

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/robbadshaw>

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

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

The Seventy-Second Psalm

WILLIAM G. SEIPLE

NOORTH JAPAN COLLEGE, SENDAI, JAPAN

THE Seventy-second Psalm is generally considered Messianic. Jewish interpretation, as reflected in the *Peshiṭta*, the *Targum*, the *Talmud* and the *Midrashim*,¹ and the mediaeval commentators Rashi (1040-1105), Ibn Ezra (1092-1167) and Kimhi (1105-1170), referred it to the Messiah, while early Christian exegesis, as we learn from the *Vulgata* and Church Fathers like St. Jerome² and Theodoret, found in it, in one way or another, an allusion to the Christ. Mediaeval commentators, like Calvin and Melanchthon, and more recent commentators, like J. D. Michaelis, E. W. Hengstenberg, Franz Delitzsch, Briggs³ and others regard it as *typically* Messianic, referring it historically to Solomon or some other reigning king but in a spiritual sense to the Messiah or the Christ. But in the *Critical Notes on the Books of Kings (SBOT)*, p. 227, l. 36 f., Professor Paul Haupt considers this psalm a poem celebrating the accession of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285 B. C.). The *King* spoken of in the first verse is Ptolemy Lagi, the "second Nebuchadnezzar"; and the *King's son*, Ptolemy II Philadelphus, the "second Cyrus".⁴

¹ Cf. B. Pick, "Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied by the Ancient Synagogue" *Hebraica* (= *AJSL*), 2, 134-5.—For the abbreviations see this *JOURNAL*, vol. 29, p. 112, and the references quoted there.

² Cf. H. B. Swete, "St. Jerome on the Psalms", *Expositor*, June 1895, pp. 425-6.

³ Cf. E. W. Hengstenberg, *Commentar über die Psalmen*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1851), p. 270, and C. A. Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy* (1886), pp. 137-8.

⁴ Cf. also *JHUC*, No. 163, p. 54a below and p. 69, n. ‡.

A number of other scholars also refer this psalm to the same period. As early as 1831, Hitzig in his *Begriff der Kritik*, p. 108, referred this psalm to Ptolemy Philadelphus. Olshausen⁵ thought that verse 10 referred to one of the Ptolemies but could not agree with Hitzig, as he questioned whether such an identification of the "oppressed" with the people of God, as we have in v. 2, was justifiable as early as the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Reuss⁶ assigned the psalm to the time of the early Macedonian rulers, before the Maccabean uprising, i. e., to the period of the Ptolemies. Cheyne in 1891 referred the psalm to Ptolemy Philadelphus and thought it "was most probably composed in Jerusalem before the release of the Jewish captives—not long after the accession of Philadelphus in his father's lifetime, B.C. 285."⁷ Wellhausen thinks the king mentioned in the psalm is an Egyptian and consequently assigns it to the period of the Ptolemies.⁸ Smend concludes from verses 8-10, where the limits and extent of the king's dominion are mentioned, that the description suits one of the Ptolemies.⁹

Various other views have been proposed. Because of the superscription, the great mediaeval Jewish commentators, Rashi, Ibn Ezra and David Kimhi, regarded David as the author of this psalm and the king referred to in it as Solomon. The great Reformer, John Calvin, considered it the last prayer of David for his son Solomon, who probably put it into poetic form. Venema (1762), Keil, Hengstenberg, and Professor Franz Delitzsch assigned the authorship of the psalm to Solomon. The superscription of our psalm, however, cannot be taken as furnishing any genuine historical evidence of its author or date.¹⁰

⁵ Cf. J. Olshausen, *Die Psalmen erklärt* (Leipzig, 1853), p. 305.

⁶ Cf. E. Reuss, *Geschichte d. Heiligen Schriften d. A. T.* (2nd ed., Braunschweig, 1890), p. 558.

⁷ Cf. T. K. Cheyne, *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter* (Bampton Lectures of 1889), London, 1891, p. 144.

⁸ Cf. J. Wellhausen, *The Book of Psalms* (SBOT, English), New York, 1898, p. 193.

⁹ Cf. R. Smend, *Lehrbuch d. Alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte* (2nd ed., Freiburg i/B., 1899), p. 376, footnote 2.

¹⁰ The great Syrian theologian and Biblical scholar, Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia, more than 1500 years ago, could not regard the super-

Although the title ascribes the authorship to Solomon, he is neither the writer nor the subject of the psalm. It has been ascribed to Solomon, on account of a certain general resemblance of the picture of imperial sway which the psalm presents with that of Solomon's empire in 1 Kings 3-10.¹¹ The phrases "the king" and "the son of the king" are taken to refer to David and Solomon respectively. The gift of righteous judgment for which request is made in v. 1 is supposed to refer to the wisdom and justice of Solomon. Verses 7 and 8 are supposed to describe his peaceful and extended rule, while v. 10 is taken to be an allusion to the visit of the Queen of Sheba (cf. 1 Kings 10 f.).

Ewald assigned this psalm to the times of Josiah (640-608 B.C.) or even later.¹² Graetz was inclined to refer it to Hezekiah on his accession to the throne (720 B.C.). In this he was followed by Halévy, whereas Dillmann assigned it to the period following Isaiah's activity (740-701 B.C.).¹³ Briggs (*Psalms*, 1907) makes it a prayer composed for the occasion of Josiah's accession to the throne. Driver in his *Introduction* (8th ed., 1898), p. 385, makes it pre-exilic but the latest of the royal psalms (2, 18, 20, 21, 28, 45, 61, 63, 72).

