

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

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,¹ 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 13th 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*² 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 1854.³ 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*,⁴ 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 137:8 it is called a *Daughter of Babylon*,⁵ and instead of Sons of Edom (v. 7) we must read *Sons of Aram*, i.e. *Syrians*, just as we must substitute *Bath-Aram*, i.e. *Sons of Aram*, Syrians, for *Bath-Edôm*,⁶ Edomites, at the end of the fourth poem in the Maccabean elegies commonly known as the Lamentations of Jeremiah.⁷ The enemies addressed in Lam. 4:21 are said to dwell in the land of *Uz*, the home of Job. Friedrich Delitzsch showed more than twenty years ago that *Uz* was mentioned

in the Monolith Inscription of Shalmaneser (860–825) as a region near *Patîn*, 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.⁶ 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 *iaššimu*, they will destroy) from *šamām*, 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 *ummân-manda*, i.e. the northeastern barbarians, and helped to destroy the Assyrian empire; but the fall of Nineveh was due to the *ummân-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 (KAT², 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,⁷ 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 *Môṣul* 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 $1\frac{1}{2}$, 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.⁸ 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 *Dār-Šarrukên* which Sargon, the father of Sennacherib, built about the end of his reign (722-705). Colonel Billerbeck's theory⁹ that *Rehoboth Ir* is represented by the modern *Môsul* is not probable. *Dār-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 Khosrau* or *Chosroes*; see Max, Freiherr von Oppenheim, *Vom Mittelmeer zum Persischen Golf*, vol. ii (Berlin, 1900) p. 180; cf. Haupt, *Biblische Liebeslieder* (Leipzig, 1907) *Addenda* to p. 48, n. 18.

Dūr-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;⁹ nor does it mean: *Fill the moats* protecting the city!¹⁰ 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 Šîn-ahê-êrba*,¹¹ the Sennacherib conduit (which may be compared to the *Croton aqueduct*) the people of Nineveh depended on the rain water: *ana sunnê tîq îamê turruçê inâšun*.

The Hûsur, now called *Khōsar*, flows in a southward direction from Khorsabâd to the middle of the eastern wall of Nineveh; ⁷ thence it passed westward through the centre of Nineveh, emptying into the Tigris on the south side of the Acropolis now known as *Kouyunjik*.⁷ 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^m 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,¹² 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.⁹ I will give, in conclusion, a new metrical translation of the four poems contained in the Book of Nahum.¹²

The first poem is an alphabetical psalm which originally consisted of 11 couplets or 22 *mēšhalīm*, i.e. *hemistichal pairs*, with three beats in each hemistich. The last seven *mēšhalīm* 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.¹⁴

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*.¹⁵ 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. *dûru*) in ruins, near a city called *Mespila*.¹⁵ 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 ^a | A jealous God is JHVH,
a revenger, ⁸ and full of wrath; |
| | 3 | 3 ^b | Through whirlwind and storm is His path, ¹⁴
the clouds are the dust of His feet. |
| ii | 1 | 4 | He scolds at the sea — it is arid,
and all the rivers He empties; |
| | 7 | | (Even) Basan and Carmel languish,
the blossoms of Lebanon wither. |
| iii | 7 | 5 | The mountains quake before Him,
the hills (at once start to) totter; |
| | 1 | | The earth before Him crashes, ¹⁶
the world and all therein dwelling. |

- iv י 6 Who can endure His fury,
withstand the heat of His anger?
ח 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;
ב 9^b Not twice upon foes wreaks He vengeance,
His work is not done by halves!¹⁷
- vii ד 9^a What do ye devise against JHVH?
3^a ' He ' never condones an offense!
ז 2^b On His foes He ever wreaks vengeance,
to enemies He ever bears hatred.
- viii ד 10 Soaked * though they be as toss-pots,^c
like stubble the fire shall consume them!¹⁸
ז * * * * *
* * * * *
- ix ד * * * * *
* * * * *
ז * * * * *
* * * * *
- x ק * * * * *
* * * * *
ך * * * * *
* * * * *
- xi ש * * * * *
* * * * *
ח * * * * *
* * * * *

(α) 1 2 that is, a revenger

(β) is JHVH

(γ) 3^a Long-suffering but powerful is JHVH, and

(δ) 3^a JHVH

(ε) 10 if they soak

(ζ) tangled (thorns)¹⁸

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

- 2 2 The glory of Jacob * reblossomed,²⁴
 Israel's vine,²⁵
 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^{xx} 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^a The Utterance on Nineveh
 i 3 8 Art thou better than No^a
 on the banks of the Nile,^b
 * Whose rampart the River,
 whose wall the water ?

- 9 With Cush to abet her,^s
 'and Libya^c to aid ?
- 10 Even she had to go
 into exile and bondage;
 * Her babes were shattered
 at the corners of ^estreets;
 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,^m
 and handle the brickmold!{{[^]}
- 15^b Though as thick as locusts,^a
 as many as ^vgrasshoppers:^f
- 15^a Fire will devour thee,[^o]
 the sword destroy! []
- 12 * Thy forts will be figtrees,
 {^e thy people} firstripe figs,^r
- 13^b Thy bars burnt with fire,^r
- 13^a {{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,^v*
 thy worthies sleep,
Thy men are scattered,^h
 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! ²⁵ (λ) strengthen thy bulwarks!
 (μ) 16^a the locusts shed ²⁷ and fly
 (ν) 17^b They alight in hedges when cool grows the day;
 When arises the sun, ²⁸ their place ²⁹ is not known.
 (ξ) 16^a Thy traders outnumber the stars in the sky;
 17^a Like grasshoppers thy like crickets ²⁷ thy scribes.
 [charmers, ²⁸
 (o) 15^a Like locusts will it devour thee!
 (π) 12 all (ρ) 13 lo!
 (σ) 12^b If shaken, they drop into the mouth of the eater!
 (τ) 13 The gates of the land are ²⁸ 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 ²⁸ (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.⁹ Nahum describes the final assault as follows:

IV

- 1 1^b The^a 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!^a
- ii Swords flash, and spears are glittering!
v in heaps lie corpses!^a
- 2 3^a Red^{aa} are the shields of their^a heroes,
encrimsoned^{aa} their^a warriors.[^a]
- iii 5 But their^a worthies make haste to her^{aa} wall
with mantlets set up.
8^b 'Ho! Stand! Ho! Stand! they yell;^{aa}
none^{aa} faces about.
- B iv 6 The gates of the River^{aa} are opened,
the palace^{aa} is tottering!
8^a 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^a once the^a 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 Seleucid Kingdom:

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

-
- (α) 1 1^b book of the
(β) 2 3^b Like fire the chariot flashes, the horsemen are frenzied, ^{νν} §§
4^b Their aspect is like torches, they flash like lightnings. ^{αα}
4^a 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 ^{αα} (ζ) 8^b 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
-
- (νν) 2 5 *they stumble in their courses* (§§) 3 8 *they stumble over their carcases* ^{αα}
-

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 156 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. 'šāʾ) Maker, Creator. *Aram* is a phonetic modification of *Adam*; cf. Lat. *arbitr* = *adbitr*, etc. See my paper *Die Etymologie von Aram* in vol. Ix 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 *mahlākh šēlōšēth šāmīm* 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) Assy. *xirōtika mē mullī*; see Delitzsch's *Assyr. Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1896) p. 290^a.

(11) See Delitzsch's *Handwörterbuch* (HW) p. 555^b.

(12) Xenophon says of *Mespila*: ἦν δὲ ἡ μὲν κρητὶς λίθου ἕστον κογχυ-
λάτου, τὸ εἶδος πεντήκοντα ποδῶν καὶ τὸ ὕψος πεντήκοντα. This does not refer to the wall of the city, but to the moat; cf. Herod. 1.132.217. 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 Assy. *kāru* (HW 849^b) 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^b.

(15) *Larissa* seems to be a corruption (with *l* for *n* and transposition) of *Resen* = Assy. *Rēš-inī*, Fountain-head, and *Mespila* may represent an Assy. *mušpīlu*, built of shell-limestone (Assyr. *pīlu* = *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: *St 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 *finish*).

(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: is:

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. *štrim* 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, κ and ξ (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 *creaker*, *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 π) of the beasts of prey, i.e. the Syrians; see ZDMG, vol. lxi, p. 286.

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

(39) A misplaced incorrect explanation of *encrimsoned*.

(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

(1¹) The first part of the title, מִשְׁמָ לַיְהוָה, is not *evidently late* (EB 8259) but belongs to section 1; the second part, חֲזוֹן נָחוֹם הָאֱלֹקִים, (ספר) should be prefixed to section 4.

The following verses (1-10) 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 Nicanor's Day, because they did not suit his purpose. This Maccabean psalm originally consisted of eleven couplets; each couplet is composed of two *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. מִרְיָה, v. 7; מִרְיָה, v. 9^a; מִרְיָה, 3 14; שְׁמִי, 3 11^b. Even at the beginning of the second hemistich an accented syllable is generally avoided. Therefore we find יָדִי instead of יָדִי, in 3 10, just as we have נָמִי instead of נָמִי in 3 15; and we may read מִקְּסֵל instead of מִקְּסֵל in 1 14; contrast מִיָּם, 3 8 and מִיָּם לְךָ, 3 14. It is not necessary to read וְשָׁמַיִם, וְשָׁמַיִם, or מִיָּם instead of מִיָּם.

(2^a) The addition of וְנָקָם after קִנְיָה is due to scribal expansion derived from the second hemistich.

After וְנָקָם, at the beginning of the second hemistich, omit יְהוָה. 6 omits וְנָקָם before חֲמָה.

V. 2^b belongs to couplet vii; also v. 3^a.

(3^b) The emendation וְנָקָם instead of וְנָקָם is not good.

(4) We need not restore the form וְנָקָם; *yaiiabbēšhu* (cf. *Kings* 210, n. 2; contrast ZDMG 58 22) is contracted from *yaiiēiabbēšhu*; וְנָקָם was pronounced *yaiiabbēšhu* (not *yaiiavēšhu*). The uncontracted form *yaiiēiabbēšhu* would have four unaccented syllables, which is unrhythmic. The emendation וְנָקָם is gratuitous.

Instead of וְנָקָם 1^a read וְנָקָם (not וְנָקָם). We find a similar careless repetition of the same expression instead of a synonym in 2 8 (נָקָם instead of נָקָם) and in 3 15 (וְנָקָם instead of נָקָם). Cf. also וְנָקָם, Ps. 76 11 (instead of וְנָקָם) influenced by וְנָקָם (1 Macc. 2 40 3 etc.) and וְנָקָם 1^a instead of וְנָקָם in Ps. 68 15; see AJSL 23 27.

(5) The article must not be prefixed to וְנָקָם; 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 וְנָקָם is used instead of וְנָקָם, but the cardinal number is not substituted for שְׁנֵי;

cf. in the cuneiform incantatory legend of the Descent of Ištar (KB 6²², ll. 42 and 45) *išlên bâba*, one gate, but *išlân 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. 2¹⁰: *בוֹזְזוּ-כֶסֶף וּ-בֹזְזוּ זָהָב*, *Bozzu-kéšf u-vózzu zaháv*, or the first hemistich of Jer. 50¹¹, quoted in the notes on *יָדָה*, Nah. 3²; also Hag. 2⁸: *לִירְבֶּסֶף וְלִי*, *לִירְבֶּסֶף וְלִי מִנְשָׁה*, and Ps. 60⁹: *לִירְבֶּסֶף וְלִי מִנְשָׁה*.

The verbal form *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ* has two beats; so, too, *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, v. 2¹; 3¹⁰; *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, 3²; *בְּלִפְתֵּיהֶם*, 2⁸; cf. n. 71 to my paper on Ps. 23 in *AJSL* 21¹⁴⁸.

For the recessive accent in pause of *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ* cf. *מִלְאָה*, 3¹; *כֶּרֶם*, 3⁸; *וְנִסְלוֹ*, 3¹¹; *נִסְלָה*, 3¹⁰; *בִּשְׁכֵּי*, 2⁸; *שִׁחָיו*, 1¹²; *עֵקְרוֹ*, 1¹⁴; *מִסְכָּה* and *שִׁלְמָה*, 3¹²; *וּמִבְלָקָה*, 2¹⁰; *לַחֲנוּהָ*, 2⁸; *הַקֶּלְתָּהּ*, 3²; *מִרְקָהּ*, 2⁷; *נִפְתָּחוּ*, 3¹²; *וּחְלָלָהּ*, 2¹¹; *מִסְכָּה*, 2¹²; *וְהִרְסָלִי*, 2¹²; *וְהִרְסָלִי*, 2⁸. Cf. notes on vv. 8 and 3².

For *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ* read *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ* = *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, Is. 6¹¹, where we must read:

עֲרֹשֶׁת אֲמִשְׁאוֹ שִׁירִים מֵאֵן יִשָּׁב
וְקִירֵים מֵאֵן אֲדָם הָאֲרָמָה תִּשָּׁאֵה

The emendation *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ* instead of *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ* is gratuitous; *שִׁמְמָה* is an explanatory gloss; *אֲמִשְׁתִּשָּׂא חֵבֶל* = *si fractus illabatur orbis*. The verb *שָׂא* means *to crash*, i.e. *to fall down and break with a crash*; *שָׂאֵן* means *crash*, French *fracas*. The form *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ* in *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ* must be derived, not from *שָׂא*, but from *שָׂא*, *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, Zeph. 1¹². Is. 6¹² and 10¹ (*וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ* . . . *שִׁמְמָה*) consists of six lines with 2 + 2 beats.

