. *ibid.* 23 222, n. 17) and for the ebbing of the high-tide of the Syrian persecution cf. 2 Macc. 5 17 6 12 7 12 22.

(13) Also v. 13 is an explanatory gloss, and מַעֲלֵי is a tertiary addition. The suffix in מַעֲלֵי refers to the יֵעַן בַּלִּיעַל in v. 11. For מַעֲלֵי point מַעֲלֵי, *his staff*; cf. Ps. 110 2 (מַעֲלֵי עֵץ) and בְּשֹׁבֶט בָּרָךְ, Ps. 2 9; cf. JHUC, No. 168, p. 90; No. 114, p. 110 (AJSL 21 147, n. 48). *His yoke* (cf. 1 Macc. 8 11 12) would be מַעֲלֵי (or מַעֲלֵי).

(21) In v. 1<sup>a</sup> מַבְשֵׁר is scribal expansion which may be derived from the Maccabean poem, Is. 52 7 (see *ad* 1 12, above, p. 28). Cf. below, the note וּפְסִים in 3 9. For מַשְׁמַע שְׁלוֹם cf. 1 Macc. 7 20 and for the *enjambement*, or shifting of the caesura, cf. e.g. Ps. 137 6 (OLZ 10 22) and Pes. 68 2 6 9 27 22 76 2 12 (AJSL 23 220) and below, note on 2 11.

(14<sup>b</sup>) A misplaced gloss to v. 1<sup>a</sup> is found at the end of the chapter in v. 14<sup>b</sup>: מַלְאֲכָה קִיל מַלְאֲכָה. For מַלְאֲכָה we must read מַלְאֲכָה, i.e. *scriptio defectiva* for מַלְאֲכָה; the final ה of מַלְאֲכָה is due to dittography: the first word of the following verse (3 1) begins with ה; cf. *Kings* 156 11 118 4. The suffix in מַלְאֲכָה refers to the מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר (3 12) i.e. the Seleucidan king of Syria; cf. 1 Macc. 1 44 2 24 7 10 27. If we read the feminine suffix (מַלְאֲכָה) it would refer to the עִיר רַמְתִּים in the following verse, i.e. the capital of the Seleucidan Kingdom. The editor who placed the first מַשַׁל of ב (3 1) after this gloss (2 14<sup>b</sup>) read מַלְאֲכָה or מַלְאֲכָה, and understood the suffix to refer to עִיר רַמְתִּים. Cf. the remarks on the suffixes in 3 12 13. The insertion of the first stanza of ב after the conclusion of 7 was suggested also by הִגִּי אֱלֹהִים (for הִגִּי נְפִיל עַלְדָּךְ) in 2 14 and 3 2.

(1) For the second מַשַׁל of v. 1, הִגִּי יְהוּדָה וְעַד שְׁלֵמֵי נִרְדָּךְ, cf. Ps. 76 12 (see n. 22 to my paper on Nicanor's Day in ZDMG 61 222) and 1 Macc. 1 22 4 22 6 22 7 22 2 Macc. 6 11 22 15 22.

The threefold כִּי at the beginning of the last three lines of this stanza may seem to some rather strange, but it is idiomatic Hebrew. The last כִּי is concessive (see above, p. 22, *ad* 1 10 and cf. Jer. 50 11, quoted below, in the notes on יִדְרֵךְ, 3 2) and therefore stressed; cf. my remarks on הִם כִּי־בָא הֵם, Jer. 17 2, in AJSL 19 122.

The addition of עוֹר after הִסִּיף is unnecessary and overburdens the hemistich.

The *scriptio plena* of the *o* in לַעֲבוֹר־בְּךָ may be due to dittography of the 7; cf. the remark on עַמּוֹד, 1 6. But the *o* is accented; we must read *la'vór-bakh*, not *la'vór-bákh*. Cf. also Syr. ܩܘܠܘܨ = Παύλος and ܠܝܩܘܠ = *liqtúl* (JBL 19 77, n. 104). The *e* and *o* in Heb. מֶלֶךְ, אֶלֶן, אֶלֶן, אֶלֶן are not long, but accented; we must read *síφρ, éζν, lttén, latál*. Heb. אֶבֶן should be pronounced like our *oven*; the *o* is not long as in *over*. The difference between the vowels in מֶלֶךְ (i.e. μέλχ, not μέλεχ!) and אֶבֶן (σέφρ) is:

the vowel in  $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\phi\rho = \text{קָפַר}$  corresponds to the vowel in the first syllable of English *leather* (in Hebrew: קָרַד) while the vowel in  $m\acute{a}llk\hbar = \text{מָלְךְ}$  should be pronounced like the *a* in English *lather* (in Hebrew: לָרַד).

Also  $\text{בְּלִיעַל}$ , i.e. Nicanor, the impersonation of  $\text{בְּלִיעַל}$  (cf.  $\text{עַן בְּלִיעַל}$ , 1 12 and Haupt, *Purim*, p. 5, l. 10) is a gloss; the hearers knew who was meant; cf. the indefinite  $\text{נִבְחָדוּ}$  and  $\text{אֲדַרְדְּרִי}$  in 2 44 and the Pythagorean  $\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{o}s \delta\phi\alpha$ .

Instead of reading  $\text{קָלָה}$ , as required by the *Qērē*, we may point the *Kēthiv*  $\text{כְּלָה}$ , following  $\text{συντελέσται}$ , as Pual:  $\text{כְּלָה}$ ; cf.  $\text{כְּלָה}$  in 4, vi. The sense is practically the same, whether we read  $\text{קָלָה}$  or  $\text{כְּלָה}$ ; the annihilation and extermination of Nicanor and the Syrian army at Adasa (1 Macc. 7 46) was certainly complete.

(8) The verb (שב) is here not transitive (JHVH restored) but intransitive: Jacob's glory returned, i.e. recovered = was recovered, regained; cf. *Kings* 199 4. In *Is.* 6 11 (cf. above, p. 19, ad 1 4) this intransitive שב, he recovered appears in connection with  $\text{לִי רָפָא}$  he was healed, lit. some one healed him; cf. *Kings* 289 10. We must read:  $\text{וְשָׁב וּרְפָאֵלִי}$ ; cf. also  $\text{וּשְׁבָה}$  in *Is.* 6 11. The addition of  $\text{וְיָהוָה}$  and  $\text{אִתּוֹ}$  in the present passage is due to a glossator.

(4) An additional (misplaced) gloss to this hemistich  $\text{וְהָיָה שֵׁשׁ יָמִים}$  is the clause  $\text{בְּיָמֵי דָבִיר}$  in v. 4; cf. my remarks on *Ps.* 68 10 11 in *AJSL* 23 22a.

(3) For  $\text{נָמַן 2°}$  we must insert  $\text{נָמַן}$ ; cf. *Ps.* 80 15. But it would be a mistake to substitute this reading also for  $\text{נָמַן 1°}$ . After  $\text{נָמַן}$  in the first hemistich  $\text{נָמַן}$  could easily be corrupted to  $\text{נָמַן}$ , just as we have  $\text{אֶמְלֵל}$  instead of  $\text{רָמַל}$  in 1 4; see above, ad loc. If the reading had been  $\text{נָמַן}$  in both hemistichs, the corruption to  $\text{נָמַן}$  could not be accounted for.

## 2

The third section consists of two seven-line stanzas followed by an appendix of four lines. Each line has 2 + 2 beats, i.e. the same meter which we find in *Ps.* 16; cf. Haupt, *Purim*, p. 18. The first two stanzas were written before the fall of Nineveh in B.C. 606, the appendix was added after Judas Maccabæus' victory at Adasa in 161 B.C.

For the heading,  $\text{בְּשָׂא נִינְוָה}$ , see above, p. 18, ad 1 1.

(3 2) Instead of  $\text{נִי}$  we must not point  $\text{נִי}$ , although the cuneiform name is *Ni(u)* i.e. *Ne'(u)* = Egypt. *nē(t)* which means *City* (*BA* 1 40). We find an *o* in Hebrew instead of Assy. *e* or *i*, not only in  $\text{רָאשׁוּ, בָּאָן, רָאשׁוּ}$  = Assy. *rešu, çenu, ekul*, but also in  $\text{סָרְרִתֵּן} = \check{S}arru-kenu$  and in  $\text{אֶסְרִי־דִינָן} = \check{A}tur-aza-iddina$ ; see *Ezra-Neh.* 31 2.

$\text{אֶמְלֵל}$  is a gloss.

For  $\text{אֶרְיִים}$  (with  $\text{א}$ ) read  $\text{אֶרְיִים}$ , with  $\text{א}$ ; see *Kings* 280 27 and cf. above, p. 27, the note on  $\text{אֶמְלֵל מֵאֵר}$ , 2 2. The plural  $\text{אֶרְיִים}$  is intensive (= the great Nile) just as  $\text{קַל נַרְרִית בְּבֵל}$ , *Ps.* 137 1 means *By Babylon's great river*, i.e. the Euphrates; see *OLZ* 10 46. Also  $\text{נַרְרִים}$  is a pluralis intensivus like

גְּדֵרִים, טַרְסִים, etc. (see *Kings* 206 = 270, n. \*): אַרְם טַרְסִיב = *Syria on the Great River*, i.e. *the Euphrates*.

The clause מִיָּם סָבִיב־לָהּ is a gloss to the following חִילָהּ הִיָּם; it might also be a variant (see *Kings* 213 4s) to the last hemistich of this verse, מִיָּם חִוּמָתָהּ (cf. the note on 2 י, i.e. ר, β) but this is improbable.

For חִילָהּ הִיָּם read חִיל הִיָּם; the relative pronoun prefixed to this clause may be omitted. The term הִיָּם is used also of a large river, just as *iamm* and *baḥr* in Arabic; cf. *Is.* 19 s. The Assyrians, on the other hand, called the Persian Gulf *nāru marratu*, the Bitter (i.e. Salt Water) River; cf. *JAOS* 16 civ and the comments on the Babylonian map of the world in the translation of Ezekiel (SBOT) p. 100, l. 36; see also the descriptive pamphlet *Die Regenbogen-Bibel* (Leipzig, 1906) p. 10.

For מִיָּם, at the beginning of the last hemistich, point מִיָּם (W). In *Gen.* 6 17, on the other hand, J. D. Michaelis read מִיָּם: — דָּגַי מִבְּרֵא אֶחָד רִמְבוּל מִיָּם עַל הָאָרֶץ; see E. Suess, *Die Sinifluth* (Prag, 1883) pp. 27, 50. I pointed out in *KAT*<sup>2</sup> (1883) p. 66, n. 3 (cf. *AJSL* 1 100, n. 2) that מִבְּרֵא was a popular adaptation of Assyrian *abūbu*, deluge; cf. *KAT*<sup>2</sup> (1902) p. 546, n. 2. For מ = א see also *Kings* 190 s; Haupt, *Purim*, p. 23, l. 23.

(9) For מִיָּם טַרְסִיבֵּיב point טַרְסִיבֵּיב.

The following וּמַצְרִים וְאֵין קָצֶה is a gloss; וּמַצְרִים וְאֵין קָצֶה belongs to כִּשׁוּ, and מִיָּם is an addition to וְלִיבִים, derived from *Ez.* 30 s; cf. the remarks on the glosses θ and φ, also א, γ and ב, α.