Toy and G. Buchanan Gray both consider the psalm post-exilic, the former placing it between the years B.C. 500 and 300, and the latter making it "a product of the period after the Exile but before the Maccabees and not later than the end of the

scriptures of the Psalms, either in the Hebrew or the LXX, as original and authoritative, a view that is now generally recognized. Cf. T. K. Cheyne, "Early Criticism of the Psalter in Connection with Theodore of Mopsuestia", *Thinker* (June, 1893), pp. 496-8, and F. Baethgen, "Siebzehn makkabäische Psalmen nach Theodor von Mopsuestia", *ZAT*, 1886, pp. 261-288; 1887, pp. 1-60.

¹¹ Jewish tradition regards Solomon as the author also of Ps. 127, Prov., Cant., Eccles., and the apocryphal books of the Wisdom of Solomon and The Psalms of Solomon, cf. C. H. Toy's *Proverbs* (1899), pp. xix-xx.

¹² Cf. H. Ewald, *Die poetischen Bücher des alten Bundes* (2nd ed., Göttingen, 1840).

¹³ Cf. J. Halévy, *Revue Sémitique*, 1896, pp. 333-6, and A. Dillmann, *Handbuch d. alttestamentlichen Theologie* (edited by R. Kittel), Leipzig, 1895, p. 528.

fourth century".¹⁴ W. Robertson Smith referred the psalm to the Persian period, "the last days of the Achaemenian empire", during the civil wars under Artaxerxes III Ochus (B.C. 361-336).¹⁵ G. Beer thinks it may be post-exilic and perhaps refer to one of the great kings of Persia.¹⁶ Baethgen, who, following Giesebrécht, omits vv. 8-11 as a later insertion, makes the rest of the psalm an ode belonging to the later period and commemorating the accession of an Israelite king to the throne, but thinks it cannot be determined to which king it refers.¹⁷

Others put the date of our psalm as late as the Maccabean period. Professor Church in Church and Seeley's *The Hammer*, p. 370, seems inclined to apply it to Judas Maccabaeus. Duhm¹⁸ refers the psalm, with the exception of vv. 5-11, which he considers a later insertion, to a native Israelite king after the Exile, and thinks it was composed under the Hasmonean kings for ritual purposes, perhaps in the time of Aristobulus I (104-3 B.C.) or his brother Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.). S. Weissmann, in the *Jüdisches Literaturblatt*, May 13, 1886, sees an allusion to the Jewish name of Hyrcanus II, who was high priest from 79-40 B.C., in the $\delta\piαξ λεγόμενον Ηρών$ v. 17.

The language of v. 2, where the entire Jewish nation are spoken of as "oppressed" ($\square\psi\psi$) precludes a Solomonic date for our psalm, as such a condition of affairs does not harmonize with the ideal picture of the wisdom and justice of Solomon's reign. There can be no reference here to a pre-exilic king, either of Israel or Judah, as the conditions set forth in the psalm distinctly presuppose the post-exilic period, when the Jews felt the burden of foreign domination with all its attendant ills. The language, too, of the rest of the psalm bears the stamp of a late date. Cf. the parallel in v. 8 to Zech. 9:10 (late Maccabean, so

¹⁴ Cf. C. H. Toy, *JBL*, 7, 53 and 18, 162; and G. Buchanan Gray, *JQR*, 7, 679.

¹⁵ Cf. *OTJC* (1895), p. 221, and article "Psalms", *Encycl. Brit.*, 9th ed. (1883), 20, 31a.

¹⁶ Cf. G. Beer, *Individual- und Gemeindepsalmen* (Marburg, 1894), p. 59f.

¹⁷ Cf. F. Baethgen, *Die Psalmen* (2nd ed., Göttingen, 1897), p. 218.

¹⁸ Cf. B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen erklärt* (Freiburg i/B., 1899), p. 189.

Prof. Haupt) and the allusion in v. 17b to Gen. 22 18 and 26 4 (640 B.C.).

With the settlement of the question of post-exilic date, there arises another question, viz., whether the king here mentioned is a native Israelite or a foreigner. Reuss¹⁹ thinks there is no mention of a later Jewish king, "for to which of them could the greatest flatterer promise the tribute of Arabia and Ethiopia, of the isles and western possessions?"

The expression "Thy people" in v. 2 seems to be a clear reference to a foreign king. The king appears distinct from the people of God. Wellhausen, in a note on the phrase "Thy people" in the English translation of the Psalms (*SBOT*, p. 193) remarks: "Not: *his* people. They do not look upon themselves as belonging to the monarch for whom they pray. They are a spiritual, non-political people (*Thy* people = *Thy* pious ones), taking no part in the kingdom and its government". Baethgen admits that the wishes and hopes expressed in vv. 8-11 are so great that we can hardly understand them, if they are referred to an Israelite king, particularly one who lived in a time of oppression, but thinks it improbable that the patriarchal promises of Gen. 22 18 and 26 4, to which allusion is made in v. 17b, should be applied by a pious Israelite to a foreign king.²⁰

In v. 15, constant prayer is made for the sovereign. Passages like Ezra 6 9 and 7 23 show us that the post-exilic Jewish community prayed for their sovereigns. Accordingly v. 15b of our psalm finds a striking parallel in Baruch 1 11, where prayer is made for the heathen kings Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar: *καὶ προσεύξασθε περὶ τῆς ζωῆς Ναβουχοδονοσὸρ βασιλέως Βαβυλῶνος καὶ εἰς ζωὴν Βαλτασάρ βιοῦ αὐτοῦ.* Cheyne, in commenting on Ps. 72 15 in his *Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, p. 154, n. i, says: "An occasional special prayer for a Jewish sovereign can be understood, but scarcely that constant repetition of prayer and blessing (Ps. lxxii. 15), except for a foreign ruler of whom much spiritual good might be hoped, but little as yet could be known".

From v. 8, where The River, i. e., the Euphrates, is mentioned

¹⁹ Cf. above, n. 6.