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

The final *וְ* in *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ* is enclitic; cf. *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, v. 7; *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, v. 9¹; *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, v. 2¹; *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, 3⁷; *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, 2²; *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, 2¹; *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, 3⁷; *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, 1¹²; *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, 3¹⁰; *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, 3⁸; *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, 2¹²; *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, 2¹¹. See my remarks on Cant. 6⁹ in *AJSL* 19⁷.

(6) The first word, *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, must be inserted after *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, and be combined with the *וְ* of the following *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*: read *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ* instead of *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*; contrast *Kings* 61⁹.

The *וְ* in *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ* may be due to dittography of the *וְ*; cf. *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, v. 3⁸ for *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, and *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*, 2¹ for *וְתִלְבְּדֶיהָ*; see Haupt, *Purim*, p. 51, l. 22.

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

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

(7) Between *וְ* and *מִשְׁחָה* we must, with W, insert *לָיו* (cf. Lam. 3²⁰) following *οἱ τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν*. *Μ* omits *מִשְׁחָה*. 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*. A *מִשְׁחָה* (cf. 3¹¹) is a place whose *strength will laugh a siege to scorn* (Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, V 5²). The noun is not derived from *מִשְׁחָה* (Arab. *'āda* = *ildā'a*, *lāda*) but from *מִשְׁחָה*; it stands for *ma'uzz*, just as *מִגְן*, shield = *magginn* (Arab. *mijānn*) from *גִּן*. The lengthening of the *a* in *מִשְׁחָה*, etc.,

stead of תָּקִים, and מַצְרִי instead of צִדָּה; the reading צִדָּה may be due to צִדָּה at the end of the first מִשְׁל of couplet v, and יָקִים (instead of יָקִים) which afterwards became תָּקִים, may have been suggested by יָקִים in v. 6; cf. the remark on מַצְרִים instead of מַצְרִים (Eccl. 9 14) in the notes on 2 a. If v. 2^b had not been misplaced, מַצְרִי would probably not have been corrupted to צִדָּה. The omission of the prefixed מ after מַצְרִים was due to haplography (*Kings* 245 a). The two expressions מַצְרִים and מַצְרִי sound almost alike; cf. the remark on מִקְרָה for מִקְרָה in v. 8.

The first and the third clause of v. 9 must be transposed: ^א instead of ^ב.

(3^a) The second hemistich to 9^a is 3^a; but instead of לֹא יִנָּקֶה לֹא יִנָּקֶה it is better to read יִנָּקֶה לֹא יִנָּקֶה שֶׁן יִדָּה.

The preceding clause, יִדָּה אֲרֻחָם תִּנְלֶנָּה, is scribal expansion; the addition of יִדָּה after לֹא יִנָּקֶה was suggested by the Decalogue (Ex. 20 7 Deut. 5 11); cf. the remarks on the gloss מִכְשֶׁר in 2 1; מִשֶׁ, 3 a. The gloss יִדָּה after לֹא יִנָּקֶה certainly belongs to the preceding clause, not to the following, כִּמְסֹה וּבִשְׁטָה דְּרָבִי; contrast Ges.-Kautzsch, § 143, a.

After the gloss אֲרֻחָם וּתְלֶנָּה יִדָּה had been prefixed to יִנָּקֶה, the conjunction ו was inserted before יִנָּקֶה.

The prefixed adjectives in אֲרֻחָם וּתְלֶנָּה (אֲרֻחָ, *erkh*, monosyllabic; וּתְלֶנָּה, *uḡdol*, dissyllabic) are proclitic; cf. מִשְׁפָּחָה וּרְיָה in 3 1; קִלְשֹׁם וּקִלְרֶשֶׁת, 3 2; אֲכֹלֶהָ אֲשֶׁר, 3 11; אֲשֹׁרֶדֶד, 2 2; נִאֲמִידָה, 3 4 2 11; מַעֲלִכְלִי, 2 10; מִדְּבָרָהּ, 3 2; אֲנִשְׁחִיל, 2 4; בְּקִלְיוֹנָם, 2 2; לְהַבְחִיר, 2 11; cf. my remarks on the Song of Lamech, *AJSL* 20 164.

The ו in נִזְלֶנָּה may be due to dittography of the ו; cf. יַעֲמֹד, v. 6 and לַעֲבֹד, 2 1.

We must not, with N, substitute חֶסֶד for כֶּחַ, following Ex. 34 a. Num. 14 18 Neh. 9 17 Joel 2 18 Jon. 4 2 Psa. 103 2 145 2; נִזְלֶנָּה would not have been corrupted to נִזְלֶנָּה. 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^b) The second מִשְׁל (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^a begins with נָקָם; cf. the remarks on the misplacement of 3 2 (see p. 23). The clause לֹא יִנָּקֶה לֹא יִנָּקֶה was transposed along with 2^b, and the gloss אֲרֻחָם וּתְלֶנָּה יִדָּה 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 Assyr. *šamāru*, and נָמַר to Assyr. *naḡāru* which is generally read *naḡāru* (HW 452). The stem שָׁמַר is a Šaphel (see p. 24, below) of שָׁר, and נָמַר is a Niphal of שָׁר (see BA 1 150, below). Both שָׁמַר and נָמַר mean originally to be embittered; נָמַר is connected with Arab. *muḡirr* (مُرِّر) bursting out (of wrath).

(10) The first two words, כִּרְעָר, belong to בְּקִלְהוֹת עֵשָׂה, v. 9^b.

The noun סִיר means both *pot* and *thorn*; cf. Eccl. 7^s. The glossator who added סִבְרִים (instead of סִבְאִים) understood סִירִים to mean *thorns*, whereas סִירִים סִבְאִים means *wine-jars*, lit. *jars wined*, i.e. *filled with wine* (cf. *toss-pot, swill-pot, swill-bowl, swill-tub*, etc.). After סִירִים סִבְאִים we must add כִּרְעָר, *although they*. The כִּי is perhaps preserved in קִלּוֹת, 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: — בִּרְקִלְתָּ אֲשִׁים קִבְרָךְ. In that case כִּי would introduce the *oratio directa* as in Ruth 1¹⁰ etc. אֲנִי קִלּוֹת may represent the Aramaic noun קִלּוֹת; cf. AJSL 23²², n. 46.

The gloss וְכִסְבָּאִם before סִבְאִים means *even if they drink* (tope). It is the infinitive Qal, and the prefixed כִּי is concessive, as in בְּקִיָּם, v. 2^s; cf. JAOS 25⁷², 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. 9²⁴) 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 12²⁰ and Haupt, *Purim*, p. 29, ll. 10. 17. We read in 1 Macc. 8^s that Judas Maccabæus τοὺς τραπεζοσάντας τὸν [λαὸν] αὐτοῦ ἐφλόγισεν.

The reading סִירִים סִבְרִים 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 כִּשָּׁר read כִּשָּׁר. This may be again, not a graphic, but a phonetic corruption; cf. the note on כְּדֻמָּה for כְּדֻמָּי, v. 8 (כָּשָׁר was pronounced קִיש; see ZA 2²²; Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, 3²², below; cf. also עִשָּׁר = יִשָּׁר, etc.).

The last word of the verse, מֵלֵא, may be a corruption of הֵלֵא, introducing the following מִפְּנֵי מֵלֵא at the beginning of v. 11; or מֵלֵא may be a misplaced correction to אִם שְׁלֵמִים וְכֵן, for אִם מֵלֵאִים, in v. 12, just as יִזְכָּר (point יִזְכָּר) at the beginning of 2^s is a misplaced correction of יִזְכָּר in 1¹⁴, or as בֵּינִים רִבִּי in 2^s is a misplaced gloss to the first clause of 2^s. Similarly בְּהִלְכָּתָם in 2^s and יִשְׁעֵל בְּנִיתָם in 3^s are misplaced glosses to יִזְכָּרְעֵל at the end of 2⁴, and the last clause of c. 2 is a misplaced gloss to the beginning of that chapter. The last clause in 2¹¹, אֲנִישִׁיחֵל מִלְּעֵלִים וּפְנֵי כֻלָּם קִבְּצוּ פִּאֲרוֹר, is a misplaced (incorrect) gloss to קִי קִלּוֹת at the end of c. 1. Cf. also the remarks on קִלּוֹת כִּי 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 'קִטְרִי meter' see AJSL 20¹²², 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 Seleucid Kingdom with its new capital Antioch is called *Daughter of Babylon* in Ps. 137 s; see my remarks in OLZ 10 s, 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 מדינה, *province* (originally *judicial district*) means in Aramaic and Arabic: *city*. Arab. *balad* means both *land* and *city*; Assy. *mātu*, *land*, appears in Syriac as ܡܬܐ, *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. *אהל*, *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 Seleucid 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. 12 37 s.

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 בחור־עיר form a copulative compound like Assy. *cizir-rab*, young and old (HW 565 s; cf. Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gr.*, § 199) or עטרה־עיר in Ps. 45 s (see the translation in Haupt, *Ecclesiastes*, p. 37). The vocalization עִירָה instead of עֵירָה is due to the recession of the accent before the following עִיר: 'עִירָה became 'anāh; contrast ZAT 21 22 and Duhm, *ad loc.* The preceding אמר־עיר must be read 'al-dvar-ēmth instead of 'al-dvar-emēth (for *emett*, *ememt*, *amint*).

The third hemistich, לא־ישֶׁבֶר, is a scribal expansion based on the preceding verses at the end of c. 2 (ר, ix). For the unaccented verbal form after לא cf. n. 70 to my paper on Ps. 23 in AJSL 21 148. Assy. *mātu*, night (cf. Heb. *אמש*) is connected with *בשר*, *יש*, just as Syr. ܡܬܐ, *evening*, is derived from ܡܬܐ, *to turn, to decline* (ܡܬܐ ܠܗ ܝܡܐ). 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 ר, where they have been displaced by a gloss (ר, β). They may have been inserted in ב owing to the similarity of חרב־חלל in 3 s and מרב־עני in 3 4, just as

the 2-line in * (1^b) has been inserted after the *^a-line (1^a) owing to the beginning נָקָם. Cf. also the conclusion of the note on 2 14^b (p. 29).

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

The verb מַכֵּר 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^a; see also AJSL 23 22. For the original meaning of *cheat* (and *shyster*) see my paper *Some Germanic Etymologies*, AJP 27 100, below.

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

The hemistich אַחֲרֵי כִּשְׁמֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם should stand after יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת in v. 5.

After רַגְנֵי the meter requires the insertion of נָקָל, and instead of אֲלֵךְ we must read עֲלֵךְ; so, too, in (the Maccabean appendix to 7) 2 14 and Jer. 51 22. For אֵל instead of עַל cf. the notes on 1 9. It is possible that the author of the late passage Jer. 51 22 read אֲלֵךְ רַגְנֵי instead of עֲלֵךְ רַגְנֵי; cf. the note on נָשִׁים for נָשִׁים, Nah. 3 12. The רַגְנֵי רַגְנֵי, 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 עֲלֵךְ עֲלֵךְ does not mean *I will pull up thy skirts over thy face*, but *I will uncover (lift up) thy skirts to affront thee*; עֲלֵךְ 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 חֲשַׁמְתִּי עֲלֵךְ עֲלֵךְ.

אַחֲרֵי כִּשְׁמֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם after יְהוָה is a gloss, also the hemistich קִלְקֹךְ at the end of the verse.

(6) The hemistich עֲלֵךְ 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 ש in שָׁמַיִם, שָׁקַל, שָׁבַר, שָׁמַל, שָׁמַר, שָׁמַל, שָׁמַל, שָׁמַר, שָׁמַר, שָׁמַר (see note on 3 8) etc., is a causative prefix (cf. JBL 19 2, 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. הִשָּׁה, now = הִשָּׁה, Syr. אֲשִׁתִּי, last year = שָׁנָה + קִרְיָה;

† The verb שָׁלַח often means *to cause to transmit* or *deliver a message*, e.g. Hagg. 1 12: כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁלַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם אֱלִידֵם . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁלַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם אֱלִידֵם, 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 2 1 K 14 5 Is. 55 11 Jer. 42 2 21 43 1.

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

The following verb, ונבלחך , *I shall disgrace* (insult, dishonor) *thee* is a gloss; cf. Jer. 14 21: $\text{אלהנאך למען שמך אלחנבל כסא בבודך}$, *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, $\text{ודדה כל ראדך ידוד ממך}$, is an explanatory gloss to כחאי at the end of the preceding verse.

The last clause, $\text{ומי יודלה במאן מבקש מנחמיםך}$, is a gloss to ומי יודלה . The participle מנחמים does not mean *providers of a funeral meal* (ZAT 22 22) but *comforters*, i.e. *sympathizers, mourners*; cf. Job 2 11: ויקמו יחדיו לכווא ; לנוחלו ולקדמו , also Is. 51 12. The primitive meaning of סחם 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. מנחמים 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 ומי יודלה .

For vv. 8-19 see section 1.

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

The final clause, יעק 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; 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, 8).

The fourth hemistich of this verse is the first clause of v. 14, תקח עליך דדה , where we must read עליך instead of עלך (cf. ערתך instead of ערתה in 3 12 and עליך instead of עלי in Is. 52 14, quoted in the note on v. 12; see also note 13, third paragraph, to my paper on Ps. 68 in AJSL 23 27; contrast רבהד for רבהד , 2 14) and omit ידדה as a gloss. The סוף פסוק of v. 11 should be placed after תקח עליך ; but תקח must be pointed as infinitive absolute, תקח ; cf. *Kings* 182 2. V. 12 belongs to stanza iii; v. 12^a and v. 18 are glosses.