The verb הִיָּם is a gloss; cf. the gloss הִיָּהּ in *Is.* 5 1 Cant. 8 11; see *AJSL* 19 100, below.

For מִיָּם בְּעֶרְחָהּ read, with W, בְּעֶרְחָהּ; cf. מִיָּם עֲלֵיךְ instead of מִיָּם עֲלֵיךְ in 1 14. For the prefixed ב see *Numbers* 57 4s.

(10) The נִם before עֲלֵיךְ is due to vertical dittography; cf. *Kings* 86 s and below, note on v. 13.

For the imperfect, מִיָּם טַרְסִיבֵּיב, read the perfect, טַרְסִיבֵּיב; cf. מִיָּם טַרְסִיבֵּיב in the last hemistich. The ' may be due to dittography of the ט; cf. the note on מִיָּם טַרְסִיבֵּיב, 2 1 (ר = ו = ט).

The prefixed מִיָּם is a scribal expansion, derived from *Lam.* 4 1 2 19; *Lam.* 2 19 is a gloss; cf. the gloss מִיָּם מִיָּם in *Is.* 51 19.

For the accentuation מִיָּם (so, too, *Obad.* 11) instead of מִיָּם see above, p. 18. The form מִיָּם might, of course, be derived from מִיָּם = מִיָּם, Assyrian *nadū*, to cast, throw, just as we have in Assyrian: *inçabtu*, aer-ring, from מִיָּם = מִיָּם, Eth. *ḡāḡ*; or in Arabic: *ḡaḡir* alongside of *naḡir*, trough (*AJSL* 23 100) but the reading מִיָּם is preferable. The verb is not denominative, derived from מִיָּם, as W suggests.

Heb. מִיָּם is an Assyrian loanword: *ziqq = zinq = singu*, from *sanāqu*, to bind, confine = Arab. *ḡānuka = ḡāqa = Assyrian. ḡqu*; cf. Heb. מִיָּם and מִיָּם; see *Kings* 125 s. For the infixed n in מִיָּם cf. the remarks on Aram. מִיָּם = מִיָּם in the note on מִיָּם, 3 s. The ' in מִיָּם for מִיָּם is due to partial assimilation of the initial מ to the following nasal; cf. מִיָּם, *time* = Assyrian. *simānu*, from *uḡsāma*; see *KAT*<sup>2</sup>, 650, n. 3. For מִיָּם

(Jer. 40:14) = וקים cf. Assyr. *agappu* = *gappu* (for *gadpu*) wing; see *Kings* 98:10. The ך in נך represents an infixed ת (cf. נר = נר; see below, *ad v.* 17<sup>b</sup> and *Kings* 258:2) while the ך in כנה is infixed just as the ך in ציטק and קנט; the כ in כנה is due to partial assimilation of the initial ך to the final ך. The noun כנה, *wing* is ultimately identical with כה, *hand*, and the original form is כה. Heb. וקים, *fetters* and שוק, *street* are ultimately derived from the same root; cf. *Kings* 133, n. †

(11) After חשכ we must supply (but not insert) כום חמה (cf. Is. 51:17 = Jer. 25:15) = כום שמה שכמה (Ez. 23:22) = τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ αἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ἀργῆς αὐτοῦ (*Rev.* 16:19; cf. 14:10). Cf. also Obad. 15.

The participle נעלמה means *covered*, i.e. *overcome* = *fainting*, falling into a swoon. In Arabic, *ǧāʿiḡa* means *to cover*, and *ǧūʿiḡa* 'alaihi, lit. a *cover was put upon him*, is the common expression for *he swooned*, became senseless. It is not necessary to read נעלמה; cf. קלמי, *are overcome*, lie *fainting*, Is. 51:20 and היתלה, *he was overcome* (by the heat) *Jon.* 4:1; also שמוך, *faints*, *fails*, Is. 57:15. The inf. Hiph. הקלים means in *Ecc.* 3:11 *covering*, *veil* = κάλυμμα, 2 *Cor.* 3:15; cf. Haupt, *Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905) p. 42, n. 18. The gratuitous emendation עמל, proposed by Kamenetzky (*ZAT* 24:22) and Macdonald (*JBL* 18:22) was suggested long ago by a *critic of authority* in C. H. H. Wright's commentary (London, 1883) p. 437. J. D. Michaelis' explanation of נעלמה as a privative denominative (*AJSL* 22:2, l. 3) of עלמה, i.e. *deflowered*, *devirginated* (cf. our term *maiden fortress*) is impossible; נעלמה means *young woman*, not *virgin*.

The following hemistichal pair (v. 11<sup>b</sup>) is a gloss to v. 14 which represents the original sequel of v. 11; vv. 12 and 13 must be inserted after v. 15, at the end of the original poem; they were displaced by the glosses in vv. 16 and 17. Cf. the note on l. 11 (p. 25).

(14) In v. 14 the two clauses חוק מבצרך and ורמסי בחמר explains the preceding באי בטיט, and חוק מבצרך is a gloss to the entire verse, and should therefore be placed after the second hemistich.

The line קי מנזר שאבי קך does not refer to *boiling water* which is to be poured over the besiegers; nor does it mean *Fill the moats* (cf. above, p. 16, n. 10). It refers to the fact that the besiegers will cut off the water-supply of Nineveh, so that the Ninevites will depend again on the rain water as in the time before Sennacherib built the great waterworks of Nineveh.

The phrase באי בטיט, *Go into the mud* means *Knead the soil with your feet*; the clay (Span. *adobe*) was mixed with water, and then worked with the feet. The emendation בוטי (Grätz, N; cf. *Zech.* 10:6) is gratuitous. The inhabitants of the besieged city will be forced to make bricks in order to restore the fortifications destroyed by the besiegers. In Assyrian we find the same phrase: *šīa erēbu* (HW 301<sup>b</sup>). Heb. בטיט = Assyr. *šīu* stands for *šītu*, with partial assimilation of the feminine

ח as in Syr. קשטמא, *archer* for קשתא, from Assy. *qaštu*, bow (a biconsonantal feminine form) pl. *qašāti*; cf. AJSL 23 ss, below.

(15) The two משלים of v. 15 must be transposed; cf. the remarks on the transpositions in 1 11 14 and 2 4.

For הרחבך read הרחבך. The reading הרחבך is not a graphic corruption, but it is influenced by הרחבך in the second hemistich (cf. the remarks on אמלל 1° for ראב in 1 4).

These imperatives are concessive: *just make thyself numerous = even if thou makest thyself numerous*, i.e. in spite of thy large population and the numerous troops manning thy fortresses, fire will devour thee. Sometimes such imperatives are ironical, e.g. in the gloss Eccl. 11 9:—

Just walk in the ways of thy heart  
and in the sight of thine eyes;  
But know that for all these things  
to judgment God will bring thee!

Cf. also the two Maccabean passages Is. 47 12 and Lam. 4 21 (OLZ 10 ss).

The מ in ארבה is not prothetic, as in Syr. ארקיע for ריקיע, etc. (Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*<sup>2</sup>, § 51). The stem is not רבי, but ארב; cf. אבר = בר (AJSL 23 717) and Assy. *aribu* (or *eribu*) a swarm of locusts. The final ה in ארבה represents the nominal affix 'י; ארבה = *arbai*, just as Assy. *gabšû*, inflated skin (Arab *tauf*) = *gabšaiu*; cf. Ezekiel 65 12 and AJSL 1 170, n. 4. The Assy. verb *arābu* (to devastate the fields) is denominative; Tennyson says: *This Philip and the black-faced swarms of Spain . . . come locusting upon us.*

The third hemistich of v. 15, חאכלך כילק, is a gloss (so W) to the first hemistich תם־חאכלך אש. Also vv. 16 and 17 contain glosses to v. 15; the antiquarian and biological erudition displayed in these verses cannot be credited to the original poet.

For שם, at the beginning of v. 15, read תם or תם; we find the same mistake in Ps. 137 4, where we must read כרנם, although (Eccl. 4 14) instead of כרשם; see OLZ 10 ss, n. 3.

(16. 17) V. 16<sup>a</sup> and v. 17<sup>a</sup> expand Nahum's terse statement regarding the countless population of Nineveh, while v. 16<sup>b</sup> and v. 17<sup>b</sup> supply some biological information with regard to the locusts. In v. 17 we find also some tertiary glosses (cf. ב, צצ).

(16<sup>b</sup>) The hemistich ילק משט ויקף severs the connection between v. 16<sup>a</sup> and v. 17<sup>a</sup> which form a משל with 2 + 2 beats.

The verb משט refers to the *exuviation* (or *ecdysis*) of the locust. We use *exuvia* of the skins, etc., of animals, which are shed or sloughed off, while in Latin, *exuvia* is used also for *spoils*, just as Heb. משט means also to *plunder*. Arab. *sāḫa*, to shed the skin, is connected with the root של which we have in שלל, to *plunder*; Arab. *sāḫa*; cf. AJSL 23 ss. A. E. Shipley states in the article on locusts, EB 2808: On leaving the egg the young immediately cast their skin, an operation repeated about the

6<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, 21<sup>st</sup>, 31<sup>st</sup>, and 50<sup>th</sup> day; the wings attain their perfect development and the locust becomes capable of flight only at the 6<sup>th</sup> and last molt. The Assyr. stem *pašāḫu*, to obliterate, has no connection with Heb. **פָּשַׁח**, but is a transposition of **פָּשַׁח**, to rinse, to wash off.

The term **יִלֵּק** is not derived from **לִקַּק** = **לָטַט** (cf. *Kings* 175, n. †) but it may be connected with Assyr. *ilqitu* (HW 76) and Arab. *ḡalaḡā* which denotes a *leaping gait* of the camel, so that **יִלֵּק** may mean *leaper*; cf. our *grasshopper* and German *Sprengling* or *Sprengsel* = locust. The second syllable of German *Heuschreck* represents the obsolete verb *schrecken* = to leap; cf. Luther's Bible, Job 39 20: *Kannst du es schrecken wie die Heuschrecken?* i.e. *Canst thou make him (the horse) leap as a locust?* Heb. **הֲרַעַשְׁנוּ כְּאַרְבֵּה**.

(17<sup>b</sup>) The **ד** in **נָדַד** (whence the name *Cádiz*) is an infix **ד**, and **נ** is connected with **קָד** and Assyr. *kāru*, wall; cf. the remarks on **נָדַד** above, p. 32, and *AJSL* 23 27. In **בַּיּוֹם קָדָה** (which is perhaps influenced by **בַּיּוֹם צָדָה**, **בַּיּוֹם צָדָה**, 1 1) should be transposed: we must read **בַּקֵּר הַיּוֹם**, in the cool of the day (for **קָר**, cool, see *AJSL* 23 28) i.e. *from sunset to sunrise*; in Arabic, the dual *al-bardāni* (cf. Heb. **בָּרַד**) means *morning and evening*; and *bardu 'n-nahāri* = *daybreak*. Toward nightfall (**לְרֵחַת הַיּוֹם**), Gen. 3 8; cf. my remarks in *AJSL* 22 24, n. 17) the locusts alight on the ground, but the next morning, as soon as the sun has warmed them a little, they resume their flight and disappear. As long as they are chilled by the night air and have their wings weighted with dew, they are unable to fly; cf. Dr. Post's article in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 3, p. 130.