²⁰ Cf. above, n. 17.

as one of the boundaries of the king's realm, we conclude that there is no reference here to any of the Chaldean, Persian, or Seleucid kings, as, for all of these kings, the Euphrates was an inland stream. From the extent of the king's sway as given in v. 10, an Egyptian king seems to be meant. According to Hitzig, it is neither Inarus, Nectanebus, nor any of the Egyptian kings who tried to throw off the Persian yoke.²¹ Wellhausen considers Pharaoh Necho (610-595 B.C.) out of the question. Only the Ptolemies (323-31 B.C.), then, remain for consideration; and because of the extent of the king's dominion in v. 10, one of the first three Ptolemies must be referred to. The phrase "the son of the king" v. 1 cannot refer to Ptolemy Lagi, who was not the son of a king. If we refer the psalm to Ptolemy III Euergetes, we cannot explain the terms of praise in v. 14 f. Accordingly, only Ptolemy II Philadelphus is left.²²

Our psalm was perhaps presented and recited in Greek at Alexandria by an Alexandrian Jew in 285 B.C., when Ptolemy Lagi appointed his son, Ptolemy Philadelphus, as co-regent, just as Ps. 45 was perhaps presented in Greek by the high-priest Jonathan at the wedding of King Alexander Balas of Syria with the Egyptian princess Cleopatra, daughter of Ptolemy VI Philometor, at Ptolemais in 150 B.C.²³ Hebrew translations of these two poems may have been later inserted and preserved in the Psalter. The expression **בְּרוּךְ** "my poem" Ps. 45 2 seems to be a translation of the Greek *ποίημα* and to point to this.²⁴

Our psalm was perhaps written as an expression of the Jewish hopes which Ptolemy's reputation warranted. Ptolemy I Soter, at the age of eighty-two, had abdicated in favor of his younger son, Ptolemy Philadelphus, and died two years later (283 B.C.). An allusion to this event may be seen in the expression *the king's son* v. 1. According to Professor Haupt, the phrase

²¹ Cf. F. Hitzig, *Die Psalmen* (Leipzig und Heidelberg, 1863), p. 114.

²² Cheyne assigns also Ps. 45 to Ptolemy Philadelphus, on the occasion of his marriage with Arsinoe, the daughter of Lysimachus, king of Thrace, cf. his *Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, p. 170 f.

²³ Cf. Paul Haupt, *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902), p. 22, n. 7 = *AJSL*, 18, 212.

²⁴ Cf. Paul Haupt, "The Poetic Form of the First Psalm", *AJSL*, 19, 136, n. 11, end.

למלך-תנו משפטך *Bestow on the King Thy justice* at the beginning of our psalm has the double meaning of *Endow the King with Thy justice* and *Punish (give it to) him for all he has done to us.*²⁵

Punishment is desired for the aged king, Ptolemy I Soter, who, in 312 B.C., took advantage of the Sabbath law to attack and capture Jerusalem, when the Jews were unarmed, and subsequently adopted rigorous measures and carried away very many Jews as prisoners of war to Egypt (cf. Jos. c. Ap. I. 22 and *id.*, *Ant.* XII. 1 and Schürer *GJV* [1909], 3, 34).

According to Josephus (*Ant.* XII. 1), Ptolemy Philadelphus ransomed with his own money 120,000 Palestinian Jews who had been made prisoners of war by his father and sold into slavery, spending for this purpose more than 460 talents (= \$496,800) and paying for each captive 120 drachmas (= \$21.60). In the pseudoecclesiastical Letter of Aristeas,²⁶ §§ 15-27 and particularly § 37, the number of captives is "more than a hundred thousand" and the price for each twenty drachmas. Thus he "delivered the crying needy" (v. 12) and "redeemed their lives from oppression" (v. 14a), for "their blood was precious in his sight" (v. 14b). Our psalm was probably composed after the news of the release of the captives came to Jerusalem. Josephus tells us (*Ant.* XII. 5) that the high-priest Eleazar, in his reply to the king's letter, says that from feelings or heartfelt gratitude sacrifices were offered for Ptolemy and his family immediately on receipt of the news, and that the people prayed for the king and the prosperity of his kingdom. Cf. v. 15 and Letter of Aristeas, § 45: "We therefore straightway offered sacrifices on thy behalf and on behalf of thy sister and thy children and thy 'friends', and the whole people prayed that thy undertakings

²⁵ On similar equivocal phrases in Semitic, cf. "Critical Notes on Kings" *SBOT*, p. 227, l. 31; p. 216, l. 17; and Haupt, *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902), p. 43, n. 30; p. 48, n. 36; and p. 52, n. 4.

²⁶ For translations, cf. German by Paul Wendland in Kautzsch's *Apostoliken u. Pseudopigraphen d. A. T.* (Tübingen, 1900) 2, 1-31 and English by H. St. J. Thackeray, *JQR*, 15, 337-391. For text, cf. Paul Wendland, *Aristeae ad Philocratem epistula* (B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, 1900) and H. B. Swete's *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (1900), pp. 499-574.

might ever prosper, and that Almighty God would preserve thy kingdom in peace with honor, and that the transcription of the holy law might be to thy profit and carefully executed".

In v. 8 the king's dominion is to extend "from sea to sea", i. e., from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf, and "from The River to the ends of the earth", i. e., from the Euphrates to the Pillars of Hercules, or Strait of Gibraltar. The description by the poet Theocritus of the conquests of Ptolemy Philadelphus (*Idyl XVII* 86-92) reminds us very strongly of vv. 8-11 of our psalm:

καὶ μὴν Φοινίκας ἀποτέμνεται Ἀρραβίας τε
καὶ Συρίας Λιβύας τε κελαιῶν τ' Αἰθιοπήν.
Παμφύλοισι τε πᾶσι καὶ αἰχμηταῖς Κιλίκεσσι
σαμαίνει, Δυκίοις τε φιλοπτολέμοισι τε Καρσί,
καὶ νάσοις Κυκλάδεσσιν, ἐπεὶ οἱ νῆες ἄρισται
πόντον ἐπιπλώντι, Θάλασσα, δὲ πῦσα καὶ αὖ
καὶ ποταμοὶ κελάδοντες ἀνάσσονται Πτολεμαίω.