The חשב עליה דדה רעה and יעק בליעל is the prototype of Haman in the

Book of Esther, Nicanor who threatened to burn JHVN's Temple on Mount Zion; see 1 Macc. 7:38-42; cf. 2 Macc. 14:35-36. In 2 Macc. 15:1 he is called a *τρισαλειήριος*, cf. Haupt, *Purim*, p. 5.

(14) In v. 14 the final hemistich *כִּרְקִלֹת קִלְיֹת* אֲשֶׁם must be transposed; *כִּי* may be omitted, and instead of *קִלְיֹת* we may read *קִלְיָן*, as suggested by W. The *כִּי* may be a misplaced remnant of the concessive clause *כִּי רַמְּה*, which must be inserted after *סִרְיִם סְבוּאִים* in v. 10; it is improbable that *כִּי* is merely due to dittography of the preceding suffix *ךְ*; contrast note on *מִלְאֲכָה*, 2:14. As stated above, p. 22, *כִּי* may be retained before *קִלְיָן*, if we read: *כִּלְיָן אֲשֶׁם קִבְּךְ*.

The clause *לֹא יִדַּע מִשְׁמֶךְ עוֹד*, *no more of thy name shall be sown*, is meaningless and unmetrical. Instead of *יִדַּע* we must read *יִדָּה*, and for *מִשְׁמֶךְ* we must substitute *שְׁלֶמֶךְ*, *thy corpse*, while *לֹא* and *עוֹד* must be omitted. The verb *יִזְכֵּר* at the beginning of 2:15 is a misplaced corrective gloss to *יִדַּע*; it should be pointed *יִזְכֵּר*; cf. *ᾠ μνησθήσονται*, 3 *recordabitur*. But the clause *לֹא יִזְכֵּר מִשְׁמֶךְ 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 *καὶ μὴ ἐν ὁράσει ὀφθαλμῶν σου* or the tertiary gloss in Eccl. 6:1, etc. On the other hand, *שָׁ* has canceled the negative in 2 K 6:27; cf. *Kings* 209:72-73. In some cases (e.g. *לֹא אֲשִׁיבֶנּוּ*, Am. 1:11, etc.) *לֹא* is *scriptio plena* of the emphatic *ל* (see AJSL 22:10, § 15, end, and my paper in OLZ, June, 1907) but *לֹא יִדָּה מִשְׁמֶךְ*, *verily, thy spoil will be scattered*, is unsatisfactory.

The noun *שְׁלֶם*, *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 יָמָתָה* or *יָמָתָה שְׁלַם*, *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 3:27, l. 32 and K. J. Grimm's dissertation, *Euphemistic Liturgical Appendixes 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 *mundāzqu*, *fighter*, for *mumtāzqu*, from *מִזְחָץ*; cf. *Kings* 112:15. I showed more than 25 years ago that *šalandu* (= *šalamtu*) passed into Aramaic as *שְׁלָמָא* and with *ר* for *ל* (as in *שְׁלִשְׁתָּא*, *chain* = *שְׁרִשְׁתָּא*; *חִרְץ*, *hip* = *חִלְץ*; see p. 45, below, and ZDMG 61:106) *שְׁלִימָא*, a diminutive form with repetition of the final consonant as in Assy. *suqāqu*, Syr. *אַשְׁלִיקָא*, Arab. *zuqāq*; cf. BA 3:22, n. 22; *Kings* 121:15; Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.* 2, § 134.

The noun *שְׁלֶם*, *corpse*, may be restored in the present passage, just as *מִקְבָּר*, *grave*; *מַנְרִי*, *benefactor*; *נִבְחָיו* (= *נִבְחָיו* = Assy. *nakamānu*) *his treasures* have been restored in 1 K 10:25-26; 2 K 12:20-21. We might, of course, substitute *נַפְתָּח* (cf. *נַפְתָּח נַפְתָּח*, Ps. 141:7; also Jer. 8:13) for *שְׁלֶמֶךְ*; but *נַפְתָּח* would hardly have been corrupted to *מִשְׁמֶךְ*.

The rhythm is improved by reading **מִקֵּל** instead of **מִקֵּל**; 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, **מַרְתֵּל**, *martel*, *war-hammer* (cf. Jer. 51 30) instead of **מִרְתֵּל**, *scatterer*. The incorrect spelling **מִרְתֵּל** instead of **מַרְתֵּל** is found also in Prov. 25 18. For the erroneous insertion of a *mater lectionis* cf. *Kings* 301 18. A **מַרְתֵּל** (*martel*) is larger than a **מַקְבֵּל** (*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 **מִלְחָמָהּ** we may substitute the masculine form **מִלְחָמָהּ**; but this change is not necessary: **מִלְחָמָהּ** would refer to Nicanor; and **מִלְחָמָהּ**, to the **עַד רְמִים** at the beginning of this section, i.e. the capital of the Seleucid Kingdom; cf. **מִלְחָמָהּ** in v. 11. Even in the preceding line (v. 14) we may read **מִלְחָמָהּ** instead of **מִלְחָמָהּ**.

For **מַצְדָּה** read **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* 21 148, n. 43. For **מַצְדָּה** cf. 2 S 5 7 1 Chr. 11 8. The reading **מַצְדָּה** is better than the reading **מַצְדָּה**, *watch a watch* (W). But instead of **מַצְדָּה** we had, perhaps, better point **מַצְדָּה** = *măcādāh*, the fem. of Arab. *maṣād*. In Eccl. 9 14, on the other hand, it is better to read **מַצְדָּה** instead of **מַצְדָּה**. The term **מַצְדָּה** denotes *bastiles*, i.e. *movable towers* used by the besiegers of a strong place (BA 3 170 and 173). The *mound of earth* or *rampart* built by the besiegers is called **סִלְלָה**; *battering engines* are termed **בָּרִים**; see *Ezekiel* 47 16. The reading of the Received Text in Eccl. 9 14 is due to **מַצְדָּה** in Eccl. 9 12, just as **צִדָּה** instead of **מַצְדָּה** in Nah. 1 9 may be influenced by **צִדָּה** in 1 7. Judas Maccabæus besieged the Acra in 163 B.C. (see 1 Macc. 6 30; cf. also 1 3 3 4 4 21). 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 **מַצְדָּה**, **מַצְדָּה**, and **מַצְדָּה** are infinitives like **מַצְדָּה** in the preceding line; the inf. abs. Piel may have *e* in the final syllable instead of *o*.

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

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

The introductory clause, **כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה**, is a gloss.

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

represent the original reading מים, *water*. Ὁ τάδε λέγει Κύριος καταράσων ὑδάτων πολλῶν seems to have read: מים רבים (כח) instead of מים רבים וכן רבים. We must emend: אֲמַרְמִם מְלָאִים וְרַבִּים; the omission of מים may be due to haplography (cf. *Kings* 245 s).

The prefixed אִם is concessive; the glossator who added the glosses וכן מים מלאים ורבים intended to emphasize the correlation: וכן מים מלאים ורבים, lit. *and thus the waters full and great, and thus they ebbed and subsided*, i.e. *just as they were full and great, so they ebbed and subsided* = however full and great the tide was, it has ebbed again and subsided. Cf. Ex. 15: וְכַאשֶׁר יָמַן אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן וְכַאשֶׁר יָמַן אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן, where we could substitute וְכַאשֶׁר יָמַן אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן for וְכַאשֶׁר יָמַן אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן; see also Hos. 4: כָּרַבְתָּם כִּן חֲטָאוּ לִי, *the more they were increased, the more they sinned against me*. In the Maccabean poem Is. 52:15 we must read:

יִרְאוּ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ מִיָּדָיו	18	הֵנָּה יִשְׂמְחֵל עַבְדִּי
יִבְנֵן יְסֻדֵּי מִלְחָמָה	14	כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעַתְּ מִלִּידָה
יִקְרְאוּ מִלְכִּים מִדָּמָה	15	כִּן יִתְרַדְּדֵה עַלֶּיךָ
וְאֵשֶׁר לֹא שָׁמַעַתְּ מִלִּידָה		כַּאֲשֶׁר לֹא שָׁמַעַתְּ מִלִּידָה

(δ) 14 טים רבים	(γ) סראו ווארי סני אים	(δ) 14 רבים	(ω) 14 תבא
-----------------	------------------------	-------------	------------

- 18 Behold, my servant will prosper,
he will be raised and exalted.
14 Though looked upon with horror,
and though marred out of all human likeness,
15 They will be enraptured about him,
even Kings will be struck dumb;
They will see what they never were told,
and perceive what they never heard of.

The verb רָא means, as a rule, *to be excited*; here and in Jer. 33: it means *to be ardent, full of enthusiasm*. The phrase יִקְרְאוּ מִלְכִּים מִדָּמָה, *they will close their mouth, means they will be speechlessly amazed, awe-struck*. The marring out of all human likeness refers to the sufferings of the Jews during the Syrian persecution.

The Niphal נָחַץ must not be derived from נָחַץ, *to cut off, to shear*, but from נָחַץ, *to pass away, disappear*; cf. Ps. 90:10: כִּי יָחַץ וְנָחַץ, *for it (our life) passes away swiftly, and we take our flight*. We need not substitute נָחַץ for נָחַץ. It is true, נָחַץ and נָחַץ are often confounded (cf. the remarks on נָחַץ in 2) and Arab. *jazr* (*al-bahr*) is the common term for *ebb*; but נָחַץ, *to fail* is used in Syriac with special reference to water: נָחַץ means *dried up, waterless*. Arab. *jāza*, *ajāzu* = Heb. עָבַר.

The omission of the final ו in עָבַר is due to the prefixed ו in the following gloss וְעָבַר; cf. *Kings* 245 s. Before עָבַר the ו may be dispensed with; it had better be prefixed to the second clause, *לֹא אֶעְיָד עָבַר*; cf. l. 12 of the Maccabean Song of Derision in *Kings* 278 s. If we

retain ¹ before עֲנִיָּה, it must be taken as ¹explicative; cf. Haupt, *Purim*, p. 15, l. 30.

For the explanation of the imagery in v. 12^a by the prosaic gloss in v. 12^b see my remarks on יָחֲזִי בַמַּעֲלִי צָרֶךְ (Ps. 23⁹) in AJSL 21¹² (cf. *ibid.* 23²², n. 17) and for the ebbing of the high-tide of the Syrian persecution cf. 2 Macc. 5¹⁷ 6¹² 7¹² 12²².

(13) Also v. 13 is an explanatory gloss, and מַעֲלֵךְ is a tertiary addition. The suffix in מַעֲלֵךְ refers to the יָעַץ בַּלֵּעַל in v. 11. For מַעֲלֵךְ point מַעֲלֵךְ, *his staff*; cf. Ps. 110² (מַעֲלֵךְ עֵץ) and יִתְּנֶם בְּשֹׁכֶט בְּרִיחַ, Ps. 2⁹; cf. JHUC, No. 168, p. 90; No. 114, p. 110 (AJSL 21¹⁴⁷, n. 48). *His yoke* (cf. 1 Macc. 8¹¹ 12¹¹) would be מַעֲלֵךְ (or מַעֲלֵךְ).

(21) In v. 1^a מַבְשֵׁר is scribal expansion which may be derived from the Maccabean poem, Is. 52⁷ (see *ad* 1¹², above, p. 28). Cf. below, the note וְשִׁמַּח in 3⁹. For מַשְׁמַח שְׁלֹמֹם cf. 1 Macc. 7²⁰ and for the *enjambement*, or shifting of the caesura, cf. e.g. Ps. 137⁹ (OLZ 10²²) and Ps. 68² 69²⁷ 76¹² (AJSL 23²²⁰) and below, note on 2¹¹.

(14^b) A misplaced gloss to v. 1^a is found at the end of the chapter in v. 14^b: וְלֹא יִשְׁמַח עַד קֵץ מְלָאכְכָּה. For מְלָאכְכָּה we must read מְלָאכְךָ, i.e. *scriptio defectiva* for מְלָאכְךָ; the final ה of מְלָאכְכָּה is due to dittography: the first word of the following verse (3¹) begins with ה; cf. *Kings* 156¹¹ 118⁴. The suffix in מְלָאכְךָ refers to the מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר (3¹²) i.e. the Seleucid king of Syria; cf. 1 Macc. 1⁴⁴ 2²⁵ 7¹⁰ 10²⁷. If we read the feminine suffix (מְלָאכְכָּה) it would refer to the רַמְתָּם in the following verse, i.e. the capital of the Seleucid Kingdom. The editor who placed the first מַשַּׁל of ב (3¹) after this gloss (2^{14^b}) read מְלָאכְךָ or מְלָאכְךָ, and understood the suffix to refer to רַמְתָּם. Cf. the remarks on the suffixes in 8¹² 12¹¹. The insertion of the first stanza of ב after the conclusion of ד was suggested also by דַּגִּי נֶפֶל עֲלֶיךָ (for דַּגִּי אֶלֶיךָ) in 2¹⁴ and 3².

(1) For the second מַשַּׁל of v. 1, שְׁלֵמִי נִרְדָּךְ, cf. Ps. 76¹² (see n. 22 to my paper on Nicanor's Day in ZDMG 61²²) and 1 Macc. 1²⁰ 4²⁰ 6²⁰ 7²⁰ 2 Macc. 6¹¹ 11²⁵ 15²².

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* 1¹⁰ and cf. Jer. 50¹¹, quoted below, in the notes on יָדָד, 3²) and therefore stressed; cf. my remarks on הֵם כִּי־בָא, Jer. 17², in AJSL 19¹²².

The addition of עַד after יִסֵּף is unnecessary and overburdens the hemistich.