The last hemistich, **וְלֹא יִדְרַע מִקְוֵוֹ**, has been expanded by a prefixed and an affixed gloss, **וְנָדַד** and **אֵינָם**; both are superfluous. For **מִקְוֵוֹ** we had better read **מִקְוֵמָם** (cf. **הַיּוֹמִים**) although the suffix refers to the collective **וְנִכְבִּי**. The singular suffix in **מִקְוֵוֹ** may be influenced by **וְלֹא יִדְרַע מִקְוֵוֹ**, Ps. 103 18 = Job 7 10; **מִקְוֵוֹ** may also mean the place (*Kings* 299 20). The singular **וְנָדַד** for **וְנָדְדוּ** may be due to haplography; cf. Haupt, *Purim*, p. 23, l. 9; see also above, p. 29, *ad* **לְעֵבֹר־בְּךָ**, 2 1.

(18<sup>a</sup>) The clause **וְהַיּוֹם הַזֶּה יִרְכָּלְךָ** may be concessive, just as the imperatives in v. 15<sup>b</sup>; but it is not necessary to substitute the imperative (so WM) in this gloss; cf. the conditional clause **אִם־יִרְכָּלְךָ בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה** in v. 13. Heb. **יִרְכָּלְךָ** is dissyllabic (*rōkhlā'ikk*).

(17<sup>c</sup>) For **מִקְוֵוֹ** we must not read **מְנַדְדִּיךָ** (see *Isaiah* 107 21 and below, note on **הַשְׁלַחָה**, 3 8) or **רַחֲמִים** (Grätz) but we must point: **מִקְוֵוֹ**, *the exorcists, conjurers*, part. Piel of **נָדַד** = Assyr. *nazāru*, to curse, execrate (adjure, conjure). Alongside of **נָדַד** we find also **נָדַד** in Assyrian (cf. *AJSL* 23 22). The primitive meaning of this stem is *to bind* (cf. **נָדַד**, *girdle*) just as **נָדַד**, *to curse* means originally *to bind*; cf. Assyr. *arru*, bird-catcher and *irru*, rope, snare (HW 138) also our *spellbound*. In Arabic, *mundir* means *admonisher, apostle, preacher*, just as **כַּהֵן** means *priest* in Hebrew, while the corresponding Arab. *kāhin* means *seer, diviner*. Heb.

נִדָּ, *devotee, Nazirite* is derived from the same stem; a *vow* is merely a *promissory oath*, cf. our *vowing vengeance* = German *Rache gelobend*. The stem נִדָּ is a differentiated dialectic byform of נִדָּ; cf. מִנְדָּן alongside of מִנְדָּ; see *Proverbs* 51 14; *Kings* 192 22 275 22.

Also נִדָּ is a Babylonian loanword = Assyrian *tupšarru*, scribe, i.e. hierogrammatist. The word is ultimately Sumerian, a compound of *dup*, tablet (which has passed into Syriac as ܕܘܦܬܐ) and *sar*, to write. Instead of נִדָּ and נִדָּ (Jer. 51 17) we ought to point: נִדָּ and נִדָּ; the נ is due to the *u*-vowel; a *t* followed by *u* sounds like נ, while a *p* followed by *i* sounds like כ; therefore the Assyrians often write *tu* for *p*, *ku* for *q*, and *ki* for *p*; see my ASKT 169, § 13; *Kings* 86 11 208 12. The *a* in נִדָּ instead of נִדָּ or נִדָּ is due to the fact that after a נ an *d* sounds almost like *δ*, just as our *wand* is pronounced *wand*; cf. BA 1 22. The late compiler of the oracle in Jer. 50 51 (which was written about the end of the reign of John Hyrcanus, 135–104 B.C.) took נִדָּ to mean נִדָּ = שׂוֹרֵר, i.e. a military officer; cf. *Judges* 85 20; contrast *Kings* 304 17. See also the note on נִדָּ, v. 13.

The form נִדָּ (= Arab. *jābi*) at the end of v. 17<sup>a</sup> represents a correction of the preceding נִדָּ. For the apocope of the termination *ai* or *é* cf. מִשְׁלָה = מִשְׁלָה, etc. (see AJSL 22 22, n. 14) and for undeleted corrigenda cf. *Kings* 194 20. The variants נִדָּ נִדָּ may be rendered in German: *Sprengsel, Sprengling*; and in English: *creaker, cricket* (*cricket* means *creaker*, i.e. *chirper*). In Assyrian we could use *êribu* (= *âribu*, participle of אִרַב) and *eribû* (i.e. אִרַבִּי = Heb. אִרְבָּה; see above, ad v. 15). The stem of נִדָּ = נִדָּ is akin to גָּבַא, *to gather*, so that נִדָּ means originally a *gathering or swarm* (of locusts). Cf. Ethiop. *gûbâ'ê*, collection, congregation; Assyrian *gabbu* (for *gub'u*) all; *gubbu* (for *gub'u*) cistern (cf. Heb. גַּבִּי 2 K 3 11 Jer 14 12 and גָּבַא, *pool, swamp*, Is. 30 14 Ez. 47 11) lit. *reservoir* (גַּבִּי) i.e. a place where water collects or is collected or stored. The root גִּב is a modification of גָּב or גָּב; קִי, *cord* is a collection of strands twisted or woven together. Heb. גָּבַל, גָּבַל; גָּבַל, גָּבַל; גָּבַל, גָּבַל; Assyrian *gabbu*, *gabbu*, *kâmil*, etc. are all derivations of the same root גָּב = גָּב = קָב = קָב = קָב = קָב = קָב = קָב; cf. the remarks on אִרַב = אִרַב = אִרַב in the note on אִרַב, v. 10 and AJSL 23 22.

(12) The prefixed כל is scribal expansion.

אִרַב should be read אִרַב; cf. the remarks on אִרַב, v. 8.

For אִרַב, at the beginning of the second hemistich, substitute אִרַב, which we find in the Received Text at the beginning of v. 13; אִרַב before אִרַב is scribal expansion.

V. 12<sup>b</sup> is an explanatory gloss: the Assyrian fortifications are like fig-trees (תְּמָרִים) and their garrisons like firstripe figs; if the תְּמָרִים are shaken, the אִרַב manning them fall into the hands of the besiegers, lit. *into the mouth of the eater*, i.e. *they are swallowed up*. For *firstripe figs* see Haupt, *Biblische Liebeslieder* (Leipzig, 1907) n. 11 on No. X.

(13) In v. 13 the hemistichal pair אִרַב אִרַב נִדָּ נִדָּ

is an explanatory gloss in which מרדח represents a tertiary scribal expansion.

The first two words of this verse, הנה עמד, belong to v. 12.

Only the two hemistichs נשים בקרבך and אכלה־אש בריחך are genuine, and they must be transposed; cf. the remarks on 1 u 14. If נשים בקרבך was the second hemistich, we can understand why עמד, which represents the beginning of the second hemistich of the preceding verse, appears before נשים. For vertical dittography see above, *ad* v. 10.

The clause אכלה־אש בריחך is conditional; cf. the concessive clause דרכית רכלך at the beginning of v. 16. For the unaccented upbeat (*Aufstakt*) in אכלה־אש cf. above, *ad* 1 f.

For נשים, *women*, we must read נשים, *we shall destroy*, from שמוס, or rather ישימו, *they will destroy*. Similarly ש has for נשים, Num. 21 30 *συνεταρα*. The compiler of the late oracle Jer. 50 57 51 30 (cf. Is. 19 12 and the note on מוסר, v. 17\*) read נשים; but if the Assyrians had been *women*, the siege of Nineveh would not have lasted so long.

(18) The section 3 1-11, apart from the glosses relegated to the margin, represents an old poem composed by an Israelitish poet in Assyria about 607 B.C. before the destruction of Nineveh in 606 B.C. But the last two verses of c. 3 were added by the Maccabean compiler of this festal liturgy for the celebration of Nicanor's Day. The suffixes in רעך, ארריך, רעך, לשטרך, מנתך, שמטך, עריך, should be feminine, referring to the City of Nineveh (i.e. the Seleucidan Kingdom), not masculine; רעך מלך אשור is a gloss. Cf. above, p. 29, *ad* 2 14<sup>b</sup> (ב, ρ).

For נמו instead of נמו cf. the remarks on יד, v. 10.

After נמו we must supply (but not insert) שנתם (Ps. 76 6) or שנת שלום (Jer. 51 30 31). All these passages are Maccabean: Ps. 76 refers to Judas Maccabæus' victory over Nicanor; see my remarks in ZDMG 61 222; for Jer. 51 cf. the note on מוסר, v. 17.

Instead of ישכנו read ישנו (not ישכנו).

For ארריך cf. ארריך, 2 6.

Instead of נשאו read נשאו, from נשאו, as in 1 K 22 17. The stem נש (whence the name נשון, *Surgy*, i.e. *rising in billows*; see JAOS 16 ciii, †) means *to gambol, caper, leap, spring, skip* (cf. Jer. 50 11, quoted in the notes on ידר, Nah. 3 2) but not *to scatter*.

The addition ער הדרים is derived from the parallel passage in Kings (see Kings 171 10 and cf. the remarks on the gloss ער in v. 9).

(19) Instead of ענה read, with W, ענה; cf. Kings 293 12; contrast ענה for ענה in 2 14 (ד, β). This noun ענה (for *gūllājatū*) corresponds to Syr. ענה (or ענה) *deliverance from pain*, etc. Cf. also Arab. *jāhhā 'l-tājjāta* (= *ḡāssa'ahā*) which does not mean *to enlarge a wound* (in the head) but *to mitigate it*.

The final clause, כי על מי לא עברה רעתך המד, is a prosaic explanatory gloss; the suffix in רעתך may be either masculine or feminine; cf. the note on מלאכה at the end of c. 2.

## 7

The fourth section consists of ten couplets with 3 + 2 beats in each line, i.e. the same meter as in the second Maccabean section, ב. The first nine couplets (which may be grouped in three sections; cf. Haupt, *Purim*, p. 47, l. 24 and the Maccabean psalm in the Book of Jonah, AJSL 23<sup>206</sup>) were composed after the destruction of Nineveh in 606; the final couplet, on the other hand, is a Maccabean appendix, just as the last four lines of 1.

Section 7 consists of 3:2 + 2+14; 2 of 3+10; 3 of 3 1 and 4+7 + 1 11-2:2; 4 of 1 1-10. Consequently 3 1+4+7 must be inserted before 1 11-2:2, and 2+14, preceded by 3:2, should stand after c. 8. Section 7 (2+14) has, it may be supposed, been inserted after ב, because it is in the same meter (3 + 2) while 2 appears at the end of the book, because it has a different meter (2 + 2). The reason why the first line of ב (3 1) has been inserted after 2 1<sup>b</sup> has been indicated on p. 29, in the note on ב, ρ; the insertion of the first three משלים of 7 between the first and the second משל of ב (3 1:4) has been explained above, on p. 28. Cf. my restoration of the Hebrew text of Canticles in AJSL 19<sup>22-23</sup> and my arrangement of Ecclesiastes in Haupt, *Kokleth oder Weltchmerz in der Bibel* (Leipzig, 1905). Cf. also the remarks on transpositions in ancient Arabic poems in Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber* (Hannover, 1864) p. vii; Ahlwardt, *Bemerkungen über die Ächtheit der alten Arabischen Gedichte* (Greifswald, 1872) pp. 18 and 84.