"Yea, and he taketh him a portion of Phoenicia, and of Arabia, and of Syria; and of Libya, and the black Aethiopians. And he is lord of all the Pamphylians, and the Cilician warriors, and the Lycians, and the Carians, that joy in battle, and lord of the isles of the Cyclades—since his are the best of ships that sail over the deep—, yea all the sea, and land and the sounding rivers are ruled by Ptolemy".²⁷

Polybius tells us that the empire of the first Ptolemy included Egypt, the coast of the Red Sea to Berenike and the Elephant Coast, Cyrene, Palestine, Phoenicia, Cyprus, Rhodes, the "free" cities of the coast of Asia Minor, and the islands of the Aegean Sea. For a century, the Ptolemies controlled the Cyclades and the adjoining coasts, together with Palestine and Coele-Syria.

Ptolemy II received from his father Egypt, the adjacent parts of Arabia and Libya, Cyrene, Coele-Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine and Cyprus. By conquest, he extended his rule over the Aegean Sea with its coast cities and islands and also over Caria, Pam-

²⁷ Cf. Andrew Lang's translation of *Theocritus, Bion and Moschus* (Golden Treasury Series), London, 1901, p. 95.

phylia, Cilicia, and Lycia. At one time during his reign, Egyptian garrisons were stationed even as far as the Euphrates.²⁸

We may be quite certain that the tribute from the conquered countries flowed into his coffers, cf. v. 10. Of this we have a striking confirmation in Theocritus, Idyl XVII, l. 95 f.:

ὅλβῳ μὲν πάντας κε καταβρίθοι βασιλῆς·
τόσσον ἐπ' ἀμαρ ἔκαστον ἐς ἀφνεὸν ἔρχεται οἴκον
πάντοθε.

"And in weight of wealth he surpasses all kings; such treasure comes day by day from every side to his rich palace." He was indeed the wealthiest ruler of his time. Appian tells us in his *Prooemium*, chapter 10, that, according to the royal archives (*ἐκ τῶν βασιλικῶν ἀναγραφῶν*), Ptolemy II, at the end of his reign, had an army of 200,000 infantry, 40,000 cavalry, 300 elephants, 2,000 war-chariots, weapons for 300,000 men, 2,000 minor war-vessels and 1,500 men-of-war, including quinqueremes, and the material for double this number, 800 sloops with gilded beaks and sterns, the enormous sum of 740,000 Egyptian talents in his treasury, and an annual income of 14,800 talents and 1,500,000 measures of grain.

The early Ptolemies made special efforts to attract trade and commerce with India, Arabia, and Ethiopia to Egypt. To this end, several cities were built on the Red Sea, the Arab pirates routed, and Pharaoh Necho's canal made once more navigable.²⁹ Mahaffy in his *Story of Alexander's Empire* (New York, 1892), p. 121 f., gives us the following picture of the commercial life of Alexandria, this great center of Hellenism and Semitism, at this time: "It was the great mart where the wealth of Europe and of Asia changed hands. Alexander had opened the sea-way by exploring the coasts of Media and Persia. Caravans from the head of the Persian Gulf, and ships on the Red Sea, brought all the wonders of Ceylon and China, as well as of Farther India, to Alexandria. There, too, the wealth of Spain and Gaul,

²⁸ Cf. J. P. Mahaffy, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty* (London, 1899), pp. 42, 54, 68.

²⁹ Cf. J. G. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (2nd ed., Gotha, 1877), 3, 52-55.

the produce of Italy and Macedonia, the amber of the Baltic and the salt fish of Pontus, the silver of Spain and the copper of Cyprus, the timber of Macedonia and Crete, the pottery and oil of Greece—a thousand imports from all the Mediterranean—came to be exchanged for the spices of Arabia, the splendid birds and embroideries of India and Ceylon, the gold and ivory of Africa, the antelopes, the apes, the leopards, the elephants of tropical climes. Hence the enormous wealth of the Lagidae, for in addition to the marvellous fertility and great population—it is said to have been seven millions—of Egypt, they made all the profits of this enormous carrying trade."

Ptolemy II explored Ethiopia and the southern parts of Africa and brought back for his zoological gardens specimens of curious fauna. Pliny in his *Natural History* (VI, 29: *qui Troglodytiken primus excussit*) is authority for the statement that Ptolemy II was the first to explore the coast of the Troglodytes, the cave-dwellers of Ethiopia.

Ptolemy II was a diplomat rather than a warrior. He never took the field in person, but gained his victories by political combinations and bribes from his enormous wealth. He had his emissaries and supporters everywhere. Besides this, he enjoyed the support and friendship of many kings (cf. v. 11). In 273 B.C., after the defeat of Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, by the Romans, he sent a friendly embassy to them. His ambassadors were received with great enthusiasm and accorded every distinction, for he was then the most powerful monarch in the world.

The late date of our psalm, the fact that the king mentioned therein is king of the Jews but a foreigner, who is favorable to them, and the extent of his kingdom—all unite in confirming our conviction that the psalm must refer to Ptolemy Philadelphus.

Both the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kings granted religious freedom and certain political rights to the Jews.³⁰ Particularly

³⁰ See E. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes* (1902), III, 20, 65 f., 87, and article "Alexandria" in *Jewish Encyclopaedia* I, pp. 361-8, J. P. Mahaffy, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty* (London, 1899), pp. 32-79; A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Lagides* (Paris, 1903) I, 50 f., 223; and articles on "Ptolemy" and "Ptolemy II" in *EB* and Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

in Egypt, the Jews played a prominent rôle in public life. The early Ptolemies were, in the main, favorably disposed toward them, and under some of the later Ptolemies, Jews attained to high positions of trust.