The *scriptio plena* of the *o* in לַעֲבוּרֶכָּה may be due to dittography of the ר; cf. the remark on עַמּוּד, 1². But the *o* is accented; we must read *la'vôr-bakh*, not *la'vôr-bâkh*. Cf. also Syr. ܡܠܝܚܐ = Παύλος and ܠܝܓܬܐ = *lightul* (JBL 19⁷, n. 104). The *e* and *o* in Heb. מֶלֶךְ, אֶלֶן, יָעַץ, אֶלֶל are not long, but accented; we must read σέφρ, ἔζν, ἰττέν, ἰατάλ. 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 μέλχλ) and עֶפֶר (σέφρ) is:

the vowel in *σέφρ* = סָפָר corresponds to the vowel in the first syllable of English *leather* (in Hebrew: לָדָר) while the vowel in *mākkh* = מָלַךְ should be pronounced like the *a* in English *lather* (in Hebrew: לָדָר).

Also בִּלְעֵסֶל, i.e. Nicanor, the impersonation of בִּלְעֵסֶל (cf. יֵסַן בִּלְעֵסֶל, 1 Macc. 12 and Haupt, *Purim*, p. 5, l. 10) is a gloss; the hearers knew who was meant; cf. the indefinite נִבְדָּדוּ and מִדְּרִי in 2:4 and the Pythagorean αὐτὸς ἴφα.

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

(8) The verb (שָׁב) is here not transitive (JHVN 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 שָׁב, he recovered appears in connection with לוֹ רָפָא he was healed, lit. some one healed him; cf. *Kings* 289:19. We must read: וְשָׁב וּרְפָא לוֹ; cf. also וְשָׁבָה in Is. 6:11. The addition of יָדָה and אָת in the present passage is due to a glossator.

(4) An additional (misplaced) gloss to this hemistich וְרָשָׁב is the clause בְּיָדָה רִבִּיט in v. 4; cf. my remarks on Ps. 68:10-11 in *AJSL* 23:22.

(3) For נָמַן 2° we must insert נָמַן; cf. Ps. 80:15. But it would be a mistake to substitute this reading also for נָמַן 1°. After נָמַן in the first hemistich נָמַן could easily be corrupted to נָמַן, just as we have אָמַל instead of רָמַל in 1:4; see above, *ad loc.* If the reading had been נָמַן in both hemistichs, the corruption to 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, בִּשְׁמַי יִנְיָה, see above, p. 18, ad 1:1.

(3:1) Instead of מֵא we must not point מֵא, although the cuneiform name is *Ni(u)* i.e. *Ne(u)* = Egypt. *nē(t)* which means *City* (BA 1:104). We find an *o* in Hebrew instead of Assy. *e* or *i*, not only in ראש, גֵּאן, אָמַל = Assy. *rešu, cenu, ekul*, but also in סָרְרֵן = *Šarru-kenu* and in אֶסְרִידִין = *Ašur-aza-iddina*; see *Ezra-Neh.* 31:22.

אֶסְרִידִין is a gloss.

For אֶרֶם (with א) read אֶרֶם, with א; see *Kings* 280:27 and cf. above, p. 27, the note on אֶרֶם מֵא, 2:2. The plural אֶרֶם is intensive (= the great Nile) just as נָהָרִים בָּבֶל in Ps. 137:1 means *By Babylon's great river*, i.e. the Euphrates; see *OLZ* 10:46. Also נָהָרִים is a pluralis intensivus like

גְּדִירִים, טָרִיִּים, etc. (see *Kings* 206 = 270, n. 2): אֲרָם טָרִיִּיב = *Syria on the Great River*, i.e. the *Euphrates*.

The clause חִילָּהּ הֵם מְכַבְּלֶיהָ is a gloss to the following חֵם; it might also be a variant (see *Kings* 213 ss) to the last hemistich of this verse, מִים חֻמָּתָה (cf. the note on 2 י, i.e. ר, β) but this is improbable.

For חֵם חֵם read חֵם חֵם; the relative pronoun prefixed to this clause may be omitted. The term חֵם 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 מֵיִם, at the beginning of the last hemistich, point מֵיִם (W). In *Gen.* 6 11, on the other hand, J. D. Michaelis read מֵיִם: — דָּגַי מְבִיא אֶת רֶמְבֹּל מֵיִם עַל הָאָרֶץ; see E. Suess, *Die Sinfstuth* (Prag, 1883) pp. 27, 50. I pointed out in *KAT*² (1883) p. 66, n. 3 (cf. *AJSL* 1 100, n. 2) that מְבֹל was a popular adaptation of Assyrian *abūbu*, deluge; cf. *KAT*² (1902) p. 546, n. 2. For מ = א see also *Kings* 190 ss; Haupt, *Purim*, p. 23, l. 23.

(9) For מְבֹל מְבֹל.

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

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

For מְבֹל read, with W, מְבֹל; cf. מְבֹל instead of מְבֹל in 1 14. For the prefixed ב see *Numbers* 57 ss.

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

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

The prefixed מְבֹל is a scribal expansion, derived from *Lam.* 4 1 2 ss; *Lam.* 2 10 is a gloss; cf. the gloss מְבֹל מְבֹל in *Is.* 51 10.

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

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

(Jer. 40:14) = וָקִים cf. Assy. *agappu* = *gappu* (for *gadpu*) wing; see *Kings* 98:10. The ך in נָךְ represents an infixed ך (cf. נָר = נִר; see below, *ad v.* 17^b and *Kings* 258:2) while the ן in בָּךְ is infixed just as the ן in צִיטָךְ and קָנָךְ; the כ in בָּךְ is due to partial assimilation of the initial ן to the final ך. The noun בָּךְ, *wing* is ultimately identical with כָּף, *hand*, and the original form is גָּף. Heb. וָקִים, *fetters* and שֹׁמֵךְ, *street* are ultimately derived from the same root; cf. *Kings* 133, n. †

(11) After חֲשַׁכְרֵי we must supply (but not insert) כֹּסֶם חֲמֹה (cf. Is. 51:17 = Jer. 25:15) = כֹּסֶם שֶׁמֶה שֶׁמֶה (Ez. 23:2) = τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ αἵνου τοῦ θυμοῦ ἧς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ (Rev. 16:19; cf. 14:10). Cf. also Obad. 10.

The participle נִשְׁלַחָה means *covered*, i.e. *overcome* = *fainting*, falling into a swoon. In Arabic, *ǧāṣiḥa* means *to cover*, and *ǧūṣiḥa* 'alaihi, lit. *a cover was put upon him*, is the common expression for *he swooned*, became senseless. It is not necessary to read נִשְׁלַחָה; cf. קָלַסְי, *are overcome*, lie fainting, Is. 51:20 and הִתְעַלָּה, *he was overcome* (by the heat) Jon. 4:2; also יִשְׁמָרָה, *faints, fails*, Is. 57:12. The inf. Hiph. הִתְעַלֵּם means in Eccl. 3:11 *covering, veil* = κάλυμμα, 2 Cor. 3:15; cf. Haupt, *Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905) p. 42, n. 18. The gratuitous emendation נִשְׁלַחָה, 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 נִשְׁלַחָה as a privative denominative (AJSL 22:2, l. 3) of שֶׁלַחָה, i.e. *deflowered, devirginated* (cf. our term *maiden fortress*) is impossible; נִשְׁלַחָה means *young woman*, not *virgin*.

The following hemistichal pair (v. 11^b) 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 חֲזַק מִבְּצָרֶיךָ and וְיָמְסִי בְּיָדְךָ are glosses; וְיָמְסִי בְּיָדְךָ explains the preceding בְּיָדְךָ, and חֲזַק מִבְּצָרֶיךָ is a gloss to the entire verse, and should therefore be placed after the second hemistich.

The line קָאֵבִי לְךָ מִבְּצָרֶיךָ 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 בִּטְסוּ בָּרִמָּה, *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 בִּטְסוּ (Grätz, N; cf. Zech. 10:2) 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: *ṣiṣa erēbu* (HW 301^b). Heb. בִּטְסוּ = Assy. *ṣiṣu* stands for *ṣiṣtu*, with partial assimilation of the feminine

ח as in Syr. קשטא, *archer* for קשתא, from Assy. *gaštu*, bow (a biconsonantal feminine form) pl. *gašāti*; cf. AJSL 23 22, below.

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

For רַחֲבֵר read רַחֲבֵר. The reading רַחֲבֵר is not a graphic corruption, but it is influenced by רַחֲבֵר in the second hemistich (cf. the remarks on אַמְלֵל 1° for רַחֲב 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 22 and Lam. 4 21 (OLZ 10 22).

The מ in אַרְבֵּה is not prothetic, as in Syr. אַרְבֵּה for אַרְבֵּה, etc. (Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.* 2, § 51). The stem is not רַבִּי, but אַרְב; cf. אַרְבֵּה = אַרְבֵּה (AJSL 23 22) and Assy. *āribu* (or *eribu*) a swarm of locusts. The final ה in אַרְבֵּה represents the nominal affix י; אַרְבֵּה = *arbai*, just as Assy. *gabšû*, inflated skin (Arab *ṭauf*) = *gabšaiu*; cf. Ezekiel 65 22 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, חֲמַלְכֵּךְ כִּלְק, is a gloss (so W) to the first hemistich אֶשׁ חֲמַלְכֵּךְ. 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 אֶשׁ, at the beginning of v. 15, read אֶשׁ or אֶשׁ; we find the same mistake in Ps. 137 2, where we must read אֶשׁ, although (Eccl. 4 14) instead of אֶשׁ; see OLZ 10 22, n. 3.

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

(16^b) The hemistich אֶשׁ וְאֶשׁ יִלֵּק severs the connection between v. 16^a and v. 17^a which form a מַשְׁל with 2 + 2 beats.

The verb אֶשׁ refers to the *exuviation* (or *ecdysis*) of the locust. We use *exuviae* of the skins, etc., of animals, which are shed or sloughed off, while in Latin, *exuviae* is used also for *spoils*, just as Heb. אֶשׁ means also to *plunder*. Arab. *ṣāḫa*, to shed the skin, is connected with the root שָׁל which we have in שָׁלַל, to *plunder*; Arab. *ṣāḫa*; cf. AJSL 23 22. 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

6th, 18th, 21st, 31st, and 50th day; the wings attain their perfect development and the locust becomes capable of flight only at the 6th and last molt. The Assyr. stem *pašāfu*, to obliterate, has no connection with Heb. *פָּשַׁע*, but is a transposition of *פָּשַׁע*, to rinse, to wash off.

The term *ילק* is not derived from *לָקַק* = *לטע* (cf. *Kings* 175, n. †) but it may be connected with Assyr. *ilqitu* (HW 76) and Arab. *yalalaqā* which denotes a *leaping gait* of the camel, so that *ילק* 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. *הֲיִרְעֶשֶׁנּוּ כַּאֲרֵבָה*.

(17^b) The *ד* in *נדר* (whence the name *Cádiz*) is an infixed *ד*, and *נ* is connected with *קד* and Assyr. *kāru*, wall; cf. the remarks on *נדרף* above, p. 32, and *AJSL* 23 27. In *ביום קד* (which is perhaps influenced by *ביום זר*, 10) *יום* should be transposed: we must read *ביום ידום*, in the cool of the day (for *קד*, cool, see *AJSL* 23 28) i.e. *from sunset to sunrise*; in Arabic, the dual *al-bardāni* (cf. Heb. *בדר*) means *morning and evening*; and *bardu 'n-nahāri* = daybreak. Toward nightfall (*לרדת היום*), 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, *ולא ירדע מקומו*, has been expanded by a prefixed and an affixed gloss, *ולא ירדע מקומו* and *ולא ירדע מקומו*; both are superfluous. For *מקומו* we had better read *מקומם* (cf. *דחנים*) although the suffix refers to the collective *תניבי*. The singular suffix in *מקומו* may be influenced by *ולא ירדע מקומו*, Ps. 103 18 = Job 7 10; *מקומו* may also mean *the place* (*Kings* 299 20). The singular *ולא ירדע* for *ולא ירדעו* may be due to haplography; cf. Haupt, *Purim*, p. 23, l. 9; see also above, p. 29, *ad לעבור בכך*, 21.

(16*) The clause *ולא ירדעו רכליהם* may be concessive, just as the imperatives in v. 15^b; but it is not necessary to substitute the imperative (so WM) in this gloss; cf. the conditional clause *אם לא ירדעו רכליהם* in v. 13. Heb. *רכליהם* is dissyllabic (*rōkhlāhēm*).

(17*) For *מקדד* we must not read *מקדד* (see *Isaiah* 107 27 and below, note on *העלחה*, 38) or *רחנים* (Grätz) but we must point: *מקדד*, *the exorcists, conjurers*, part. Piel of *קד* = Assyr. *nazāru*, to curse, execrate (adjure, conjure). Alongside of *קד* we find also *קד* in Assyrian (cf. *AJSL* 23 24). The primitive meaning of this stem is to bind (cf. *קד*, *girdle*) just as *קד*, 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 *כֹּהֵן* means *priest* in Hebrew, while the corresponding Arab. *kāhin* means *seer, diviner*. Heb.

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

Also נזכר is a Babylonian loanword = Assy. *nupšarru*, scribe, i.e. hierogrammatist. The word is ultimately Sumerian, a compound of *dup*, tablet (which has passed into Syriac as ܕܡܬܐ) and *sar*, to write. Instead of נזכר and נזכר (Jer. 51 7) we ought to point: נזכר and נזכר; 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 *p*, and *ki* for *p*; see my ASKT 169, § 13; *Kings* 86 11 208 12. The a in נזכר instead of נזכר or נזכר is due to the fact that after a נ an *d* sounds almost like *δ*, just as our *wand* is pronounced *wond*; 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 נזכר to mean נזכר = שומר, i.e. a military officer; cf. *Judges* 85 20; contrast *Kings* 304 7. See also the note on נזר, v. 13.