(1 1<sup>b</sup>) For the heading, חזון נהום האלקיש, see above, p. 18. The prefixed ספר is a gloss; cf. EB 8259.

(3 1) The singulars, שוט, איוסן, סוס, מרכבה, פרש, רכב, חניז, פטר, קנן, פטר, חניז, רכב, פרש, מרכבה, סוס, איוסן, שוט (and רכב in gloss β) are collective; cf. our *horse* = cavalry.

The participle רודר means *crying, neighing, not galloping*. Barth has pointed out that this stem is identical with Arab. *hādara*, to roar, which is used of the roaring of the sea, the braying of an ass, etc. *Hādara* means especially *ḥāyūḡata ft gajri ḥiqḥiqatin*, to roar without inflation of the *ḥiqḥiqā*, i.e. the faucial bag (German *Brüllsack*) of a male camel which he inflates and projects out of his throat at the season of rut, when he sees a female camel. Arab. *hadra* means (like שאן; cf. שמש, 1 s) *crash*; Arab. *hadir* = roaring of the waves (cf. שאן ימים, Ps. 85 s). *Hadir*, cooing of doves, stands for *hadil*. For the transposition in רודר = *hādara* cf. AJSL 22<sup>200</sup>, n. 10. Our verb to *bray* was formerly used also with reference to the bull, deer, etc., as well as to man. On the other hand, Herodotus (3 s) uses *φθέγγεσθαι* with reference to a horse.

In the Song of Deborah (Jud. 5 s) the hemistichal pair,

אֲתִקְלוּ קַקְבֵי סוּס מִתְהַדְדוּת דְּהַדְדוּת אֲבִירָיו

means: *Then clattered the hoofs of the horses from the yells, the yells of his heroes, i.e. owing to the (incessant frantic) yelling of the heroes (of*

the enemies) urging on their steeds, the horses galloped so that their hoofs clattered. In Arabic, *rākāḏa* means not only to urge on a horse, to gallop, but also to flee; cf. the note on *מסלה*, 3 a. In Scotland, *to thud* means to move with velocity; cf. *הלטו* = they thudded away. In German the *kick* is called *Hufschlag*, i.e. hoof-beat (cf. Lat. *pulsus*, Greek *κτύπος*). Apart from *Zagen* for *Schreien*, Luther translates Jud. 5 a correctly: *Da rasselten der Pferde Füße vor dem Zagen ihrer mächtigen Reiter*. The suffix in *מביריו* refers to the enemy; cf. *מביריו* and *בבוריו*, Nah. 2 a s. We must not read *הקלטי*, nor need we join the prefixed *ב* of *דריוח* 1° to *סם*; contrast Ps. 68 a (AJSL 23 22). The first *דריוח* is not a suspended *status constructus*, but *status absolutus*; for the repetition cf. v. 5:

הדים טלו מִיָּדָהּ מִבְּרִיחָהּ אֶלֶּי יִשְׂרָאֵל

and gloss *θ* in Ps. 68 (AJSL 23 22). *§* renders Jud. 5 a: *הדיוח נפל עקבא* and *דרכשה* *נן רבמתא רחילא רחיקתא*; Syriac *רבמתא*, *roaring*, is a correct translation of Heb. *דריוח*; contrast ZDMG 56 46. *¶* renders freely: *ungulae equorum ceciderunt, fugientibus impetu, et per praeceps ruentibus fortissimis hostium*; cf. ZDMG 56 46. In this passage, *ceciderunt* does not mean *they fell* = *they stumbled*, but *they came down with a crash*; cf. *fulmina cadentia* and our *the blows fell*, also *נפל* in Gen. 24 4 2 K 5 a. They tumbled all over themselves trying to get away. In Arabic, *yaḏqa'a*, to fall, means also 'to rush away' (*ḏāhaba yanḏalaqa sarī'an*) = German *fortstürzen*. The comments on Jud. 5 a in ZDMG 56 46-48 are unsatisfactory, and the restoration of this line, given on p. 184, is gratuitous.

Also in Jer. 8 a *צִלְלוּחַ מִבְּרִיחַ* denotes the yells of the horsemen, not the neighing of the horses. We must read:

מִן שִׁמְעַת נִרְחַת סוּסִים  
מִצְהָלוֹת מִבְּרִיחַ רַעֲשָׁה כְּלִי-אֶרֶץ:

The prefixed *ב* before *צִלְלוּחַ* is not a nominal preformative, but the preposition *מן*, as in Jud. 5 a. We must point *מִצְהָלוֹת*, plur. constr. of *צִהָלָה*; cf. *Isaiah* 110 a. The noun *מִצְהָלוֹת* in the late passage Jer. 13 a has a different meaning: it is explained by the following gloss *וְשִׁת וְנִתְד*; cf. Syr. *צִהָלָה*, *lustful*. The noun *צִהָלָה* represents a form *ḥāhalat*, not *ḥuhālat*. The explanation of *מִצְהָלוֹת* in the prefixed gloss *מִקוֹל* is correct. *¶* has *מִבְּרִיחַ* for *מִבְּרִיחַ*, *¶* (*a voce hinnituum*) *pugnatorum ejus*; but *קלא רבמללא רנבריהו*, while *קלא רבמללא* is rendered: *הקלא רכשה*. Heb. *נרחה*, however, means *snorting*, not *neighing*; see my paper on the cuneiform name of the sperm-whale, AJSL 23 22. In Arabic, *ḥāhala* is used of the cry of a horse (*ḥāhala 'l-fārasu ḏā ḥāyūyāta*) but in German the term *wiehern* (i.e. to neigh, to whinny) is used also of a *roaring laughter*; cf. our *horse-laugh* (see Haupt, *Purim*, p. 13, l. 30). *Roaring* may be used with reference to a lion, a tempest, the sea, boisterous mirth; it may denote also an outcry of distress, etc.



'l-fārāsa bi-rjilāihī ʾilā 'stahāyahu lil-'ādmi; — ḥatta = ḥaḏqa). Heb. מַטְלָה has here about the same meaning as Arab. *mutarākiq*. Cf. also Arab. *uḏkara* which means *to move with springs or bounds, to rear, to race, etc.*

(2<sup>b</sup>) The first three מַטְלָה of 7 have been displaced in the Received Text by gloss β. The first מַטְלָה of β (2<sup>b</sup>) is a variant (cf. *Kings* 213<sup>48</sup>) to the second מַטְלָה of 8<sub>2</sub>, and the two מַטְלָה of the following verse (2<sup>c</sup>) represent an explanatory gloss to this variant: 2<sup>c</sup> explains the second hemistich of 2<sup>b</sup>; (הַיְרָשִׁים הִרְקָלִי) and 2<sup>b</sup> gives an explanation of the first hemistich of 2<sup>b</sup>; it is therefore better to transpose the two מַטְלָה of 2<sup>c</sup> (cf. the transposition of the two מַטְלָה of 3<sub>12</sub>; also 3<sub>12</sub> and 1<sub>12</sub>). The glossator understood הַיְרָשִׁים to mean *horses* (of the chariots) not *horsemen*.

Instead of כָּמַש we must, with W, read כָּמַש (cf. *Kings* 182<sub>2</sub> and *Esth.* 1<sub>12</sub> 3<sub>4</sub>) and לַפָּרָה (cf. the Homeric λαμπρόων, *Il.* 1104; *Od.* 4<sub>222</sub>) instead of פָּלֶדֶת; cf. 1 *Makk.* 6<sub>22</sub>: κατηύλαξεν ὡς λαμπάδες πυρός. The verb לָפַר is denominative, derived from לָפַר, torch, and this may be a transposition of *dappū* = *dappir*, a byform of Assyri. *dipāru*, torch. The collective הַרְכָב may be construed as a feminine in spite of *Ex.* 14<sub>7</sub>; cf. מַרְאִיָּה in v. 5<sup>b</sup>, which must not be (with W) changed into מַרְאִיָּה. The corresponding Arabic word *rakb*, a troop of horsemen, cavalcade, etc., may be construed either as masculine or feminine; cf. Wright-de Goeje, 2<sub>101</sub> A; 1<sub>22</sub> B (§ 148, rem.).

The clause בַּיּוֹם הַבֵּינִי between the two hemistichs of 2<sup>b</sup> is a misplaced gloss to v. 3<sup>a</sup>, just as זָכַר, at the beginning of v. 6, is a misplaced gloss to חָדַע in 1<sub>14</sub>, and יַעֲשֶׂלִי בְהַלְבוֹחִים (v. 6) a misplaced gloss to יַעֲשֶׂלִי in the present מַטְלָה. The fact that the gloss יַעֲשֶׂלִי בְהַלְבוֹחִים, which gives another explanation of יַעֲשֶׂלִי, appears in the Received Text at the end of 3<sub>2</sub>, shows that 3<sub>2</sub> must have originally stood near 2<sub>4</sub>, just as the two glosses אֵךְ מוֹרִידִים שָׂכְנוּ צְרוּחָה (Ps. 68<sub>10</sub>) and וְאֵךְ מוֹרִידִים לְשֶׁבֶן יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים (Ps. 68<sub>7</sub>) show that Ps. 68<sub>7</sub> stood originally near Ps. 68<sub>10</sub>; see *AJSL* 23<sub>22</sub>; cf. also my remarks on the gloss מִצֵּן נִים in *Cant.* 4<sub>12</sub> (*AJSL* 18<sub>22</sub>, n. 85 on No. 8) and Haupt, *Biblische Liebeslieder* (Leipzig, 1907) p. 27, l. 9.

For בָּרַשׁ read, with W, מָרַשׁ; cf. מָרַשׁ for מָרַשׁ, 1 *S.* 17<sub>24</sub>; בָּרַח for מָרַח; contrast מָרַח for מָרַח in 3<sub>12</sub>. The rendering of ἄ, καὶ ὁ λαὸς θορυβήσονται, is correct, although θορυβήσονται is somewhat vague; this verb means especially *to be confused, mixed up, to be in a confused mass or jumble*; θόρυβος = רִמְזוֹן, מְרִמְזָה; cf. *ad* v. 9<sup>a</sup>. The passive הִרְקָלִי means *they are frenzied*, i.e. *they run amuck*, rushing to the attack in a state of frenzy, charging furiously with desperate resolution, at breakneck speed. Their chargers *run like mad* (cf. מְרִמְזָה הִרְכָב in v. 5 and בשָׁנִין יִרְגַּז, 2 *K.* 9<sub>20</sub>) as though they had the (blind) *stagger*, German *Koller*; cf. תִּרְקָלִי. In Arabic the verb *ra'ila* means *to be stupid, doltish*, and the Pual of its synonym (*hāmuqa*, to be stupid, dull): *hūmuqa* means especially *to be stupefied by wine, to drink wine (šariba*

ʿi-xámra). Cf. also Greek (πρόσσω) μάομαι (which is connected with μαμάω and μαίνομαι, also πανία and μίνος) especially μεμαώς, also μεναίω. In the two misplaced tertiary glosses *ישלו בהלכותם* (2<sup>e</sup>) and *ישלו בנייתם* (3<sup>s</sup>) this *furious precipitation* was misinterpreted to mean *stumbling in their course or over the corpses*. The *Kéltiv* הלכותם must not be read *הלכותם*, but the ן should be transposed as in *יודע*, 17, and in *לודב* for *לודב*, 3<sup>s</sup>; we must read the plural הלכותם, not the singular הלכותם, as pointed in the *Qéré*. Nor is the *Qéré* of *ישלו* in the second gloss correct; we must not read *וקשלו*, but *ישלו*, as in the first gloss. For the *scriptio defectiva* of the t in הלכותם cf. *Kings* 84<sup>ss</sup>.