Shortly after the founding of Alexandria, Alexander the Great is said to have induced many Jewish colonists to come there by granting to them the right of citizenship, and even to have established Jewish settlements in Upper Egypt. Mahaffy thinks this hardly probable. At any rate, Ptolemy I Soter carried off great numbers of Jews as captives to Egypt. His lenient policy toward the captives, however, induced many of their co-religionists to come and settle there. During his reign, not less than 30,000 Jewish soldiers were stationed in garrisons throughout the land. Cf. Letter of Aristeas, § 13: "Of which number he armed about thirty thousand picked men and settled them in the fortresses in the country".

No other Ptolemy, however, in fact, no other king, carried his kindness toward the Jews so far as Ptolemy II Philadelphus. He figures in Jewish tradition as the liberator of all the Jewish captives in his realm (*Jos. Ant.* XII. 2) and the patron of the Temple, to which he sent a number of costly presents (*Jos. Ant.* XII. 4). It may have been part of the diplomacy of Ptolemy II to make friends with the Jews in order to win and hold at least the southern part of Syria. Probably because of the growing numbers and importance of the Jewish population in Egypt, he is said to have authorized a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek. This version is known as the Septuagint from a tradition recorded in the Letter of Aristeas that it was a translation made all at once by seventy or, more exactly, seventy-two officially appointed translators. The tradition runs as follows.³¹

In the early years of the reign of King Ptolemy II Philadelphus, the librarian Demetrius Phalereus, who was in charge of the famous Alexandrian Library, suggested to the king that he should have prepared for the Library a Greek translation of the Jewish law-books. For this purpose, Ptolemy sent to Palestine

³¹ Cf. also Bar Ebhraya's *Chronicles*, Paris edition, p. 37, and Roediger's *Chrestom. Syriaca*, p. 13 (No. IV).

for translators. Seventy-two men,³² six from each of the twelve tribes, were sent to Alexandria by the high-priest Eleazar of Jerusalem and put by twos in thirty-six cells on the island of Pharos. They are said to have completed their task in seventy days to the entire satisfaction of the king and his librarian, and to have been sent back to Palestine with expensive gifts and high acknowledgment of their services.

This story is no longer regarded as historical³³ in all its details, but is undoubtedly so far correct, that at least the Pentateuch was translated during the reign of Ptolemy II and possibly under royal patronage. A. Bouché-Leclercq, however, in his work, *Histoire des Lagides* (Paris, 1903), I, p. 223, thinks that the Septuagint version was not made by the orders of Ptolemy II, nor in his time, nor for the Library, but that it was the voluntary effort of Alexandrian Jews, who were working for the large number of their co-religionists who did not know Hebrew.

Ptolemy III Euergetes is said to have offered sacrifices in the Temple at Jerusalem. On an inscription found in Lower Egypt and given by Schürer *GJV*, 3, 66, n. 27, Ptolemy III is represented as granting the right of asylum to a proseuche, or oratory. Some of the synagogues also seem to have enjoyed the same right. This is of interest as showing that the Jewish houses of worship were placed on an equality with the heathen temples.

Ptolemy VI Philometor showed his kindness toward the Jews in permitting them to build a temple at Leontopolis. According to Josephus (*c. Ap.*, II. 5), Ptolemy VI and his consort Cleopatra "entrusted their whole kingdom to Jews, and the commanders-in-chief of the army were the two Jews Onias and Dositheus". Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy VI, in a war against her son, Ptolemy Lathyrus, appointed two Jews, Helkias and Ananias, sons of the high-priest Onias, who built the temple

³² Note the curious coincidence between the number of translators and the number of our psalm in the Psalter.

³³ The Letter of Aristeas, from internal evidence and its tendency to laud the Jews, shows that it is not contemporary with the events it narrates but is the work of an Alexandrian Jew, writing about 200 b. c. (so Schürer). Wendland, Willrich and Thackeray put it even later. See literature cited in n. 26.

at Leontopolis, as generals in her army (cf. Jos. *Ant.* XIII. 10 and 13).

Under the earlier Ptolemies, the Jews formed so large a portion of the population of Alexandria that a separate section of the city, east of the palace, was assigned to them. Of the five districts, into which the city was divided, two were known as Jewish districts, because inhabited mostly by Jews. Josephus tells us (*B. J.*, II. 18, 8) that the fourth, or "delta", district was populated by the Jews. Although even at this time the Jews were isolated, this isolation was not strictly enforced, for synagogues and Jewish dwellings could be found all over the city. The Alexandrian Jew enjoyed a greater measure of political independence than his co-religionist elsewhere. In Alexandria the Jews formed an independent political community, ruled by an ethnarch. Here they occupied a more influential position in public life than anywhere else in the ancient world. They held public offices and positions of honor, and by their riches and education constituted a large and influential portion of society. So great was their wealth that they were able to make frequent pilgrimages to Jerusalem and send many rich gifts to the Temple.²⁴

Neither Olshausen nor Hupfeld found any regular stanzas in our psalm. Hengstenberg divided it into two stanzas: I a, vv. 1-5; I b, vv. 6-10; and II a, vv. 11-15; and II b, vv. 16-17. De Wette arranged it in five stanzas, vv. 1-4, 5-7, 8-11, 12-14, and 15-17. Delitzsch also has the same number, but a different grouping of the verses: vv. 1-4, 5-8, 9-11, 12-15, and 16-17 (so Cheyne, *Book of Psalms*, London, 1888). Ewald divided the psalm into three stanzas, vv. 1-7, 8-15, and 16-17²⁵ (so also A. B. Davidson, *Biblical and Literary Essays*, London, 1902, p. 161). W. E. Barton (*The Psalms and Their Story*, Boston, 1898, Vol. I, p. 175) has five stanzas, viz., vv. 1-5, 6-8, 9-11, 12-14, and 15-17. The arrangement by Zenner-Wiesmann (*Psalmen*, Münster i/W,

²⁴ Cf. Hugo Willrich, *Judaica*, Göttingen; Schürer's review in *TLZ* (1900), p. 587; Wilcken, *Griech. Ostraka aus Ägypten u. Nubien* (Leipzig, 1899); *TLZ* (1901), p. 65; and Max L. Strack, *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer* (Berlin, 1897), esp. chapter 1: *Mitherrschaft u. Samnitherrschaft*.