The form נזי (= Arab. *jābt*) at the end of v. 17^a represents a correction of the preceding נז. For the apocope of the termination *ai* or *é* cf. נזל, etc. (see AJSL 22 22, n. 14) and for undeleted corrigenda cf. *Kings* 194 20. The variants נז נז 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 ארב) and *eribû* (i.e. ארבי = Heb. ארבה; see above, ad v. 15). The stem of נז = נז is akin to גבא, *to gather*, so that נז means originally a *gathering* or *swarm* (of locusts). Cf. Ethiop. *gabbâ'ê*, collection, congregation; Assy. *gabbu* (for *gab'u*) all; *gubbu* (for *gub'u*) cistern (cf. Heb. גבית 2 K 8 10 Jer 14 18 and גבא, *pool, swamp*, Is. 30 14 Ez. 47 11) lit. *reservoir* (גבית) i.e. a place where water collects or is collected or stored. The root ק is a modification of נב or נם; קי, *cord* is a collection of strands twisted or woven together. Heb. גביל, גביל, גביל; גביר, גביר, גביר; Assy. *gabbu*, *gabbu*, *gabbu*, etc. are all derivations of the same root נב = נם = קב = קם = קי = כב = כם; cf. the remarks on אקב = קב in the note on וקב, v. 10 and AJSL 23 22.

(12) The prefixed כל is scribal expansion.

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

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

V. 12^b is an explanatory gloss: the Assyrian fortifications are like fig-trees (נזרים) and their garrisons like firstripe figs; if the נזרים are shaken, the נז 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 נז נז

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

The first two words of this verse, רגה 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 1114. 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 (Auftakt) in אכלה־אש cf. above, ad 14.

For נשים, women, we must read נשים, we shall destroy, from שמו, or rather ישימו, they will destroy. Similarly ש has for נשים, Num. 2130 καταγυναικες. The compiler of the late oracle Jer. 5037 5130 (cf. Is. 1912 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 3-12, 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 רעד, ארדך, לשכך, מנתך, שמתך, עלך, should be feminine, referring to the City of Nineveh (i.e. the Seleucid Kingdom), not masculine; מלך אשור is a gloss. Cf. above, p. 29, ad 214 (ב, ρ).

For נמי instead of נמי cf. the remarks on נמי, v. 10.

After נמי we must supply (but not insert) שנתם (Ps. 766) or שנת שלום (Jer. 5137 52). All these passages are Maccabean: Ps. 76 refers to Judas Maccabæus' victory over Nicanor; see my remarks in ZDMG 61222; for Jer. 51 cf. the note on מוסר, v. 17.

Instead of ישנ ישכנ read ישנ (not ישכנו).

For ארדך cf. ארדך, 24.

Instead of נשעו read נשע, from נשע, as in 1 K 2217. The stem נשע (whence the name נשעין, Surgy, i.e. rising in billows; see JAOS 16 ciii, †) means to gambol, caper, leap, spring, skip (cf. Jer. 5011, quoted in the notes on רעד, Nah. 32) but not to scatter.

The addition של דרדך is derived from the parallel passage in Kings (see Kings 1712 and cf. the remarks on the gloss שלום in v. 9).

(19) Instead of נקה read, with W, נקה; cf. Kings 2932; contrast נשים for נשים in 24 (ד, β). This noun נקה (for gūllājatū) corresponds to Syr. ܢܩܬܐ (or ܢܩܬܐ) deliverance from pain, etc. Cf. also Arab. jdhā 'l-tājāta (= ḡdssā'ahā) which does not mean to enlarge a wound (in the head) but to mitigate it.

The final clause, כי לא עברה רעתך חמד, 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 no) 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 ל.

Section 7 consists of 3:3 + 2:14; 2 of 3:10; 3 of 3:1 and 4:7 + 1:11-2:3; 4 of 1:1-10. Consequently 3:1+4:7 must be inserted before 1:11-2:3, and 2:14, preceded by 3:3, 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 7 (3:1) has been inserted after 2:14 has been indicated on p. 29, in the note on ב, p; the insertion of the first three משלים of 7 between the first and the second משל of ב (3:1) has been explained above, on p. 23. Cf. my restoration of the Hebrew text of Canticles in AJSL 19 no-23 and my arrangement of Ecclesiastes in Haupt, *Kokeleth oder Weltschmerz 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) For the heading, חזון נחום הנאקש, see above, p. 18. The prefixed ספר is a gloss; cf. EB 3259.

(3:1) The singulars, שם, אים, סם, מרכבה, פרש, רכב, חנית, רכב, פטר, קנן, תהפך, קנן, 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 *ḥāyḡata ft gajri ḥiqṣiqatin*, to roar without inflation of the *ḥiqṣiqat*, 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. *hādara* means (like שאתן; cf. שאתן, 1:1) *crash*; Arab. *hādīr* = roaring of the waves (cf. שאתן ימים, Ps. 85:3). *Hādīr*, cooing of doves, stands for *hādīl*. For the transposition in רודר = *hādara* cf. AJSL 22 no, 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 (3:4) uses *φθίγγεσθαι* with reference to a horse.

In the Song of Deborah (Jud. 5:2) the hemistichial pair,

אֶתְחַלְמוּ קַקְבֵי סוּם מִדִּהְדוֹת דִּהְדוֹת 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, *raḥḥa* means not only to urge on a horse, to gallop, but also to flee; cf. the note on מַעֲלָה, 31. In Scotland, to thud means to move with velocity; cf. הִלַּט = they thudded away. In German the קול עֲקָבֵי סוּס is called *Hufschlag*, i.e. hoof-beat (cf. Lat. *pulsus*, Greek *κτύπος*). Apart from Zagen for Schreien, Luther translates Jud. 52 correctly: *Da rasselten der Pferde Füße vor dem Zagen ihrer mächtigen Reiter*. The suffix in מַבְרִיז refers to the enemy; cf. מַבְרִיז and מַבְרִיזו, Nah. 24 s. We must not read הִלַּט, nor need we join the prefixed ב of דָּרִיחַ 1° to סוּס; contrast Ps. 687 (AJSL 2322). The first דָּרִיחַ is not a suspended *status constructus*, but *status absolutus*; for the repetition cf. v. 5:

דָּרִיחַ סוּל מִיָּדָהּ מַבְרִיזָהּ אֶלֶיָּהּ יִשְׂרָאֵל

and gloss θ in Ps. 68 (AJSL 2322). § renders Jud. 52: הִדִּיחַ נָסַל עֲקָבָהּ; דְּרִכָּשָׁה מִן נִמְחָתָהּ דִּחְלָהּ דִּחְקִיחָהּ; Syriac נִמְחָתָהּ, *roaring*, is a correct translation of Heb. דָּרִיחַ; contrast ZDMG 5641. § renders freely: *ungulae equorum ceciderunt, fugientibus impetu, et per praeceps ruentibus fortissimis hostium*; cf. ZDMG 5641. 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 נָסַל in Gen. 242 2 K 52. They tumbled all over themselves trying to get away. In Arabic, *ḡḡa'a*, to fall, means also 'to rush away' (*ḡḡaba ḡanḡlaḡa sarī'an*) = German *fortstürzen*. The comments on Jud. 52 in ZDMG 5641-42 are unsatisfactory, and the restoration of this line, given on p. 184, is gratuitous.

Also in Jer. 81 מַבְרִיזוּ denotes the yells of the horsemen, not the neighing of the horses. We must read:

מִן שָׂמַע מִן נִיחָה סוּסִים
(סוּסִים) מַבְרִיזוּ מִבְּרִיז רִעָה כְּלִיחָרָץ:

The prefixed ב before מַבְרִיזוּ is not a nominal preformative, but the preposition מִן, as in Jud. 52. We must point מַבְרִיזוּ, plur. constr. of מַבְרִיזָה; cf. *Isaiah* 1101. The noun מַבְרִיזוּ in the late passage Jer. 137 has a different meaning: it is explained by the following gloss וְשִׁת וְנִתְחַד; cf. Syr. מַבְרִיזָה, *lustful*. The noun מַבְרִיזָה represents a form *ḡahalat*, not *ḡahālat*. The explanation of מַבְרִיזוּ in the prefixed gloss מִן is correct. § has מַבְרִיזוּ for מַבְרִיזוּ, § (*a voce hinnituum*) *pug-natorum ejus*; but מִן קִלָּה מַבְרִיזוּ, while מַבְרִיזוּ is rendered: מִן קִלָּה דְּרִכָּשָׁה. Heb. מַבְרִיז, however, means *snorting*, not *neighing*; see my paper on the cuneiform name of the sperm-whale, AJSL 2322. In Arabic, *ḡahala* is used of the cry of a horse (*ḡahala 'l-fārasu ḡḡa ḡuḡata*) 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.

In Arabic, *qāqara* (which denotes originally the sound of rushing water; cf. *AJSL* 23 26) means not only *to roar, to crow, to coo, to murmur*, but also *to guffaw*; and in modern Arabic it means *to complain, to grumble*. In *Is.* 12 : 24 14 54 : *Jer.* 31 זל appears as a synonym of רנן, *to shout for joy*; in *Esth.* 8 15 we read ושמחה זללה ושמחה; but in *Is.* 10 20 זל means *to utter shrill cries of distress*, just as we speak not only of *shrieks of laughter* but also of *shrieks of fright*.

Nor does אבירי in the Maccabean passage *Jer.* 47 : refer to the horses. We must read: מִשְׁעֶמֶת פִּרְסָה אַבְרִי מִרְעֵשׁ לִרְכָּבִי⁸ לארבע אבות אלכנים מרפח דים: (β) הסון נלנלי (α) קל The stem שש corresponds to Arab. *šāša*, a synonym of *dāqqa*, to pound (Heb. רצק) and *rāḏaza*, to smash (which corresponds to Heb. רצח, to slay). For שש again, correctly, נכרוד, 3, מִרְעֵשׁ רִנְנוּרִי 3, אבירי 3 (cf. לרכבו in *Nah.* 2 12) is inserted for rhythmical reasons; just as כעלי ברשא is more rhythmical than כעלי רשא, *Jer.* 50 11; see below. The phrase מִרְעֵשׁ לִרְכָּבִי (= שש) which Cornill considers to be a gloss, is far more poetic than רמון נלנלי, which Cornill relegates to the margin. For the intransitive Hiphil לארבע אבירי (אחמני 3) cf. the last hemistich of *Nah.* 2 : ואין משה; also *Kings* 217 : *AJSL* 22 24, l. 4. For the second line of *Jer.* 47 : cf. ll. 112, 113 of the cuneiform account of the Deluge, mistranslated by Jensen, *KB* 6 22, l. 113; see *KAT*² (1883) 62 π 73 10.

In *Jer.* 50 11, on the other hand,

כִּרְתַּשְׁמֹחוּ כִּי תַעֲלֶזוּ שְׂמֵי מַלְאֲכֵי
כִּרְחֻשׁוֹ כַּעֲלֵי בִדְשָׁא וְתַצְלֻוּ כְּאַבְרִים

the noun אבירים means *bulls*; we must render: *though ye bellow like bulls* (so AV). For the concessive כי see the note on כִּרְבִּיקִים, *Nah.* 2 1. 3 ἐκαστὰτε ὡς βοῖδια ἐν βοράνῃ, καὶ ἐκπαρίζετε (this is wrong) ὡς ταῦροι, 3 sicut vituli super herbam et mugistis sicut tauri, 3 ותצלו ותקדו, אך דברא רשא כעלי רבקה ותמולן כִּיבִירָא 3, אך דברא רשא.

There is no evidence that אבירים ever refers to horses, nor does דוד mean to gallop.

The clause מִרְעֵשׁ מִרְעֵשׁ forms the last hemistich of v. 2; the סוף מִרְעֵשׁ after מִרְעֵשׁ must be transposed. The collective מִרְעֵשׁ means here *horsemen*, not *horses*; cf. the second hemistich of gloss β: הַמִּרְעֵשִׁים הָרָקְלִי = 3 καὶ οἱ ἰππεῖς θορυβήσουσιν.

After מִרְעֵשׁ we may supply (but not insert) אַחֲסִיחוּ, cf. the intransitive Hiphil מִרְעֵשׁ in 2 : מִרְעֵשׁ means literally *he rears = he causes* (his horse) *to rear* by urging him on with whip and spur. Spur (Assyr. *ziqtu*) is no anachronism; see l. 54 of the sixth tablet of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic (*KB* 6 10; cf. p. 450 and *HW* 262^b). The Median horsemen may have spurred (or goaded) their horses with the points of their swords, etc., or with their feet; cf. Arab. *rāḏaḏa* = *dāḏa'a*: *rāḏaḏa*

'l-fārāsa bi-rjldāhi ʾilā 'stahāyahu lil-'addi; — ḥaṭṭa = ḥadda). Heb. מַטְלָה has here about the same meaning as Arab. *mutarākiq*. Cf. also Arab. *uḍḡara* which means *to move with springs or bounds, to rear, to race, etc.*

(2^b) The first three מַטְלָה of 7 have been displaced in the Received Text by gloss β. The first מַטְלָה of β (2^b) is a variant (cf. *Kings* 213^{ss}) to the second מַטְלָה of 8^a, and the two מַטְלָה of the following verse (2^c) represent an explanatory gloss to this variant: 2^c explains the second hemistich of 2^b; (הַמַּטְלָה הַזֶּה) and 2^b gives an explanation of the first hemistich of 2^b; it is therefore better to transpose the two מַטְלָה of 2^c (cf. the transposition of the two מַטְלָה of 3^u; also 3^u 17 and 1^s 9). The glossator understood הַמַּטְלָה to mean *horses* (of the chariots) not *horsemen*.