(5<sup>b</sup>) The verb *ירצצו* is not frequentative, but intensive; it does not mean *they move hither and thither*, in a zigzag manner, but *they run fast*, quick as a flash, swift as lightning; cf. our *they run 'like blazes'* and modern Arab. *rámah*, to run = *lámah*, *láma'*.

(5<sup>a</sup>) For *יחרוללו* read the singular, *יחרולל*; cf. *Kings* 170, n.\*; 296<sup>ss</sup>. The plural is conformed to *ישחקשקו* in the second hemistich. For the singular in the first hemistich and the plural in the second cf. *Gea-Kautzsch*, § 145, g. This *raging of the chariots* (German *dahinrasen*) means *driving furiously*, טב בשנשן, cf. the remarks on *הרעלו*.

Just as *יחרוללחל*, *Esth.* 4<sup>s</sup> is connected with *חיל*, so *ישחקשקו* must be combined with *שוק*, *leg*; it means *they move their legs*, i.e. *they speed*; cf. *Ps.* 147<sup>10</sup>:  
 לֹא בַבֹּרַח הָסוּם לֹא רַבְשֻׁקֵי הָאִישׁ יִרְגָּה

Cf. our phrase *he had the legs of him*, i.e. he was quicker. In certain parts of England *to leg* means *to run nimbly*. Assyr. *puridu*, swift messenger, originally *runner*, which has passed into Arabic as *barid*, courier, is identical with *puridu*, leg; see *KB* 6<sup>1008</sup> (*mē puridi* = מִרְתָּלִים). Both Heb. מִרְד, mule and German *Pferd*, horse (cf. *palfrey*) are derived from the same stem, and מִרַד, מִרַשׁ, שִׁמַר, etc. go back to the same root, מִר, to *flee, fly, speed*.

(3<sup>s</sup>) The first two words of v. 3 belong to v. 2; see above, p. 39.

In *ילרב* the ן must be transposed as in *יודע*, 17, also *ברק* should be pointed as *פִּרְעַל*; the omission of the ן may be due to haplography; cf. the note on *לעבור*, 21. Both *לודב* and *ברק* are denominative participles like *למדה* in 2<sup>a</sup>. Cf. also the note on 2<sup>11</sup> and *הפוצץ*, *Ps.* 144<sup>s</sup>. The verb *barāqu* is used also in Assyrian, and *láhība*, to flare, is used in Arabic (*láhībati 'n-náru*).

Although *חרב* is fem. (cf. 3<sup>11</sup>) the preceding verbal predicate may be masc. Nor is the masculine form preferred for rhythmical reasons: *לדבת* would be dissyllabic: *lohevth-xérv*; cf. the anapestic beginning in *צַפְרֵה־דֶרֶךְ* (*cappe-dérkh*) 2<sup>s</sup>; *אֶכְלֵה־אֵשׁ* (*ákhla-éš*) 3<sup>11</sup>; *וּנִינְה* (*ú-Ninué*) 2<sup>a</sup>; *וַאֲמַחְזֵהָ* (*yamhothéha*; cf. the note on *באר*, 2<sup>s</sup> and *Nöldke*, *Syr. Gr.* 3, § 33, A) 2<sup>s</sup>; *בֹּזְזוּ־כֵסֶף* (*bozzu-késf*) 2<sup>10</sup>.

Both the prefixed *חלל* *ורב* and the affixed *לניה* *ואין* are explanatory glosses to *פִּנְר*; for *רב* we had better point *רַב*. In *פִּנְר* the first word is not a substantive in the construct state, but a participle

with recessive accent; cf. Ges.-Kautzsch, § 29, f. We find the same form in Is. 30 *st*, where we must read:

דָּהָה יִדְהָה כָּא מִמְרוֹק בְּעֶרְאֵפֵי וּבְקֶר מִשְׁאָה  
שִׁמְתִּיז • מְלֵאז עָם וְלוֹטִיז כָּאֵשׁ אֶבְלָח:

For *קִשְׂאָה* we must point *מִשְׂאָה*, *His crash*, i.e. *His thunder-peals*, from a noun *מִשְׂאָה*; see the note on *וְחֶשֶׁא*, 1 s. Similarly the Masorites have mispointed the plural of *מִשְׂאָה* (*משואות*) Ps. 73 *is* 74 *s*: *משואות*, as though it were a derivative of *מָשָׂא*. The prefixed *ש*, *name*, before *ידה* is a gloss. In 2 K 23 *is* the form *מִשְׂאָהִים* (which may have been pronounced *מִשְׂרָהִים* or even *מִשָּׂהִים*; cf. *בָּם* = *בָּרָם*, etc.) appears as *מִשָּׂהִים*. The form *מִרְצָה* must be derived from *רָצַץ*, and *מִשְׂ(ר)הִים* means *their crash*, i.e. *ruin, debris*; cf. *Kings* 295 *ss*; also 272 *is*, where I have stated that *קְנֵה רִצְוֹן* does not mean a *broken reed*, but a *split reed*. This is not *ein aufgeschlitztes Rohr* (Ges.-Buhl<sup>14</sup>, s.v. *רִצְוֹן*) but *ein zerfasertes Rohr* (frayed, raveled at the ends).

The participle *בְּכָבֵד* in the present passage means *numerous*; cf. German *die schwere Menge* and the Hithpael in *הִתְכַבְּדִי*, v. 15; also *כָּבֵד עָם*, Num. 20 *ss* 1 K 8 *s*; *עֵיב כָּבֵד*, Ex. 8 *ss*, etc. For *בְּכָבֵד* instead of *בְּכָבֵד* cf. *רִבְצָה*, *רִבְצָה*, *רִבְצָה*, *רִבְצָה*, etc.

The last two words of this verse, *יִשְׁלַח בְּנִיחָם*, are a gloss to *הִרְעִילוּ*, 2 *is*; see above, p. 41.

(2 *is*) The suffix in *נִבְרָדוּ* (i.e. *scriptio defectiva* for *נִבְרָדוּ*) † and *אִהְיֶה* (v. 6) does not refer to *מִיָּצֵחַ* (i.e. Judas Maccabæus) in v. 2 (so W) but to the enemy besieging Nineveh; cf. *Jer.* 4 *is* 8 *is*.

Both *מְאָדָּם*, *reddened*, and *מְחֻלְעָם*, *crimsoned*, mean *bespattered with blood*, *נִגְאָלִים בָּרֵם*, Lam. 4 *is* Is. 59 *s*. Ⓞ *ἐξ ἀνθρώπων* read *מְאָדָּם*, and for *מְחֻלְעָם*, apparently, *מְחֻלְעָבִים* (cf. Arab. *lā'iba bis-sajfi yat-tursi* ‡) combining *מְחֻלְעָבִים* with *בָּאֵשׁ* (*ἐμπαίζοντας ἐν πυρὶ*). For *מְאָדָּם* cf. my restoration of the Song of Vengeance in Is. 63 *is* (JHUC, No. 163, p. 49<sup>a</sup>). The denominative participle *מְחֻלְעָם* does not mean *clad in scarlet*, but *crimsoned*, scil. *with blood*. The term *crimson* is a doublet of *carmine*, and both are derived from *kermes*, *alkermes* (Arab. *al-qirmiz*). This red dyestuff consists of the dried bodies of the females of the *Coccus ilicis* (Heb. *חִוְלַע שֵׁנִי*) etc. Heb. *מְחֻלְעָם* corresponds to the Shakespearean *purpled*:

Our lusty English, all with purpled hands,  
Dyed in the dying slaughter of their foes.

\* In cases like *שִׁמְתִּיז מְלֵאז* there is an unaccented syllable between the two beats: *שִׁמְתִּיז* is pronounced *sfathā(h)ū*; cf. *אִבְדוּ* = *אִבְדוּ*, etc. In some cases we must substitute the poetic form *מִשְׂדָּה* for *מִשְׂדָּה*.

† Cf. *לְבַבְרָם*, Nah. 2 *s* and *יִרְדְּדוּ* = *καὶ τοῖς πλοῖσιν αὐτοῦ*, 1 S 30 *ss*. In Assyrian, *sarrānu*, his kings, etc., is the usual form; see *Kings* 270, n. <sup>a</sup>.

‡ Arab. *turs*, shield, is a transposition of *sutr* = *sātūr*; *tatārrasa* = *tasātūra*.

There has been a sanguinary battle: everything is bespattered with blood, not only the shields of the warriors attacking Nineveh, but also their faces, hands, etc. They have received numerous wounds, but, undaunted, their nobles rush to the wall of Nineveh, shielded by the large pavises or mantelets (מכד). At the beginning of v. 6 we may supply (but not insert) the adversative וגם, *yet*; cf. נ"ם תאכלך אמ, 3 ג.

(11) A misplaced (incorrect) gloss to מְהִלְעִים is found at the end of v. 11: וּפְנֵי קִלְמֵי קָבְצוּ מְאָרִיר, lit. the faces of all of them have gathered (*i.e.* acquired\*) glow, *i.e.* all their faces are suffused with color, they are flushed (from excitement, eagerness, and exertion). The noun מְאָרִיר, *glow*, is connected with מְרִיר, *pot*, lit. *boiler*. The stem is מור; the מ in מְאָרִיר must be explained according to Ges.-Kautzsch, § 72, p. The form מְאָרִיר (*pārūr*) has two long vowels; it is a form like נִמְשִׁים and נִמְצָרִים, but from a stem עו. In Arabic the verb *fāra*, *iafūru* means *to boil*; cf. *fāra* 'l-*qidaru*, the pot boils. Arab. *fayr*, boiling, means also a *flush of passion, excitement, precipitation*, etc. In certain parts of England *flush* denotes the *hot stage of a fever*; cf. Syr. מְשָׁתָא, fever = Assyr. *isātu*, fire. In Assyrian we have *pūru*, urn; cf. Haupt, *Purim*, p. 20, l. 22, and the paper on Nicanor's Day in ZDMG 61 m. The noun מְאָרִיר means *boiler*, then *heater*, *glowing hotness*, *glow*, *flush*, *vidid redness*; and the phrase וּפְנֵי קִלְמֵי קָבְצוּ מְאָרִיר means: *all their faces blazed vivid, burning crimson*.

(6) The first word of v. 6, יָרָר, is a misplaced (corrective) gloss to יָרַע, 1 א; see above, p. 26.