²⁵ Cf. H. Ewald, *Die poetischen Bücher des alten Bundes* (2nd ed., Göttingen, 1840), part 2, p. 114.

1906-7) is as follows: I a, vv. 1, 2, 3; I b, vv. 4, 6, 5; II, vv. 7, 8, 10, 9, 11; III a, vv. 12, 13, 14, 15; and III b, vv. 16 and 17.

Bickell makes the meter heptasyllabic throughout but cannot discern any arrangement in stanzas.³⁶ Briggs in his *Messianic Prophecy* (Edinburgh, 1886), p. 138, footnote, considers the psalm a hexameter with occasional pentameters and tetrameters, and divides it into three strophes,³⁷ or stanzas, omitting v. 12 as an interpolation. In his *Psalms* (1907) he arranges the psalm in two stanzas, vv. 1-7 and 13-17a, each of seven hexameters, and omits vv. 8-12 and 17b as a series of glosses, consisting of citations or adaptations of earlier writings, added in Greek or Maccabean times "to give the psalm a Messianic meaning and to adapt it for public worship". Duhm³⁸ divides the psalm into nine stanzas, containing each four poetic stichs, or rather hemistichs, with three beats to each hemistich. Vv. 10 and 15a he omits as glosses. Baethgen (*Die Psalmen*, 3rd ed., Göttingen, 1904) makes the prevailing meter double trimeter (*Doppeldreier*, i. e., 3 + 3 beats), vv. 3, 5, and 17c hexameters (*Sechser*, i. e., three dipodies), and v. 10 two pentameters (*Fünfer*, i. e., 3 + 2 beats). According to Cheyne (1904) the poem consists of trimeters, i. e., hemistichs of three beats each.

According to Professor Haupt's arrangement of the text, our psalm consists of three stanzas, each of two couplets with 3 + 3 beats in each line. Verses 4, 12, 13, 7, 3, and 17a should be omitted as glosses and פָּשָׁע וְנִצְחָה עַזְבָּה v. 4 and בָּם לָעֵד v. 3 as tertiary glosses. V. 3 may have originally stood in the margin as a gloss to v. 16 but a copyist may have taken it as a gloss to v. 2 and put it immediately after it. Originally vv. 6 and 8 may have been grouped together, as both begin with תְּנִ. Verses 12 and 13 are simply a continuation of the gloss v. 4. The doxology, vv. 18-19, and the colophon, v. 20, form no part of the original poem and are not in metrical form.

³⁶ Cf. G. Bickell, "Die Hebräische Metrik", *ZDMG*, 84, 557, and 35, 421, and *Dichtungen der Hebräer*, part 3 (Innsbruck, 1883), p. 131.

³⁷ According to Professor Haupt, the term *strophe* should be used only of quantitative, not of Hebrew accentual, poetry, cf. his article on "The Poetic Form of the First Psalm", *AJSL*, 19, 132, n. 4.

³⁸ Cf. B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen erklärt* (Freiburg i/B., 1899), p. 187, and *Die Psalmen übersetzt* (Freiburg i/B., 1899), pp. 106-8.

The Hebrew text should be arranged as follows:

עב	
א i 1	“יהוָה” משפטך למלך-תְּהִנֵּן
וְעַנְיִץ יִשְׁפֹּט בְּמִשְׁפָּט:	ב
2	צָדֵן עֲפֵן בָּצֶדֶק
14 ii	צָלָק ^ג יָנָל נְפָשָׁם
15	וַיַּחֲפַלְלוּ בְּעֵדו תְּמִיד
6 iii	יָרַד כִּמְטָר עַל-זָנוֹן
16	יְהִי פָּשָׂת-כָּבֵר בָּאָרֶץ
17 iv	וַיַּצִּיצוּ מִעֵיד כַּעַשְׁבָּי
5	יָאָרֶיךְ שָׁמוּעַ שְׁמַשׁ
8 v	וַיָּרַד מִים עַד-יָמִים
9	לִפְנֵינוּ יִכְרְשֶׁז צְדִים
10 vi	מֶלֶכי תְּרִשְׁישׁ וְאַיִם { }
11	וַיַּשְׁתַּחַווּלְוּ כָּל מֶלֶיכִים
(א) 1	לְשָׁלְמָה
(ב) 4	שָׁקַט עֲנֵי אַם יֹשִׁיעַ לְבָנֵי אַבְיוֹן ^ו :
(ג) 12	כְּרִיאֵל אַבְיוֹן מְשֻׁעַע וְעַנְיִץ עַירְלוֹ:
13	יְהָסָעֵל וְאַבְיוֹן גְּנִפְשָׁוֹת אַבְיוֹנִים יֹשִׁיעַ:
(ד) 14	וּמְתַחַטָּס
(ה) 7	יְתָרָה בִּקְיָה צְבִיק וּרְכִשְׁלָום עַדְכְּלִי יְרָחָה:
(ו) 16	בְּרָאשׁ הַרִּים
(ז) 3	יְשָׁאוּ הַרְמָם שְׁלֹמָה ^ז וְכָבוּתָה תְּלִכָּנה בְּדִקָּה:
(ח) 17	יְשָׁרוֹן לְפִנֵּי-שְׁפָטָיו
(ט) 10	יְהִי שָׁמוּעַלְם { }
(י) 8	מְחָה יְשִׁיבוֹן
(יא)	וְרְכָבָה צְשָׁק

This may be translated as follows:

Psalm 72

- A i 1 "Give the king Thy justice, O Jahveh,
and Thy righteousness unto the king's son!
2 He will govern Thy people with righteousness
and rule Thine oppressed with justice.^b

ii 14 "He will redeem their lives from oppression,^b
in his sight their blood will be precious."
15 They will ever pray for him
and bless him a'l the day.