Instead of כָּמַש we must, with W, read כָּמַש (cf. *Kings* 182^{ss} and *Esth.* 1^u 3^a) and לַפֶּתַח (cf. the Homeric λαμπρόων, *Il.* 1^u 104; *Od.* 4^{ss}) instead of פֶּתַח; cf. 1 *Makk.* 6^{ss}: κατηύγαλεν ὡς λαμπάδες πυρός. The verb לָפַת is denominative, derived from לָפַת, *torch*, and this may be a transposition of *dappil* = *dappir*, a byform of Assyri. *dipāru*, *torch*. The collective הַמַּטְלָה may be construed as a feminine in spite of *Ex.* 14⁷; cf. מַטְלָה in v. 5^b, which must not be (with W) changed into מַטְלָה. The corresponding Arabic word *rakb*, a troop of horsemen, cavalcade, etc., may be construed either as masculine or feminine; cf. Wright-de Goeje, 2^u 10 A; 1^{ss} B (§ 148, rem.).

The clause בֵּינָם הָיָה between the two hemistichs of 2^b is a misplaced gloss to v. 3^a, just as זָכַר, at the beginning of v. 6, is a misplaced gloss to חָזַק in 1^u, and יַעֲשֶׂה בְּהַלְכֹתָם (v. 6) a misplaced gloss to הָרָקִיעַ in the present מַטְלָה. The fact that the gloss בְּהַלְכֹתָם, which gives another explanation of הָרָקִיעַ, appears in the Received Text at the end of 3^a, shows that 3^a must have originally stood near 2^a, just as the two glosses מַטְלָה וְאֵף מַטְלָה לְשֶׁנִּי (Ps. 68¹⁰) and אֵף מַטְלָה שֶׁנִּי (Ps. 68⁷) show that Ps. 68⁷ stood originally near Ps. 68¹⁰; see *AJSL* 23^{ss}; cf. also my remarks on the gloss מַטְלָה נִים in *Cant.* 4^u (*AJSL* 18^{ss}, n. 35 on No. 8) and Haupt, *Biblische Liebeslieder* (Leipzig, 1907) p. 27, l. 9.

For מַטְלָה read, with W, מַטְלָה; cf. מַטְלָה for מַטְלָה, 1 *S.* 17^{ss}; מַטְלָה for מַטְלָה; contrast מַטְלָה for מַטְלָה in 3^u. The rendering of ὁ, καὶ ὁ μαῖος 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 = רֶמֶס, מַטְלָה; cf. *ad* v. 9^a. The passive הָרָקִיעַ 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. מַטְלָה הַמַּטְלָה in v. 5 and בשָׁנִי טִיג, 2 *K.* 9^{ss}) as though they had the (blind) *staggers*, German *Koller*; cf. מַטְלָה. In Arabic the verb *ra'ila* means *to be stupid, dolish*, and the Pual of its synonym (*hāmūqa*, *to be stupid, dull*): *hāmūmīqa* means especially *to be stupefied by wine, to drink wine (šāriba*

'l-xámra). Cf. also Greek (πρόσσω) μάομαι (which is connected with μαμῶω and μαίνομαι, also μανία and μίνος) especially μεμῶός, also μενεαίνω. In the two misplaced tertiary glosses *יִשְׁלֹו בְּהִלְכָּתָם* (20) and *יִשְׁלֹו בְּנִיחָם* (31) this *furious precipitation* was misinterpreted to mean *stumbling in their course or over the corpses*. The *Kēlāt* הִלְכָּתָם must not be read *הִלְכָּתָם*, but the *l* should be transposed as in *יִדַּע* for *יָדַע*, 17 and in *וְלִדְב* for *לִדְב*, 31; we must read the plural *הִלְכָּתָם*, not the singular *הִלְכָּתָם*, as pointed in the *Qérê*. Nor is the *Qérê* of *יִשְׁלֹו* in the second gloss correct; we must not read *וְיִשְׁלֹו*, but *יִשְׁלֹו*, as in the first gloss. For the *scriptio defectiva* of the *t* in *הִלְכָּתָם* cf. *Kings* 84 a.

(5^b) The verb *יִרְצֹצוּ* 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*, *lámá'*.

(5^a) For *יִתְחַלְלֻ* read the singular, *יִתְחַלֵּל*; cf. *Kings* 170, n.*; 296 a. The plural is conformed to *יִשְׁתַּקְשְׁקוּ* in the second hemistich. For the singular in the first hemistich and the plural in the second cf. Ges-Kautzsch, § 145, g. This *raging of the chariots* (German *dahin-rasen*) means *driving furiously*, *טֵבַּב בְּשִׁנְעָן*; cf. the remarks on *הִרְעֵל*.

Just as *יִתְחַלְלֻ*, Esth. 4:1 is connected with *חַל*, so *יִשְׁתַּקְשְׁקוּ* must be combined with *שָׂק*, *leg*; it means *they move their legs*, i.e. *they speed*; cf. Ps. 147 10: *לֹא בִגְבוּרַת רַגְלָם לֹא בִקְשֹׁק רַגְלָם יִרְצֹצוּ*.

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*. Assyri. *puridu*, swift messenger, originally *runner*, which has passed into Arabic as *barid*, courier, is identical with *puridu*, *leg*; see KB 6 606 (*mê puridi* = מִרְתִּילָם). Both Heb. *mule* and German *Pferd*, horse (cf. *palfrey*) are derived from the same stem, and *פָּרַד*, *פָּרַשׁ*, *פָּרַח*, etc. go back to the same root, *פָּר*, to *flee*, *fly*, *speed*.

(31) The first two words of v. 3 belong to v. 2; see above, p. 39.

In *וְלִדְב* the *l* must be transposed as in *יִדַּע*, 17, also *בֵּרַק* should be pointed as *פִּרְעַל*; the omission of the *l* may be due to haplography; cf. the note on *לִעֲבֹר*, 21. Both *לִדְב* and *בֵּרַק* are denominative participles like *לִפְרַח* in 21. Cf. also the note on 211 and *וְהִפְרִיחַ*, Ps. 144 a. The verb *harāqu* is used also in Assyrian, and *láhība*, to flare, is used in Arabic (*láhībati 'n-nāru*).

Although *חִרֵב* is fem. (cf. 311) the preceding verbal predicate may be masc. Nor is the masculine form preferred for rhythmical reasons: *לִדְבַת* would be dissyllabic: *lohevth-xérut*; cf. the anapestic beginning in *צַפְּהֶדְדִּיךְ* (*cappe-dérkh*) 21; *אֶכְלֵהֶם* (*akhla-ê*) 311; *וְנִינֵה* (*uē-Ninué*) 211; *וְאֶמְחִיחָהּ* (*uamhothēha*; cf. the note on *בִּמְאֹר*, 21 and Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.* 1, § 33, A) 21; *בֹּזְזוּ-כֶסֶף* (*bozzu-késhf*) 210.

Both the prefixed *חִלֵּל* *וּרְב* and the affixed *קָמַה* *לְנִיחָהּ* are explanatory glosses to *וְיִקְבֹּר פָּנָיו*; for *וּרְב* we had better point *רָב*. In *וְיִקְבֹּר פָּנָיו* the first word is not a substantive in the construct state, but a participle

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 (מכבד). At the beginning of v. 6 we may supply (but not insert) the adversative וְגַם, *yet*; cf. נָלִים תִּכְבְּדוּ אִשׁ 3, 14.

(11) A misplaced (incorrect) gloss to מְחַלְלִים is found at the end of v. 11: וְפָנֵי כָלֶם קִבְצוּ מֵאִיר, 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 מֵאִיר, *glow*, is connected with מִיר, *pot*, lit. *boiler*. The stem is מִיר; the מ in מֵאִיר must be explained according to Ges.-Kautzsch, § 72, p. The form מֵאִיר (pārūr) has two long vowels; it is a form like נִמְשִׁים and נִמְשִׁים, but from a stem עִי. 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. מֵאִיר, fever = Assy. *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 מֵאִיר means *boiler*, then *heater*, *glowing hotness*, *glow*, *flush*, *vivid redness*; and the phrase וְפָנֵי כָלֶם קִבְצוּ מֵאִיר means: *all their faces blazed vivid, burning crimson*.

(6) The first word of v. 6, יָדָה, is a misplaced (corrective) gloss to יָדָה, 14; see above, p. 26.

The suffix in מֵאִירָה refers to the enemy; the suffix in מֵאִירָה, to the besieged city, i.e. Nineveh.

The clause מֵאִירָה בְּהִלְכָּתָם is a misplaced (incorrect) gloss to יָדָה in v. 4^b; see above, p. 41.

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

(9^b) Between vv. 6 and 7 we must insert the second מֵשֶׁל of v. 9, while v. 9^a must be inserted between vv. 7 and 8. The clause at the beginning of v. 9^b, וְהָיָה נִסִּים, is a gloss. The first word of this gloss has displaced the verbal predicate of מֵשֶׁל at the end of v. 9^a; cf. the note on מֵשֶׁל for הָיָה in 1 n. The original text of this hemistich was מֵשֶׁל הָיָה, which appears in the Received Text as מֵשֶׁל הָיָה. The מ in מֵשֶׁל must be canceled, and the two consonants הָיָה should be transposed; cf. יָדָה for יָדָה, 17; וְהָיָה for וְהָיָה, 3 a.

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

At the end of the first hemistich we must insert מֵשֶׁל, *they* (the Ninevite captains) *yell*. This verb has dropped out here just as מֵשֶׁל at the end of 17 or תִּכְבְּדוּ (or תִּכְבְּדוּ) in Ps. 68 m (AJSL 23 m, n. 86).

* Cf. Lat. *tram colligere*, *situm ab aestu colligere*, etc.

The second hemistich, וַאֲנִי בָּסַח, 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 בָּסַח cf. רָשַׁח, Jer. 47: quoted in the note on יָדָר, 32.

(7) The plural הַבְּרִיחִים is due to the preceding שָׁעָר; cf. JBL 19 88, second paragraph; *Numbers* 49 21; *Kings* 206 12. 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 3 124, l. 36; 12, l. 18; 12, l. 28; 12, 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 הַכֶּלֶל 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. *amujj* 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 מִיָּמֶה דְּרוּקָה. 6 has *ra* *âura* *âura*, 3 *aquae ejus*; מִיָּמֶה is not a dittogram of מֵם (W) nor is the form a reduplication of מֵ; see *Kings* 200 12. The suffix in דְּרוּקָה refers to בִּרְכָה, not to the river; the suffix in דְּרוּקָה, to the city. The form דְּרוּקָה is the impf. Qal of a denominative verb derived from מְרוּמָה; cf. Deut. 7 25: וְהָיָה מְרוּמָה נִלְכָּה עַד הַשְׂמָרָם. The flooding of the city produces a מְרוּמָה מֵת, 1 S 5 11; cf. מְרוּמָה יָדָה, Zech. 14 12. This denominative verb רוּם, *engulf, overwhelm, swallow up, ruin*, etc., is more frequent than is generally supposed: all the forms of the alleged stem רוּם are forms of רוּם. Instead of לִדְרוּם and יִדְרוּם we must point לִדְרוּם and יִדְרוּם; the forms הִבְסִי (he has swallowed me up, Jer. 51 4) and הִבְסִי are Polel forms of רוּם; even הִבְסִי is derived from רוּם. For the construct הִבְסִי cf. הִבְסִי, constr. הִבְסִי, from יָדָר; see BA 1 124, l. 4. The primary meaning of רוּם is *to roar*: in Assy. *mûmu* (= *malûmu*, i.e. the masculine of מְרוּמָה) *Ti'amat* (i.e. the feminine of תְּרוּם) it denotes the roaring of the billows of the sea; in *ûmu* (HW 33) the roaring of a tempest; in הִבְסִי, the roaring of a multitude shouting together. For Assy. *ûmu, mûmu, Ti'amat* see note 96 to my paper cited above, p. 15, n. 4. Assy. *mummu* (i.e. *mûmu*) was combined with מְרוּמָה by Friedrich Delitzsch in *Geo. Smith's Chaldäische Genesis* (Leipzig, 1876) p. 297, l. 10.

(8) For הִנֵּה הִיא read הִנֵּה הִיא = הִנֵּה הִיא, *she will be taken out*, i.e. *carried off*; cf. 2 S 12 21 and *Kings* 253 22; for הִנֵּה הִיא = הִנֵּה הִיא see *ibid.* 119 22; cf. the remarks on בָּאָר, Nah. 2 2.

For *וְנִלְקָה*, *she was stripped* read *וְנִלְקָהּ*, *she was led into captivity*; the omission of the prefix *ה* is due to haplography: *וְנִלְקָהּ* became *וְנִלְקָה*; afterwards the final *ה* of *וְנִלְקָה* was corrupted to *ב*; cf. the omission of the two *ה*'s in *יִם חֵיל* for *יָם חֵיל* for *הַיָּם חֵיל*, 31.