The suffix in אֲרִיִּי refers to the enemy; the suffix in הוֹמָתָה refers to the besieged city, *i.e.* Nineveh.

The clause בְּהִלְכֹתָם יִשְׁלֹוּ בְּהִלְכֹתָם is a misplaced (incorrect) gloss to יִדְרְעֻוּ in v. 4<sup>b</sup>; see above, p. 41.

Heb. סִכְךָ means here *pavise, mantelet*; cf. above, p. 13 and the cuts in BA 3 175.

(9<sup>b</sup>) Between vv. 6 and 7 we must insert the second כִּשְׁל of v. 9, while v. 9<sup>a</sup> must be inserted between vv. 7 and 8. The clause at the beginning of v. 9<sup>b</sup>, וְהִמָּה נִשְׁמָה, is a gloss. The first word of this gloss has displaced the verbal predicate of נִשְׁמָה at the end of v. 9<sup>a</sup>; cf. the note on מְלֵא in הִלֵּא in 1 n. The original text of this hemistich was קִיָּהּ יִזְבְּקָה which appears in the Received Text as קִיָּהּ הִיא וְהִמָּה. The מ in מִיִּזְבְּקָהּ must be canceled, and the two consonants הִי should be transposed; cf. יִדְרַע for יִדְרַע, 1 ז; לְהִיב for וְהִיב, 3 א.

The imperatives עֲמְדוּ עֲמְדוּ are addressed by the Ninevite captains to their soldiers.

At the end of the first hemistich we must insert יִצְעִיקוּ, *they* (the Ninevite captains) *yell*. This verb has dropped out here just as יִצְעִלִים at the end of 1 ז or תְּבַרַח (or תִּגְתַּק) in Ps. 68 א (AJSL 23 22, n. 86).

\* Cf. Lat. *tram colligere, stitim ab aestu colligere*, etc.

The second hemistich, וַיִּזְעַק בְּפָנֵיהֶם, refers again to the Ninevite soldiers: they do not turn back in their panic, their disorderly flight cannot be stopped. This sudden fright of the soldiers is not due to the assault of the besiegers, but to the flooding of the city. For the intransitive Hiphil בְּפָנֵיהֶם cf. רָשַׁע, Jer. 47: quoted in the note on יָדָר, 32.

(7) The plural הַבְּרִיחֹת is due to the preceding שָׁעָר; cf. JBL 19 00, second paragraph; Numbers 49 27; Kings 206 14. The phrase does not mean *the gates of the rivers*, but *the gates of the river* (singular) i.e. the three flood-gates (especially the second and third) of the Khôsar at the point in the eastern wall of Nineveh where this river enters the city; cf. BA 3 100, l. 36; 100, l. 18; 102, l. 28; 102, l. 24, and Map II in Col. Billerbeck's paper cited above, p. 16, n. 9. The gates of the river (i.e. the flood-gates in the three dams built across the Khôsar) were opened, while the sluice-gates at the side of the Khôsar, through which the water of the river flowed into the moats and canals, were shut. Thereupon the unchecked spring-flood of the Khôsar submerged the city.

The singular הַיָּם is collective; cf. above, p. 37. It denotes the royal palaces in the Acropolis of Nineveh, on the mound known as *Kouyunjik*.

Heb. נָמַח means lit. *it is waved* (Arab. *mayj*, plur. *amûdj* means *wave, billow*) i.e. *moved up and down* or *to and fro*; it is shaken, swayed. The unchecked flood of the Khôsar undermines the foundation of the Acropolis, and the masonry begins to surge as a ship on the waves.

(9\*) In the second hemistich we must read מִיִּמֵּי יְרוּשָׁה. 6 has 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎢 *udara aúrâs*, 3 *aquae ejus*; מִיִּמֵּי is not a dittogram of מַיִם (W) nor is the form a reduplication of מַי; see Kings 200 10. The suffix in מִיִּמֵּי refers to בְּרִכָּה, not to the river; the suffix in יְרוּשָׁה, to the city. The form יְרוּשָׁה is the impf. Qal of a denominative verb derived from מְרוּסָה; cf. Deut. 7 20: יִרְסָם מְרוּסָה גִּלְגָּל עַד הַשְּׂמֵרָם. The flooding of the city produces a מְרוּסָה מַת, 1 S 5 11; cf. מְרוּסָה יְרוּשָׁה, Zech. 14 10. This denominative verb רוּסָה, *engulf, overwhelm, swallow up, ruin*, etc., is more frequent than is generally supposed: all the forms of the alleged stem are forms of רוּסָה. Instead of לְרוּסָם and יְרוּסָם we must point לְרוּסָם and יְרוּסָם; the forms הִרְמוּנִי (*he has swallowed me up*, Jer. 51 4) and הִרְמוּסָם are Polel forms of רוּסָה; even הִרְמוֹן is derived from רוּסָה. For the construct הִרְמוֹן cf. הִרְמוֹן, constr. הִרְמוֹן, from הִרְמוֹן; see BA 1 100, l. 4. The primary meaning of רוּסָה is *to roar*: in Assy. *mûmu* (= *malûmu*, i.e. the masculine of the billows of the sea; in *ûmu* (HW 33) the roaring of a tempest; in הִרְמוֹן, the roaring of a multitude shouting together. For Assy. *ûmu, mûmu, Tî'âmat* see note 96 to my paper cited above, p. 15, n. 4. Assy. *mummu* (i.e. *mûmu*) was combined with מְרוּסָה by Friedrich Delitzsch in *Geo. Smith's Chaldäische Genesis* (Leipzig, 1876) p. 297, l. 10.

(8) For הִרְצָה read הִרְצָה = הִרְצָה, *she will be taken out*, i.e. *carried off*; cf. 2 S 12 21 and Kings 253 20; for הִרְצָה = הִרְצָה see *ibid.* 119 20; cf. the remarks on בָּאָר, Nah. 2 2.



For  $\text{שָׁרָה}$ , *female parent* =  $\text{לֵוִי}$ , *queen* cf. *dam* (female parent) = *dame* (lady; in French also *queen* in chess) and *sire* (male parent) = *Sire* (O King). Just as Assyr. *šigrēti*, ladies of the palace, appears in Hebrew as  $\text{שָׁרָה}$ , female parent of a beast, so the daughters of the Kings of France were formerly known as *les dames de France*, while in English *dams* means female parents of beasts. The  $\text{ל}$  in  $\text{לֵוִי}$  instead of  $\text{ר}$  is due to a popular adaptation, connecting this word with the obscene Heb. verb  $\text{שָׁלַח}$ ; cf. the Talmudic  $\text{שְׂרָרִיטוֹ}$ , concubines, Sanh. 95<sup>b</sup>.

The verb  $\text{שָׁלַח}$  means originally (like Arab. *sājala* = *ṣābba*) to pour out; Arab. *mā'u dākarin*, water of a male, denotes *semen virile*. The stem  $\text{שָׁלַח}$  may be a Šaphel (see above, p. 24) of  $\text{לָל}$ , well (Assyr. *gillu*) while  $\text{שָׁרָה}$ , female parent, may be a Šaphel of  $\text{רָא}$ , young; cf.  $\text{רָאָה}$ , v. 13. The construct state of  $\text{שָׁרָה}$  is  $\text{שָׁרָה}$ , just as the construct of  $\text{לָבָב}$  is  $\text{לָבָב}$ ; the form  $\text{שָׁרָה}$ , Ex. 13 stands for  $\text{שָׁרָה}$ , i.e. the syncopated byform *šigru* for *šigaru*, just as we have in Assyrian: *zikru* = *zikaru*, male, and *šikru* = *šikaru* =  $\text{שָׁרָה}$  (a Šaphel of  $\text{רָא}$ ; see AJSL 23 200). For *zikru* = *zikaru*, etc. (cf. Heb.  $\text{לֵב}$ , *libb* =  $\text{לָבָב}$ , *libab*) see AJSL 3 108, l. 6; and for the forms of the construct state, AJSL 1 22, n. 1.

For  $\text{אֲמִתְיָהּ מְגִדָּה כְּקוֹל יוֹנִים}$  cf. Assyr. *kima summātī idāmumā ardātī* (see JAOS 22 1, n. 6 and HW 220<sup>b</sup>) and E. Littmann, *Neuarabische Volkspoesie* (Berlin, 1902) pp. 52 and 133, l. 96: *qābēt miḥ il-ḥamām 'alēē illi qākiḥ 'a-djār inūh*, I will cry for thee like a dove which sits on a tree and moans. Heb.  $\text{נָאָה}$  appears in Arabic as *na'aja*, to bellow like an ox (syn. *zāra*). In Assyrian we have *nagāgu* (HW 446<sup>b</sup>). In Syriac,  $\text{נָאָה}$  is used of the *groaning* of camels, just as Arab. *naḥir* denotes not only the *cooing* of a dove, but also the *braying* of an ass and the *roaring* of the sea, etc. (cf. the note on  $\text{רָדַד}$ , 3 1, above, p. 37). Arab. *naḥā* means *cooing* and also *lament*; Arab. *nisā' nauḥ* means *wailing women*, Heb.  $\text{נָאָה}$ ; cf. the translation of Ezekiel (in the Polychrome Bible) p. 163, l. 7. For the  $\text{ה}$  in  $\text{נָאָה}$  (=  $\text{נָאָה}$ ,  $\text{נָאָה}$ ) see JBL 19 104, l. 3; AJSL 22 200, below.

For the plural  $\text{לָבָבִים}$  (cf.  $\text{נְבוֹרִים}$  for  $\text{נְבוֹרִים}$ , 3 1) we must not substitute the singular,  $\text{לָבָבִי}$ ; the form  $\text{לָבָבִי}$  is the regular constr. plur. of  $\text{לָבָב}$ ; cf.  $\text{שֵׁנִי}$  = *inabē*, grapes. Even if there were no byform  $\text{לָבָב}$ , the plural of  $\text{לָב}$  might be  $\text{לָבָבִי}$ ; cf.  $\text{עַמִּי}$  for  $\text{עַמִּי}$ ; Syr.  $\text{עַמְמָא}$ , etc. (Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.* 1, § 93). For *heart* = *breast* cf. the German phrase *Hand aufs Herz*.

(10) The rhythm is improved by inserting  $\text{ו}$  before  $\text{פָּה}$  2°. For the unaccented  $\text{פָּה}$  1° cf. the note on  $\text{רָיָה}$ , 1 1.

Before  $\text{כָּבֵד}$  we must insert  $\text{שָׁלַח}$ , and for  $\text{כָּבֵד}$  we had better read  $\text{כָּבֵד}$ , just as we must substitute  $\text{כָּבֵד}$  for  $\text{כָּבוֹד}$  in Ps. 16 1, etc. (cf. *Genesis* 107 10). For the erroneous insertion of the *mater lectionis*  $\text{ו}$  cf. *Kings* 301 12. Heb.  $\text{וּשְׁלַח שָׁלַח כָּבֵד}$  would be in Assyrian: *šallata kabīta šullā* (see HW 663<sup>b</sup>).

The prefixed  $\text{מ}$  before  $\text{כָּלִיכָלִי}$  (read *mikkāl-kāl*) need not be omitted, as W suggests.