B iii 6 He will descend like rain on the mown meads,
like a shower that waters the land.
16 "In the land there will be a rich harvest,
"its crop will wave like Lebanon.^b

iv 16.17 His loins will sprout like grass,^b
with him^x will all nations bless themselves.^x
5 His name shall endure with the sun
and with the moon for ever and ever.

C v 8 May he rule from sea to sea,
from the River to the ends of the earth.
9 Before him foes will bow
and his enemies lick the dust.

(a) 1 By Solomon

(S) 4 He will rule the oppressed of the people, he will save the sons of the needy.^{oo}

(γ) 12 He'll deliver the crying needy, the humble and him who is helpless.

13 He'll have pity on the poor and needy, and the lives of the
needy he will save.

(5) 7 In his days shall righteousness flourish, and welfare thrive till
the moon fade.

(x) 16 on the top of the mountains

(6) 3 The mountains will bear welfare, and the hills will run with righteousness.

(λ) 17 In sunshine his name will bud. his name shall be forever.

(R) IV. In addition the following

1984-00000000

vi 10 The kings of The Isles and Tarshish
and "Sheba 'will offer tribute. {^t}

11 All kings will bow before him,
all peoples will do him service.

(μ) 10 the kings of

(ν) or Seba

(ξ) bring a gift

Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text

V. 1.—Five of Kennicott's MSS omit לשלמה, cf. J. B. de Rossi, *Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti* (Parmae, 1788), p. 50. Cheyne, in the article "Psalms", *EB*, 3943-4, considers it an error for "Of Salmah",³⁹ which he refers to the Salmaeans, whom he considers a North Arabian clan forming one of the divisions of the temple singers. It was probably prefixed because of מלכי שבא v. 10. A scribe may have thought of the Queen of Sheba and her visit to King Solomon, cf. 1 Kings 10 *et seq.* Briggs considers it a "pseudonym of the author composing from the point of view of Solomon".

אללים is a redactional change and must be replaced by גַּתָּה. So also Baethgen (1904) and Briggs. For a similar redactional change, cf. Ps. 14 2 and 53 3.

הַלְכַת דִּין מִשְׁפְּטָךְ but צְדָקָה מִשְׁפְּטָךְ, and Hier. point to a singular **צ**, and agrees with M. Baethgen, Wellhausen (*Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, Berlin, 1899, VI, p. 178), Duhm, and Buhl (Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, 1909) read the singular.

On the poetic omission of the article with מלך and בֶּן מלך even though definite kings are referred to, cf. Ps. 21 2 and 45 2 and GK, § 126, h. The monosyllables תִּן and מלך in the phrases לְבָנִים-מֶלֶךְ and לְמֶלֶךְ-תִּן must be treated as enclitics and closely connected with לבן and מלך, both of which receive the tone because they are emphatic by contrast. Cf. Sievers' *Metrische Studien*,⁴⁰ §§ 163, 1 and 263.

³⁹ Cf. Wellhausen's and Winckler's readings of Cant. 1, 5: קָרְבָּן שְׁלֹמֹה || שְׁלֹמֹה. Cheyne, in the new edition of his *Book of Psalms* (1904), vol. I, p. xlviii, § 13, suggests also as a preferable emendation "Of Ishmael".

⁴⁰ *Abhandlungen der philol-hist. Classe d. Kgl. Sächs. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften*, vol. 21 (1901).

צדקה may take two beats because of its length. Delitzsch and Cheyne (*Origin of the Psalter*, p. 156) consider this a catch-word determining the relative position of Pss. 71 and 72, since it occurs both in 71 24 and 72 1. Cheyne (1904) suggests the reading **צדקה** on the basis of Ps. 103 6.

V. 2.—Instead of **דין**, **שׁ** undoubtedly read **לְדוֹין** (*κρίνειν*). Buhl prefers to point **לְדוֹן**.

For Briggs would read **צדקה**. For **עַמְקָה בְּצִדְקָה** **שׁ** has *populos in tua justitia* (= **עַמִּים בְּצִדְקָה**) and H-P give two variants *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ σου* and *ἐν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ σου*.

Halevy proposes the reading **ועניך וענינו** (*Revue Sémitique*, 1896, p. 333).

If we insert **ישפט** after **ועניך**, it gives us the necessary three beats to the hemistich and restores the poetic parallelism. It may have been omitted by haplography (so Briggs, who, however, would put it after **בְּמִשְׁפָט**).

V. 4 is a gloss to v. 2. V. 4a is in the same meter as v. 2 (3+3). **שִׁפְטָת** in v. 4 is perhaps written with Pesik to call attention to its omission in v. 2. Duhm, Baethgen (1904), Briggs, Buhl, and Zenner-Wiesmann (*Psalmen*, Münster i/W, 1906-7) also omit it. Cheyne (*EB*, 3954, footnote 4) regards this clause and also v. 5 as corruptions of "He shall crush the folk of Cusham" (**עַם כָּשָׂם**). In 1904 he considers **דְּכָא עוֹשֵׁק** a variant to **יְרָאֵךְ עַם־שְׁמַשׁ** v. 5 and emends v. 5 so as to read: "He will crush the folk of Cusham and destroy the race of Jerahmeel" (**וַיִּשְׁמַדֵּבְנִי**). **שׁ** puts all the verbs in v. 4 in the imperative.