For *וְנִלְקָהּ* read *וְנִלְקָהּ*; cf. *וְנִלְקָהּ* for *וְנִלְקָהּ*, etc. In Assyrian the causative *uṣeli* (to bring up) often means *to remove, carry off*; see HW 62^b; cf. Ps. 102^a: *וְנִלְקָהּ*, and our *to bring up a prize* (German *eine Prise aufbringen* = *ein Schiff erbeuten*) = to capture a ship; also *to raise* = to remove; *to lift* = to take away; Greek *δυναίω*, Lat. *praedam tollere*, French *enlever une fille* (Heb. *נָשָׂא*, Jud. 21^a; cf. 1 S 17^a, etc.). Ruben's emendation *וְנִלְקָהּ* = Assyrian *etillitu* (which was endorsed by Cheyne, JBL 15¹⁹⁰⁵) is just as gratuitous as his reading *מְנַרְדֵּךְ* for *מְנַרְדֵּךְ*, 31^a. The conjectures proposed by Ruben, PSBA 20 113-114 are singularly infelicitous. Not one of the Assyrian and Arabic words which he finds in Nahum (e.g. *שָׁנָה*, to sound, *יָד*, infantry, *בֵּן*, canal-bed, *נָלַח*, to be frightened, *עַלְלָה*, lady) occur in the Book. His metrical reconstruction of the text is impossible.

For the three synonyms, *וְנִלְקָהּ*, *וְנִלְקָהּ*, *וְנִלְקָהּ*, cf. the first hemistich of v. 11. In Jud. 5^a, on the other hand, the accumulation of synonyms is due to scribal expansion, and the entire verse is a gloss; cf. ZDMG 56 114-115 and above, p. 38. We must read:

בֵּן נָלַח אֶשְׁכָּב^β בְּאֶשֶׁר כָּרַע שְׁמֵנִי^γ

(γ) שָׁרָד

(θ) בֵּן נָלַח כָּרַע נָפַל

(α) כָּרַע נָפַל

The second hemistich of v. 8 has dropped out, just as in Cant. 8^a, etc.; cf. Haupt, *Biblische Liebeslieder* (Leipzig, 1907) p. 47, l. 3. Similarly we must supply in Ps. 110^a after *וְלֹא יִחָם* (ידוה) *נִשְׁכַּח* the hemistich *כַּמֶּשֶׁךְ שָׁרָד*; cf. also the restoration of the last hemistich of couplet iv of Ps. 45 in Haupt, *Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905) p. 37. After *וְנִלְקָהּ* we must insert *וְנִלְקָהּ* we must insert *וְנִלְקָהּ*; cf. Ps. 45¹⁰ Neh. 2^a. Xenophon (*Anab.* iii, 4 11) says of the *τείχος* (= Assyrian *dûru*, wall, castle, fortress) near Mespila, i.e. the Acropolis of Nineveh (see above, p. 8): *ἐνταῦθα λέγεται Μῆδεα γυνὴ βασιλέως καταφυγεῖν ὅτε ἀπώλλυσαν τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ Περσῶν Μῆδοι· ταύτην δὲ τὴν πόλιν πολιορκῶν ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἔδυνάτο οὔτε χρόνῳ ἔλπειν οὔτε βίῃ· Ζεὺς δὲ βροντῇ κατέκλεξε τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας καὶ οὕτως ἔλαβω.* We must, of course, substitute *Assyrians* for *Medians*, and *Medians* for *Persians*; cf. *Daniel*, 29 15.

Heb. *לְשָׁרָד* is identical with *לְשָׁרָד*, *dam* (Ex. 13 13 Deut. 7 11 28 11 21) and Assyrian *sigrêti* (for *sigrâti*) ladies of the palace; see *Ezra-Neh.* 67 12. For the interchange of *ל* and *ר* cf. Arab *hadîl*, cooing = *hadîr*; see above, note on *וְנִלְקָהּ*, 31; cf. also *שָׁרָד*, chains = Arab. *silsila*, pl. *salâsil*; Aram. *לֹיִן*, loin (Arab. *ḫāṣira*, pl. *ḫaṣāṣir*) = Heb. *חֲלָצִים* (Assyrian *sinçâ*) and Heb. *אַלְמָנָה*, widow = Arab. *ārmala*; also Aram. *מְרִנְחָא* (or *מְרִנְחָא*) = Lat. *margarita*, Greek *μαργαρίτης*. See p. 26, above.

For שָׁרָה, *female parent* = שָׁרָה, *queen* cf. *dam* (female parent) = *dame* (lady; in French also *queen* in chess) and *sire* (male parent) = *Sire* (O King). Just as Assy. *šigrēti*, ladies of the palace, appears in Hebrew as 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 ל in שָׁרָה instead of ר is due to a popular adaptation, connecting this word with the obscene Heb. verb שָׁרָה; cf. the Talmudic שָׁרָה, concubines, Sanh. 95^b.

The verb שָׁרָה means originally (like Arab. *sājala* = *ṣābba*) to pour out; Arab. *mā'u ḏākarin*, water of a male, denotes *semen virile*. The stem שָׁרָה may be a Šaphel (see above, p. 24) of לָל, well (Assyr. *gillu*) while שָׁרָה, female parent, may be a Šaphel of לָל, young; cf. שָׁרָה, v. 13. The construct state of שָׁרָה is שָׁרָה, just as the construct of לָל is לָל; the form שָׁרָה, Ex. 13 stands for שָׁרָה, i.e. the syncopated byform *šigru* for *šigaru*, just as we have in Assyrian: *zikru* = *zikaru*, male, and *šikru* = *šikaru* = שָׁרָה (a Šaphel of שָׁרָה; see AJSL 23 ^{no}). For *zikru* = *zikaru*, etc. (cf. Heb. לָב, *libb* = לָב, *libab*) see AJSL 3 ^{no}, l. 6; and for the forms of the construct state, AJSL 1 ^{no}, n. 1.

For שָׁרָה מְנַחֵם כְּקול־יוֹרֵם cf. Assyr. *kima summāti idāmumā ardāti* (see JAOS 22^a, n. 6 and HW 220^b) and E. Littmann, *Neuarabische Volkspoesie* (Berlin, 1902) pp. 52 and 183, l. 96: *qābēt miḥ il-ḥamām 'alēē elli qākiṣ 'a-ḏajār ināḥ*, I will cry for thee like a dove which sits on a tree and moans. Heb. שָׁרָה appears in Arabic as *na'aja*, to bellow like an ox (syn. *zāra*). In Assyrian we have *nagāgu* (HW 446^b). In Syriac, שָׁרָה is used of the *groaning* of camels, just as Arab. *ḥauḥir* 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 שָׁרָה, 3^a, above, p. 37). Arab. *naḥā* means *cooing* and also *lament*; Arab. *niṣā' nauḥ* means *wailing women*, Heb. מְנַחֵם; cf. the translation of Ezekiel (in the Polychrome Bible) p. 163, l. 7. For the ה in שָׁרָה (= שָׁרָה, שָׁרָה) see JBL 19 ^{no}, l. 3; AJSL 22 ^{no}, below.

For the plural לְבָבִים (cf. שָׁרָה for שָׁרָה, 3^a) we must not substitute the singular, לְבָבִי, the form לְבָבִי is the regular constr. plur. of לָל; cf. שָׁרָה = *'inabé*, grapes. Even if there were no byform שָׁרָה, the plural of לָל might be לְבָבִי; cf. שָׁרָה for שָׁרָה; Syr. שָׁרָה, etc. (Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*², § 93). For *heart* = *breast* cf. the German phrase *Hand aufs Herz*.

(10) The rhythm is improved by inserting ו before שָׁרָה 2°. For the unaccented שָׁרָה 1° cf. the note on שָׁרָה, 1^a.

Before שָׁרָה we must insert שָׁרָה, and for שָׁרָה we had better read שָׁרָה, just as we must substitute שָׁרָה for שָׁרָה in Ps. 16^a, etc. (cf. *Genesis* 107 ^{so}). For the erroneous insertion of the *mater lectionis* ו cf. *Kings* 301 ^{is}. Heb. שָׁרָה שָׁרָה would be in Assyrian: *šallata kabtita šullā* (see HW 663^b).

The prefixed מ before שָׁרָה (read *mikkāl-kā*) need not be omitted, as W suggests.

(11) The three terms *בִּיקָה* and *מִבְּקָה* and *מִבְּלָקָה* are generally supposed to be substantives; W: *Öde und Verödung und Verheerung*; A. R. S. Kennedy (in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, 3rd ed.): *a wild and weary waste*. *מִבְּלָקָה*, however, is clearly a fem. part. Pual, and we had better substitute participles (as in 8^a) for the first two terms, reading *בִּיקָה* and *מִבְּלָקָה*, i.e. part. Qal and Poal of *בָּקַק*; cf. *בִּיקָה* and *מִבְּלָקָה*, 2 s. The two forms were originally written *defective* (*בִּיקָה* and *מִבְּלָקָה*) and the ק was haplographed. W cites Is. 24:1: *הָיָה יְהוָה בִּיקָה רֹאשׁ וּבִלְקָה*. On the other hand, we must point *לִמְנָח*, for the *liturgy*, instead of *לִמְנָח*; see *AJSL* 23²², n. 2; cf. also *Kings* 184 s.

The stem *בָּקַק* is connected with *מָסָה*; cf. Ps. 6:1: *בִּרְמֵסִי עֵשׂוֹי אֲמָסָה*, *I water my bed with tears*; see *Ezekiel* 64²⁰. 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. *לְבוֹ נָסָה* *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* 270²¹. In Ethiopic, *masāya*, *ḥemsā* means *to liquefy, to dissolve*, and the quadriliteral *māsāna*, *to putrefy*, is derived from the same root (מָסָה = מָסָה). Syr. *מְסִיחָא* means a *putrid corpse*. For *שְׂלֵדָא* = *שְׂלֵדָא* see above, on *זֶרַח שְׂלֵמָךְ*, 1¹⁴.

The last clause of v. 11, *וְהָיָה כֵּלָם קִבְּצוֹ מֵאֲדָר* (cf. *Joel* 2⁶) is a misplaced (erroneous) gloss to *מִתְּלַעֲסִים*, v. 4; see above, p. 43.

(12) The *אִיה* after *מֵרָעָה* should be inserted after *אִיה*; cf. *מֵרָעָה* Pa. 24¹⁰, etc. (Ges.-Kautzsch, § 136, c; Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*², § 221) also *בִּרְעִי בְּלִיָּהוּא עֲשָׂה*, 1¹⁰.

Instead of *מֵרָעָה* read, with W, *מֵרָעָה*.

For *מֵרָעָה* *לְכַפֵּי* cf. *מֵרָעָה* *לְכַבּוֹ*, *Jer.* 47², quoted above, p. 39.

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

The addition of *אִיה* after *הֵלֶךְ* is superfluous; so, too, at the beginning of the following verse.

For *לְבִיא* read, with W (following *ἡ τοῦ ἐπορεύθη λίαν τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν ἐκεῖ*, *Ad quam ivit leo ut ingrederetur illuc*, § 221) *לְבִיא* (*ראול אִיה* *לְמַעַל לְחַמֵּן*). This mistake is due to *לְלִבְאָחִי* at the end of the following line.

Before *אִיה* omit *וְהָיָה*; this gloss is derived from *נִרְחִי* in the following line.

(13) For the omission of *אִיה* before *מֵרָעָה* see the notes on the preceding verse.

For *בִּרְ* read *בִּרְ*; cf. *בִּרְ* for *בִּרְ*, v. 4. In *Esth.* 1¹⁸, on the other hand, we must read *וְכִרְ* (cf. *Job* 39²⁰) for *וְכִרְ*; the ו before *קָנָה* is the *Waw apodosis*; *וְכִרְ בִּרְ וְקָנָה* means: *Whenever there is disrespect, there is wrath*; cf. the gloss in *Ecc.* 5²: *בִּרְ בִּרְ חִלְמֵת וְכִרְ*, *in many a dream there are vanities*. For *וְ* *sufficiency* see *Proverbs* 60²¹. 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 1 we must substitute feminine forms for the masculine suffixes; מלך אשר is a gloss; see above, p. 36. The feminine suffixes refer to the דרמים, i.e. the Seleucidan Kingdom, and this may be the reason why the beginning of ב has been inserted after the conclusion of ד; cf. above, p. 29.

For דגני אלד we must read again, as in the Maccabean passage 34, דגני נאל עלד.

For רבקה read רבנך, *thy lair* (= German *Lager*) i.e. *the camp of the Syrians*. For the burning of the Syrian camp בעשן cf. 1 Macc. 4.10. For the confusion of the suffixes cf. the note on עלד 14 instead of תלה עלד. The readings סבכבה, *thy thicket* (Smend *apud* W) and ארבבה, *thy den* (PSBA 20.122; see above, *ad* העלתה, v. 8) are not good. ὁ τὸ πλεθρον σου read רבבה. In Arabic the lion is called *errâbid* or *errabbâd*; this would be in Hebrew: רבבן and רבבן. The corruption of רבבן to רבבך was influenced by באש מלוח הרכב in v. 4. The scribe who wrote רבבך probably understood מראיהן כלפידים (v. 5) to mean that the Ninevite chariots were burnt.

The following clause, וכפידך תאכלהרב, is a gloss (cf. Ps. 137.9; see OLZ 10.10).