(11) The three terms *בִּיקָה* and *מִבְּקָה* and *מִבְּקָה* are generally supposed to be substantives; W: *Öde und Verödung und Verheerung*; A. R. S. Kennedy (in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, 3<sup>ms</sup>): *a wild and weary waste*. *מִבְּקָה*, however, is clearly a fem. part. Pual, and we had better substitute participles (as in 8<sup>s</sup>) for the first two terms, reading *בִּיקָה* and *מִבְּקָה*, i.e. part. Qal and Poal of *בָּקַק*; cf. *בִּיקָה* and *מִבְּקָה*; 2 s. The two forms were originally written *defective* (*בִּיקָה* and *מִבְּקָה*) and the *ק* was haplographed. W cites Is. 24<sup>1</sup>: *הִנֵּה יְהוָה בּוֹקֵק רֶאֶץ וּבּוֹלֵקָה*. On the other hand, we must point *לִמְנָחָה*, for the *liturgy*, instead of *לִמְנָחָה*; see AJSL 23<sup>ms</sup>, n. 2; cf. also *Kings* 184 s.

The stem *בָּקַק* is connected with *מָסָה*; cf. Ps. 6<sup>1</sup>: *בִּרְמֵסַי עֵשׂוּי אֲמָסָה*, *I water my bed with tears*; see *Ezekiel* 64<sup>ms</sup>. In Syriac, *מְסִיחָא* means *watery* (i.e. *running, tearful*) eyes; *לְבָא מְסִיחָא*, a *watery heart*, is a *cowardly heart*; *לְבָא מְסִיחָא* means *to enervate*. Heb. *לִבּוֹ נָפַס* *his heart becomes watery* means *his courage fails*; he is discouraged, disheartened, dejected. In Arabic, *masās* means *impure, brackish water*, also *pure water*; cf. *Kings* 270 s. In Ethiopic, *masāya*, *ḫēmsā* means *liquefy, to dissolve*, and the quadrilateral *māsāna*, *to putrefy*, is derived from the same root (מָסָה = מָסָה). Syr. *מְסִיחָא* means a *putrid corpse*. For *שְׂרָדָא* = *שְׂרָדָא* = *שלמתא* see above, on *זִרְהָ שְׂלֵמָךְ*, 114.

The last clause of v. 11, *וּפְנֵי כָלֵם קִבְּצוּ סְאֻרֵר* (cf. Joel 2<sup>6</sup>) is a misplaced (erroneous) gloss to *מִתְּלַעִים*, v. 4; see above, p. 43.

(12) The *מַרְעָה* should be inserted after *אֵיִה*; cf. *מַרְעָה* Pa. 24<sup>10</sup>, etc. (Ges.-Kautzsch, § 136, c; Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*<sup>2</sup>, § 221) also *בִּרְעֵר בְּקִלְהֵוּא עֵשָׂה*, 1<sup>s</sup>.

Instead of *מַרְעָה* read, with W, *מַעְרָה*.

For *מַעְרָה* cf. *מַרְעָה* *לְכַסְיִים* cf. *מַרְעָה* *לְכַסְיִים*, Jer. 47<sup>s</sup>, quoted above, p. 39.

At the beginning of the second line omit the relative pronoun; cf. 1, γ.

The addition of *אֵיִה* after *הַלֵּךְ* is superfluous; so, too, *אֵי* at the beginning of the following verse.

For *לְבִיא* read, with W (following *Ἐπὶ ἐπορεύθη λέων τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν ἐκεῖ, Ἔ ad quam ivit leo ut ingrederetur illuc, § לחמן*) *לְבִיא*. This mistake is due to *לְבִיאָחִי* at the end of the following line.

Before *אֵיִה* omit *וַיִּרְאֵהוּ*; this gloss is derived from *נִרְחַז* in the following line.

(13) For the omission of *אֵיִה* before *מִרְעָה* see the notes on the preceding verse.

For *בְּרִי* read *בְּרִי*; cf. *בְּרִי* for *בְּרִי*, v. 4. In Esth. 1<sup>18</sup>, on the other hand, we must read *וּבְרִי* (cf. Job 39<sup>ms</sup>) for *וּבְרִי*; the *ו* before *קָנָה* is the *Waw apodosis*: *וּבְרִי בִדְוֹן וְקָנָה* means: *Whenever there is disrespect, there is wrath*; cf. the gloss in Eccl. 5<sup>s</sup>: *בְּרִיב חֲלֻמֹת וְדַבְלִים*, *in many a dream there are vanities*. For *רִי* *sufficiency* see *Proverbs* 60<sup>18</sup>. In Arabic, *kufiā*, *sufficiency*, means especially *food*.

(14) The last couplet is a Maccabean appendix, just as the last four lines of 1. It is, therefore, not necessary to substitute, with W, mascu-

line suffixes. In the Maccabean appendix to  $\lambda$  we must substitute feminine forms for the masculine suffixes;  $\text{מלך אשור}$  is a gloss; see above, p. 36. The feminine suffixes refer to the  $\text{דער רמים}$ , i.e. the Seleucidan Kingdom, and this may be the reason why the beginning of  $\text{ב}$  has been inserted after the conclusion of  $\text{ד}$ ; cf. above, p. 29.

For  $\text{דגני אלף}$  we must read again, as in the Maccabean passage 34,  $\text{דגני נאל עליך}$ .

For  $\text{רקבה}$  read  $\text{רקבך}$ , *thy lair* (= German *Lager*) i.e. *the camp of the Syrians*. For the burning of the Syrian camp  $\text{בששן}$  cf. 1 Macc. 4. 20. For the confusion of the suffixes cf. the note on  $\text{עליך}$  114 instead of  $\text{אפה עליך}$ . The readings  $\text{סבכבה}$ , *thy thicket* (Smend *apud* W) and  $\text{ארבבה}$ , *thy den* (PSBA 20 122; see above, *ad השלחה*, v. 8) are not good.  $\text{Ὁ τὸ πλεθὸς σου}$  read  $\text{רכבה}$ . In Arabic the lion is called *er-râbid* or *er-rabbâd*; this would be in Hebrew:  $\text{ריבץ}$  and  $\text{רבץ}$ . The corruption of  $\text{רבץ}$  to  $\text{רבבך}$  was influenced by  $\text{באש מלחה הרכב}$  in v. 4. The scribe who wrote  $\text{רבבך}$  probably understood  $\text{כלפידים}$  for  $\text{רבבך}$  (v. 5) to mean that the Ninevite chariots were burnt.

The following clause,  $\text{וכפידך תאכלהירב}$ , is a gloss (cf. Ps. 137. 3; see OLZ 10 26).

Also  $\text{מארץ}$  after  $\text{הברזית}$  must be omitted.

The last clause of c. 2 is a gloss to the first verse of this chapter.

## INDEX

### TO CHAPTERS AND VERSES OF THE RECEIVED TEXT

With Corresponding Sections, Stanzas, and Glosses in the present edition.

1 1 <sup>a</sup> : $\lambda$ , heading	2 1 : $\text{ב}$ , iii	3 1 : $\text{ב}$ , i
1 <sup>b</sup> : $\text{ד}$ , heading	2 : ii	2-3 : $\text{ד}$ , i, ii
2 <sup>a</sup> : $\text{א}$ , i	3 : iii	4-7 : $\text{ב}$ , i
2 <sup>b</sup> : vii	4 : $\text{ד}$ , ii	8-11 : $\lambda$ , i, ii, 1
3 <sup>a</sup> : vii	5 : $\beta$	12-13 : ii, 6-7
3 <sup>b</sup> : i	6 : iii	14 : 2-3
4-8 : ii-vi	7 : iv	15 <sup>a</sup> : 5
9 <sup>a</sup> : vii	8 : v	15 <sup>b</sup> : 4
9 <sup>b</sup> : vi	9 <sup>a</sup> : iv	16 <sup>a</sup> : $\xi$
10 : viii	9 <sup>b</sup> : iii	16 <sup>b</sup> : $\mu$
11 : $\text{ב}$ , ii	10-14 : vi-x	17 : $\xi$
12 : iii		17 <sup>b</sup> : $\pi$
13 : $\circ$		18-19 : iii
14 : ii		

ומחנק ללבאותי                      מִרְחַף כְּדֵי גִרְתִּי      13 ix  
 ומעגתיו מרפה:                      וימלא מִרְחַף חֲרִי

נאמדיה צבאות                      הנני נפל עליך      14 x  
 יהכרתיו מִמֶּנִּי מִרְסָךְ:                      והבערתי בעשן ר'בצד'

		1	1 <sup>b</sup>	(α)
	והעִרְשִׁים הָרַעְלוּ: 11	3	4 <sup>b</sup>	(β)
	כברקים ירוצו		5 <sup>b</sup>	
	שתקשקון כרחקות:		5 <sup>a</sup>	
פארור	§ 11 (ε) ופני קלם קנצו פארור	3	8	(γ)
אריה	13 (α) אריה (ι) גור (θ) אריה (η) אשר	3	9 <sup>b</sup>	(δ)
מארץ (μ)			14	(λ)

§ 8 יגשלו כניחם (εε)

§ 6 יגשלו כהליחם (וו)

### ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations AJSL, BA, HW, JAOS, JHUC, OLZ, ZDMG are explained above, pp. 15-17, nn. 2, 1, 11, 14, 5, 4, respectively. — For AJP, ASKT, AV, EB, JBL, KAT, KB, OT, PSBA, SBOT, ZA, ZAT, ZK, *§§*, *§*, *§*, *§*, see this JOURNAL (JBL) 19 18; cf. AJSL 18 207 23 222 and Haupt, *Purim* (Leipzig, 1906) p. 53. — M = Marti; N = Nowack; W = Wellhausen. — The names of Biblical Books printed in *italics* denote the Critical Notes on the Hebrew text in SBOT; the first number after the name refers to the page; the second, to the line; e.g. *Kings* 301 18 = Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings (SBOT) page 301, line 16.

16 <sup>a</sup> (o)	תאכלוך כילק	12 (x)	כל	13 (p)	הנה
12 <sup>b</sup> (o)	אם-יָוִעוּ וּנְפְלוּ עַל-פִּי אוֹכֵל				
18 (r)	לֹא-יָבִין <sup>28</sup> נִפְתָּחוּ שַׁעֲרֵי אֶרֶץ			18 (v)	מֶלֶךְ אֲשׁוּר
18 (φ)	עַל הַחַרְיִים	19 (x)	כִּי עַל מִי לֹא עֲבָרָה רַעְתָּן תִּמְד		
17 2 ונרדז' (aa)	אֵיִם (ββ)	טב (γγ)		18 פרוח (δδ)	

## ד

חזון נחום האלקושי 1 1<sup>b</sup>

3 2 i A	קוֹל-שׁוֹט וּקוֹל-רֶעֶשׂ אֹמֵן וּמִרְכָּבָה מִרְקָדָה	וְסוֹם דָּהָר פָּרֵשׂ מִעֲלֵהֶי: <sup>a</sup>
3 ii	לֹהֵב-בְּחָרֹב וּבְרִיק חֲנִית	יִוְכַבֵּד פָּנָיו אֲנֹשִׁי-חֵיִל מִתְּלַפְּסִים [ו]:
2 4 <sup>a</sup>	מִגֵּן נְבוֹרָדוֹ מֵאֲדָם	
6 iii	אֲדִירָיו יִמְהַרְרוּ חוֹמָתָה	וְהִבֵּן הַסֶּכֶד: וְאֵין מִפְּנֵה:
9 <sup>b</sup>	עֲמָדוֹ עֲמָדוֹ יִדְעִיקוּ	
7 iv B	שַׁעֲרֵי הַנְּהַרֹת נִפְתָּחוּ וְנִינְוָה כִּבְרַכַת מִים	וְהִדְיֹכַר נִמּוֹן: מִיִּמֵּיהָ יְהוֹמָה:
8 v	וְהִצְאָה הַגְּלִיתָה הַעֲלָתָה וְאִמְהַתִּיה מִגְּהֻגָת כְּקוֹל־יוֹנִים	שָׁנַל הַמֶּלֶךְ מִתַּפְּפַת עַל-לִבְבָהֶן:
10 vi	בְּזֹרְקָםָּ יִבְּזוּ וְהֵב וְשָׁלוֹ שָׁלַל כִּבְד	אִי-קָצָה לַתְּכוּנָה מִכֹּל-כְּלֵי חֲמָדָה:
11 vii C	בְּקוֹקָה וּמְבוֹקָקָה וּמְבַלְקָה וּפֶקַ בְּרַבִּים חֲלָלָה	וְלֹב נִמָּם בְּכָל מִתְּנִים [ו]:
12 viii	אֵי-הָיָהוּ {מֵעוֹן אֲרִיֹת יִהְיֶה לְכֹזְאֲרֵשׁם אֲרִיָּה	וּמֵעָרָה 8 לְכַפְיָרִים וְאֵין מִחֲרִיד:

ג

משא נינדה

1 1\*

היִשְׁבֵּה בִּיאָרִים <sup>א</sup>	הִתִּיטְבִי מִנָּא *	3 8 i A
מִים חוּמְתָהּ:	יְחִלֶּה הַיָּם	
וְלוֹבִים בְּעוֹרְתָהּ:	כּוֹשׁ עֲצָמָה <sup>ב</sup>	9
הִלְכָה בְשָׁבִי	נִסְחָדִיא לְגָלָה	10
בְּרָאשׁ חוֹצוֹת	יְטַלְלֶיהָ רִפְשׁוֹ	
יְדוֹ נוֹרָל	וְעַל־נִכְבְּדֶיהָ	
רָתְקוּ בְּקוֹים:	וְכָל גְּדוּלָהּ	
תְּהִי נַעֲלָמָה: *	נִסְאָתָּ תִשְׁכַּרִי	11 ii B
שָׂאֲבִי לָךְ	מִי מַצּוֹר	14
הַחֲזִיקִי מִלְּקוֹנִי <sup>ג</sup>	בְּאֵי בְשִׁיטָּ <sup>ד</sup>	
הַתְּכַבְּדִי כְּאֹרְכָה:	הַתְּרִיבִי כִּילֶק <sup>ה</sup>	15 <sup>ב</sup>
תִּכְרִיתְךָ תִּרְכַּבֵּ: *	וְנִסְחָדִיא כְּלֶךְ אִשׁ <sup>ו</sup>	15 <sup>א</sup>
[עֲמֶךָ] כְּפוּרִים: *	מִכְּבָרֶיךָ תֵּאָנִים	12
[יְשִׁימוֹ בְּקֶרְבְּךָ: *	וְאֹכְלֵהָ אִשׁ בְּרִיחֶיךָ <sup>ז</sup>	13
יִשְׁנֵן אֲדִירֶיךָ	נִמְוֹ רִעֵיךָ *	18 iii C
וְאֵין מִקְבֶּקֶץ:	נִפְצוּ עִמָּךְ *	
נִחְלָה מִכְּתֶיךָ	אֵין־נִזְהָה לְשִׁבְרֶיךָ	19
תִּקְעֶרְכָּה עֲלֶיךָ *	שְׁמַעֲי שְׁמַעֲךָ <sup>ח</sup>	

9 ומצרים ואין קצה	(8) אשר	(7) אשר	(6) מים סביב-לה	8 אמון	(5) 8
כל	(9) גם	(10) גם	(11) היו	פוט	(4) 9
14 ורמסי בחמר	(11) ילק פשט ויעף	(12) ילק פשט ויעף	מעוז מאויב	גם-את תבקשי	(3) 11
				חוקי מכצריך	(2) 14
			כעקר הניזום	החונים בגירות	(1) 17 <sup>ב</sup>
			ולא-גודע מקומים <sup>א</sup>	שמע ורחח	
			מכוכבי השמים	הרבית לכלך	(4) 16 <sup>א</sup>
			ושפסריך כג'גובי	מנזריך כארכה	17 <sup>א</sup>

ב

כחש־פֶּרֶק מִלְּאֵה׃	הוֹדִיעִיר דְּמִים בְּלֵה	3	1	i
בַּעֲלַת כְּשָׁפִים	מִלֵּב וּנְוִי וּזְנֵה		4	
נֹאמֵי־הָיָה צַבֹּאוֹת׃	הִנְנִי נֹפֵל עִלְיָךְ			
הִרְאִיתִי מַעְרָךְ׃	וּנְגִלְתִּי שׁוֹלֵךְ עַל־פְּנֶיךָ		5	
וְשֹׁמְתֶיךָ כְּרָא׃	הִשְׁלַכְתִּי עִלְיָךְ שִׁקְצִים׃		6	
וּמִי יִנְחֵלֶה׃	וְאָמַר שְׁדָדָה יִנְחֵה		7	
וַיִּעֵץ בְּלִיעֵל׃	הֲלֹא מִמֶּךָ יֵצֵא	1	11	ii
וַיִּצְנֶה עֲלֵיו׃	חָשַׁב עַל־יְהוָה רָעָה׃			
יִהְיֶה׃ שֶׁל־מֶךָ׃	[אֲשִׁים קִבְרֶךָ - קְלוֹז׃]		14	
פְּסָל וּמִסְכַּח׃	מִבַּיִת אֱלֹהֶיךָ אִכְרִית			
נִצּוֹר מִצְוֵי־הָ	עֲלֵה מִפֶּיךָ עַל־פְּנֶיךָ	2	2	
אִמְרֵי־כַח מֵאֵד׃	צַפֵּה־דָרֶךְ חֻקַּי מִתְּנִים			
נָגוּז וְעִבְרִי׃	{אֲמִי־מִים מִלְּאִים} וּרְבִים	1	12	iii
מִשְׁמֵעַ שְׁלוֹם׃	הִנֵּה עַל־הַהָרִים רִגְלֵי׃	2	1	
שֶׁל־מִי נִרְדָּךְ	תִּנְיִי יְהוָה חֲנִיךָ			
בְּעֵלֶיךָ וּנְכַרְתָּ׃	כִּי־לֹא יוֹסִיף לַעֲבֹר־כֶּךָ׃			
וּנְסִיךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל	כִּי־שָׁב׃ * נֶאֱוִן יַעֲקֹב		3	
חֲמִרֵיהֶם שְׁחָתוּ׃	כִּי בִקְקוֹם בִּקְקִים			

4 טוֹבַת חַן (β)	8 1 (α)	לֹא־יִמֵּשׁ טָרֶף
	4 (γ)	הַמְכַרְת גּוֹיִם בּוֹנוֹנִיָּה וּמִשְׁפָּחוֹת בְּכִשְׁפֵיה
6 וּנְבִלְתֶיךָ (z)	5 (δ)	גּוֹיִם (e) וּמִמְלָכוֹת קְלוֹנָךְ
	7 (ה)	וְהִיָּה כָל רֵאִיךָ יִהְיֶה מִמֶּךָ
כִּי (κ)	(θ)	מֵאִיִן אִנְקֵשׁ מִנְחֻמִּים־לֶךָ
14 1 יהוה (ι)	14 (λ)	1 14 לא
12 וְכֵן (ε)	6 9 זִכְרֹךְ (μ)	1 14 לא
	12 (o)	{עֲנִתְךָ} וְ{אֲעַנְךָ־עוֹד}
	18	וְעַתָּה אֲשַׁבֵּר מִפְּתוֹחַי xx וּמוֹסְרֵיךָ אֲנִתֶךָ
14 ולא ישמע עוד קול מלאכתך׃ (ρ)	9 1 (τ)	מִבְּשָׂר
8 יהוה את־ (φ)	1 (σ)	עוֹד
		(τ) בְּלִיעֵל
		1 18 (xx) סְעִיךָ

נחום

א

נָקַם וּבְעַל חַמָּה:	אֶל קְנֹא־יְהוָה	1	2 <sup>o</sup>	i
וַעֲנֵן אַבְק רַגְלָיו:	בְּסוּפָה וּבשִׁעָרָה דִּרְכּוּ		3 <sup>o</sup>	
וְכָל הַגְּהֻרוֹת הַחַרְיִב	נִוְעַר בַּיָּם תִּבְשְׁהוּ	4		ii
וּפְרַח לִבְנֵן אִמְלֵל:	דְּאִב' כֶּשֶׁן וּכְרַמֶּל			
וְהַגְּבֻעוֹת הַתַּמְלֵגוּ	הָרִים רַעֲשׂוּ מִמֶּנּוּ	5		iii
תִּבְל וְכָל יוֹשְׁבֵי-בָהּ:	וְהַשָּׂא הָאָרֶץ מִפְּנֵי			
מִיִּיקוֹם בַּחֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ	וְזַעַמּוֹ מִיִּיעֲמֹד לְפָנָיו	6		iv
וְהַזָּרִים נִצְתּוּ מִמֶּנּוּ:	חַמְתּוּ נִתְּכָה כְּאֵשׁ			
מִעֲזוֹ בַיּוֹם צָרָה	סוֹב יְהוָה לִקְרוֹי	7		v
וּבִשְׂטֵף עֵבֶר יִצְלֹם:	יִחַדַּע יְהוָה חֲסִיבוֹ			
כִּלְהָ יַעֲשֶׂה בִּמְתִיקוֹמֵיו	וְאִיבִיו יִהְיֶה אֶל-חֲשָׁד:	8		vi
לֹא-יִקּוֹם פַּעַמִּים מִצָּרָיו	כִּי-רָעָה בְּפִלְהֵהוּא עֲשֶׂה:	9 <sup>o</sup>		
מִהִתְחַשְׁבֵּן עַל-יְהוָה	יִנְקָה לֹא-יִנְקָה עֵין:	3 <sup>o</sup> 9 <sup>o</sup>		vii
נָקַם יְהוָה לְצָרָיו	וְנוֹטְרֵהוּא לְאִיבִיו:	2 <sup>o</sup>		
סִירִים סְבוּאִים כִּי-הִמָּה	אֶכְלוּ כֶּקֶשׁ כְּאֵשׁ:	10		viii
ע * * * * *				
פ * * * * *				ix
צ * * * * *				
ק * * * * *				x
ר * * * * *				
ש * * * * *				xi
ת * * * * *				

1 2 (a) 1 ונסס (β) יהוה (γ) 8<sup>o</sup> יהוה ארך-אפים ונרל-לח ו  
 8<sup>o</sup> יהוה (δ) 10 סבבים (ε) וכסבאם (ζ)