Also מרץ after הברית 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 ^a : 1, heading	2 1 : ב, iii	3 1 : ב, i
1 ^b : ד, heading	2 : ii	2-3 : ד, i. ii
2 ^a : א, i	3 : iii	4-7 : ב, i
2 ^b : vii	4 : ד, ii	8-11 : ג, i. ii, 1
3 ^a : vii	5 : β	12-13 : ii, 6-7
3 ^b : i	6 : iii	14 : 2-3
4-8 : ii-vi	7 : iv	15 ^a : 5
9 ^a : vii	8 : v	15 ^b : 4
9 ^b : vi	9 ^a : iv	16 ^a : ξ
10 : viii	9 ^b : iii	16 ^b : μ
11 : ב, ii	10-14 : vi-x	17 : ξ
12 : iii		17 ^b : ς
13 : ο		18-19 : iii
14 : ii		

13 ix מִרְיָה כְּדֵי גִרְתִּי וּמִחֲנֹק לְלִבָּאֲתִי
וּמִלֵּא מִרְיָה חֲרִי וּמִעֲגִתִּי מִרְפָּה:

14 x הִנְנִי נִפְלַע עֲלֶיךָ נִאֲמִידָה צִבְאוֹת
וְהִבְעֲרֵתִי בַעֲשָׁן רִבְצָדָה יִהְיֶה כִרְתִּי מִרְפָּךְ:

	1	1 ^b	(a)	סֵפֶר
וְהַעֲרִישׁ הָרָעָלִי: 22	3	4 ^b	(β)	מִיָּאֵשׁ לַעֲרִית הָרֶכֶב
כְּבָרִים יִרְעֻצּוּ		5 ^b		מִרְאִיָּהוּן כְּלָפִידִים
יִשְׁתַּקְשֶׁקֶן בְּרֻחוֹת:		5 ^a		בְּחוֹצוֹת יִתְהוֹלֵל הָרֶכֶב
וּפְנֵי קֶלֶם קִצְצוּ פֶּאֶרֹר	11	8	(γ)	וְיָדִיכׇ חֹלֵל (δ) וְאִין־קָצָה לִגְזִיה (ε)
וְהִמָּה נָסִים	12	9 ^b	(δ)	אֲשֶׁר (θ) אֲרִיָּה (ι) גֹּר (κ) 13 אֲרִיָּה
וּכְפִירָן תֹּאכַל־חֵרֶב	14	(λ)		מֶאֶרֶץ (μ)

(xx) 2 יִנְשַׁל בְּהִלְכָתָם 3 יִנְשַׁל בְּנִיחָם

(xx) 2 יִנְשַׁל בְּהִלְכָתָם

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, *JA*, *Q*, *S*, *3*, see this JOURNAL (JBL) 19 *us*; cf. AJSL 18 *us* 23 *us* 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 *us* = Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings (SBOT) page 301, line 16.

16 ^a (o)	תאכלוך כילק	(x) 12 כל	(p) 13 הנה
12 ^b (σ)	אם-יָוִעוּ ונָפְלוּ עַל-פִּי אוֹכֵל		
18 (τ)	לֹא-יָבִין נִפְתָּחוּ שַׁעֲרֵי אֶרֶץ	(υ) 18 מֶלֶךְ אֲשׁוּר	
18 (φ)	עַל הַחַרְסִים	(ψ) כִּי עַל מִי לֹא עֲבָרָה רַעְתָּן תִּמְד	
(αα) 17 2 וַנְדַּרְצִי	(ββ) אֵיִם	(γγ) נֹכַח	(δδ) 18 פְּחוּחַ

ד

חזון נחום האלקושי 1 1^b

3 2 i A	קוֹל-שׁוֹט וקוֹל-רֶעַשׁ אֹפֵן ומִרְכָּבָה מִרְקָדָה	וְסוֹם דָּהָר פָּרַשׁ מִעֲלֵה־יָ֑
3 ii	לֹהֶב-בָּחֹרֶב וְבִרְק חֲנִית	וְכַבֵּד פָּנָיִם אֲנִשִּׁיחִיל מִתְּלַעִים[.]:
6 iii	אֲדִירָיו יִמְהָרוּ חוֹמָתָה	וְהָבֵן הַסֶּכֶךְ וְאֵין מִפְּנֵה:
9 ^a	עֲמָדוֹ עֲמָדוֹ יִזְעִיקוּ	
7 iv B	שַׁעֲרֵי הַנִּתְּרוֹת נִפְתָּחוּ וַיִּנָּה כְּבָרְכַת מִים	וְהִזִּכֵּר נִמּוֹן מִיָּמֶיהָ יְדוּמָה:
8 v	וְהִצָּאָה הַגְּלִיתָה הַעֲלָתָה וְאִמְהָתֶיהָ מִגְּהֹגֹת כְּקוֹל־יוֹנִים	שֶׁנֶּל הַמֶּלֶךְ מִתַּפַּת עַל-לִבְבָהּ:
10 vi	בְּזִרְקָםָּ וְיָבֹזוּ זָהָב וְשָׁלוֹ שָׁלֵל כִּבְדִּי	אִזְקָצָה לַתְּכוּנָה מִכֹּל-כֵּלִי חֲמָדָה:
11 vii C	בְּקִוְיָה וּמְבוֹקְיָה וּמְבֻלְקָה וּפֶק בְּרָכִים וְחֻלְלָה	וְלֵב נִמֵּם בְּכָל מִתְנִים[.]:
12 viii	אִי־הָוָא {מֶעֶן אֲרִיזָה יִהְיֶה לְכֹזָאֲרֶשׁ אֲרִיָּה	וּמִצָּרָה 8 לְכַפִּירִים וְאֵין מִחֲרִיד:

ג

משא נִינְה

1 1*

הִישְׁבֵּה בִּיאָרִים ^א	הִתִּיטְכִי מִנָּא ^ב	3 8 i A
מִים חֹמְתָהּ:	חִילָהּ הַיָּם	
וְלֹבִים ^ג בְּעֹזְרָתָהּ:	כּוֹשׁ עֲצָמָהּ ^ד	9
הִלְכָה בִשְׁבִי	נִסְחִיָּא לְנִלָּה	10
בְּרָאשׁ חֲצֹצֹת	עֲלִילָהּ רִפְשֹׁ	
יָדָהּ נִזְרָל	וְעַל־נִכְבְּדִיהָ	
רָתְקָהּ בְּקִיָּם:	וְכָל נִזְוִלָהּ	
תְּהִי נִעְלָמָה ^ה :	נִסְחִיָּתָהּ תִּשְׁכָּרִי	11 ii B
שָׂאֲבִי לָךְ	מִי מִצּוֹר	14
הַחֲזִיקִי מִלְּקֹנֶיךָ ^ו	בְּאֵי בִשְׁמִי ^ז	
הַתְּכַבְּדִי כְּאַרְכָּהּ ^ח :	הַתְּרִבִּי כִּילָק ^ט	15*
תִּכְרִיתָהּ חֲרִבָּה ^י :	וְנִסְחִיָּא כָּל־אֶשְׁרָהּ ^י	15*
[עֲמִידָהּ] בְּפֹרִים ^י :	מִבְּצֻרֶיהָ תֵּאֱנִים	12
[יְשִׁימֶהָ] בְּקִרְבָּהּ ^{יא} :	אֲכַלְהָ אֶשׁ בְּרִיחֶיהָ ^{יב}	13
יִשְׁנֵנִי אֲדִירֶיהָ ^{יג}	נִמְוֵה רִעִיָּהּ ^{יד}	18 iii C
וְאֵין מִקְבֵּץ:	נִפְצֹו עִמָּךְ ^{טו}	
נִחְלָה מִבְּתָרָהּ	אֵין־נִחְלָה לִשְׁבָּרָהּ ^{טז}	19
תִּקְעֶרְכֶּה עֲלֶיךָ ^{יז}	שְׁמֵעִי שְׁמֵעֶךָ ^{יח}	

9 (8) וּמִצָּרִים וְאֵין קִצָּה	(7) אֶשֶׁר	(6) מִים סָבִיב־לָהּ	8 אִמּוֹן	(5) 8
כָּל (9)	(7) 10 גַּם	(7) הִי	פֹּסֵט	(5) 9
14 וּרְמִסִּי בְּחֹמֶר		מִעֲזֵו מֵאוֹיֵב	גִּם־אֵת תִּבְקֶשֶׁי	(5) 11
(10) 16 יִלֵּךְ פֶּשֶׁט וְיַעַף			חֲזָקִי מִבְּצֻרֶךָ	(5) 14
		בְּעֵקֶר הַנְּיוֹם	הַחֲזֹנִים בְּנִצְרוֹת	(5) 17*
		וְלֹא־נִדְעָה מִקּוֹמָתָהּ ^א	שְׁמֵשׁ וְרוּחָהּ	
		מִבּוֹכֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם	הַרְבִּית לִכְלֹךְ	(5) 16*
		וּשְׁפִסְרֶיךָ כִּי־נֹבִי	מִנְזֻרֶיךָ כְּאַרְכָּהּ	17*

ב

כחשפרק מלאה:	הוֹדִיעִיר דָּמִים בָּלָה	3	1	i
בַּעֲלַת כְּשָׁפִים י	מָלַכּ וּנְוִי וּנְוִה	4		
נִאֲסִיחָה צְבֹאֹת:	הִנְנִי נֶפֶל עִלֶּיךָ			
הִרְאִיתִי מַעְרָךְ:	וּנְגִילַתִּי שׁוֹלֶיךָ עַל־פְּנֶיךָ	5		
וּשְׁמַתֶּיךָ כְּרָא:	הִשְׁלַכְתִּי עִלֶּיךָ שְׁקָצִים	6		
וּמִי יִנְחֵלֶה:	וְאָמַר שְׂדֵדָה נִינְה	7		
וַיֵּצֵץ בַּלְעָל	הֲלֹא מִמֶּךָ יָצָא	1	11	ii
וַיִּצְנֶה עָלָיו:	חָשַׁב עַל־יְהוָה רָעָה			
יִחְדָּה שְׁלֹמֶךָ	[נֹאשִׁים קִבְּרָךְ - קְלוֹן]	14		
פָּסַל וּמִסְכַּח:	מִבֵּית אֱלֹהֶיךָ אִכְרִית			
נִצּוֹר מִצְוֵיָה	עָלָה מִפֶּיךָ עַל־פְּנֶיךָ	2	2	
אִמְךָ בַּח מֵאֵד:	צַהֲרֵה־דֶרֶךְ חֻקַּי מִתְּנִים			
נָגוּז וְעִבְרִי:	{אֲסִימִים מִלֵּאִים} וּרְבִים	1	12	iii
מִשְׁמֵעַ שְׁלוֹם	הִנֵּה עַל־הַהָרִים רִגְלִי	2	1	
שְׁלֵמִי נִרְדֶּךָ	תִּנְחִי יְהוָה חֲנִיךְ			
בָּלָה וּנְכָרַת:	כִּרְלָא יוֹסִיף לַעֲבֹרְכֶךָ			
וּנְסֵן יִשְׂרָאֵל	כִּרְשָׁב * נֶאֱוֵן יַעֲקֹב	3		
חֲמִידֵיהֶם שְׁחָתוּ:	כִּי בִקְקוֹם בִּקְקִים			
<hr/>				
4 טוֹבַת חַן (β)	לֹא־יִמֵּשׁ טָרָף	8	1	(α)
	הַמְכַרְת גּוֹיִם בּוֹנוֹנִיָּה וּמִשְׁפָּחוֹת בְּכַשְׂפִּיה	4		(γ)
6 וּנְצַלְתֶּךָ (z)	גּוֹיִם (c) וּמִמְלָכוֹת קְלוֹנָךְ	5		(δ)
	וְהִידָה כָּל רֵאשִׁיךָ יְהוֹד מִפֶּךָ	7		(ε)
כִּי (ε)	סִאִין אִנְכֶשׁ מִנְחָמִים־לָךְ			(θ)
14 יְהוָה (i)	לֹא 8 זִכָּר (μ) 14 עוֹד (ν) 12 וְכֵן (ξ)	1	14	(λ)
12 וְכֵן (ξ)	{עֲנִתֶךָ} {וְאִי אֲעֲנֶךָ־עוֹד}	12		(o)
	וְעִתָּה אֲשַׁכֵּר מִסִּיחָה xx	18		
14 וְלֹא יִשְׁמַע עוֹד קוֹל מִלֵּאֲכָךָ	מִבְּשָׂר	8	1	(τ)
8 יְהוָה אֶת־ (φ)	עוֹד (τ) בְּלִיעֵל (υ) 5 בְּיוֹם חֲכִינוּ	1		(σ)
<hr/>				
	1 18 סַעֲלִיךְ (xx)			

נחום

א

1	2	i	אל קנא- יהוה	נקם ובעל חמה:
	3		בסופה ובשעה דרכו	וענן אבק רגליו:
	4	ii	נוצר בים ובקשהו	וכל הגדרות החריב
			דאב' בשן וכרמל	ופרח לבנון אמלל:
	5	iii	הרים רעשו ממנו	והגבעות התמננו
			והשוא הארץ מפניו	תבל וכל יושביבה:
	6	iv	וזעמו מירעמוד {לפניו}	מייקום בחרון אפיו
			חמתו נתכה כאש	והארים נצתו ממנו:
	7	v	סוב יהוה לקיו	מעוז ביום צרה
			יחדע יהוה חסרבו	ובשטף עבר יצילם:
	8	vi	כלה יעשה 'בימת'קומ'מיו	ואיבו יהוה אל'חשך:
	9 ^a		לא יקום פעמים 'מצריו'	{כרעו} בלה הוא עשה:
	3 ^a 9 ^a	viii	מהתחשבון 'עליהוה	ינקח לאינקוה: עון:
	2 ^a		נקם יהוה לצריו	ונוטרהווא לאיבו:
	10	viii	{סירים: 'סבואים' כיהמה	אכלו כקש 'כאש':
			ע	* * * * *
			פ	* * * * *
		ix	צ	* * * * *
			ק	* * * * *
		x	ר	* * * * *
			ש	* * * * *
		xi	ת	* * * * *

1 2 (a)	1 ונסם	(β) יהוה	(γ) 8 ^a יהוה ארך-אפים וגרל-כח ו
8 ^a (δ)	יהוה	(e) 10 סבבים	(z) וכסבאם