V. 3.—This is a prosaic explanatory gloss to v. 16. **לְעַם** is a tertiary gloss. We must insert **תְּלִבְנָה** before **בְּצִדְקָה**. This may be a quotation from some other poem. The person who added this, probably a Palestinian glossator, may have been conscious of the double meaning of **בר** in v. 16, both "grain" and "purity". Cf. Arabic *barr* "pious, just, righteous, honest" and *burr* "wheat".

For **לְעַם** **שׁ** reads **τῷ λαῷ σου** and is followed by **שׁ** and **שׁ**. Cheyne (1904) omits it as dittography for **לוּם**. For **לְעַם וְגַבְעָה** **בְּצִדְקָה**, Buhl suggests **עלָוּ נְבֻעָות צִדְקָה**.

According to **שׁ**, instead of standing at the end of

v. 3, is put at the beginning of v. 4: ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κρινά. Οὐδὲ and οὐδέ, however, read καὶ οἱ βουβοί, with which I and Hier. et collis justitiam agree. S has צְדִקָתֶךָ, as if it had read צְדִקָתֶךְ. Houbigant (*Notae Criticae*, Frankfurt a/M, 1777, Tom. II, p. 58) considered the letter ב superfluous. J. B. Köhler in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, XIII (1783), pp. 144-158, thought that ב was either pleonastic, or else we must supply mentally a verb like תַבָּנָה from the preceding. Böttcher in his *Neue exegesis-kritische Ahrenlese* (edited by F. Mühlau, Leipzig, 1864), Part II, p. 266, believing that there was something wanting between תַצְמַחֲנָה and בְּצִדְקָה, of which ב was a remnant, supplied בְּצִדְקָה. This Hupfeld considered quite superfluous. For Graetz read בְּצִדְקָה, supposing that ר had fallen out of the text before ב. Delitzsch suggested תַפְרֵחָנָה as the missing verb. Wellhausen, Cheyne (1904), Duhm, Briggs and Zenner-Wiesmann read simply צִדְקָה. Briggs considers ב an interpretative gloss. Duhm cancels it as a scribal error caused by the similar expressions in v. 2. Halévy reads בְּרָכָה.

Ehrlich takes שלום to mean "security" as in Zech. 8 10, and considers the preposition in לעם as indicating the genitive-relation, so that שלום לעם would mean "general security". From the latter half of the verse he supplies ב as belonging to עם, explains the phrase ב נשא as meaning "to partake of, share in" on the basis of Num. 11 17 and Job 7 13, and renders the verse as follows:

dass die Berge der herrschenden Sicherheit teilhaft werden,
und die Hügel der Gerechtigkeit.

V. 4.—For general remarks on v. 4, cf. last paragraph of note on v. 2.

Cheyne (1904) reads עטך for ע. On the poetic omission of the article with ע, cf. Ps. 22 7 and 45 13.

וְלֹשֶׁן may be construed either with the accusative, as in Ps. 6 5, or with the dative (ל), as here and in Ps. 116 6. According to Duhm, the construction with the dative is an indication of late date.

V. 5.—The emendation וְאַרְזֵךְ on the basis of συμπαραμετί, and I permanebit for וְיַרְאֵךְ was first suggested by Job

Ludolf in his edition of the Ethiopic Psalter in 1721 and has since been adopted by Houbigant, Lagarde, Bickell, Brüll (*Jahrbücher für jüdische Geschichte u. Litteratur*, 1885, p. 71), Cheyne (*Book of Psalms*, London, 1888), Nowack (Hupfeld-Nowack, *Die Psalmen*, 3rd ed., Gotha, 1888), Kautzsch (*Beilagen*, Freiburg i/B, 1896), Oort, Buhl, Baethgen, and Ehrlich. Most scholars construe this verb without an object in the sense of "to live long" and cite Eccles. 7:15. Hupfeld, Graetz, Wellhausen, and Halévy read יְרָאֹוּהוּ.

Cheyne (1904) considers דָּוֶר דָּוִרִים : יְרָאַה "a careless scribe's three attempts to write יְרָאַה".

Ewald thinks a verse has fallen out between vv. 4 and 5, cf. *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft*, V (1853), p. 173. Beer (*Individual- und Gemeindepsalmen*, Marburg 1894, p. 59 f.) considers v. 5 a marginal gloss that has crept into the text. Baethgen regards it as a later insertion, breaking the connection between vv. 4 and 6. Duhm pronounces vv. 5-11 not genuine and as disturbing the connection between vv. 1-4 and v. 12 ff.

In view of שְׁמָן in v. 17, the first part of which verse is a gloss to v. 5, we must insert שְׁמָן, which has been omitted before עַם יְרָאַה, perhaps by haplography. We should read וְעַם יְרָאַה שְׁמָן, instead of לְפָנֵי יְרָאַה, as the latter may be due to שְׁמָן in v. 17. The first and second clauses of v. 17 should be transposed, and the second clause, לְפָנֵי שְׁמָן יְנִין שְׁמָן, regarded as an incorrect poetic explanatory gloss to v. 5, and the first clause as a correct prosaic gloss to the same verse.

עַד־בְּלִי עַל־נוּ and עַם־יְרָאַה עַמְשָׁמָן in v. 5, and עַם־יְרָאַה עַמְשָׁמָן in v. 6, כִּירְצִיל v. 7, עַל־דָּל v. 8, and כִּירְצִיל v. 13, and עַל־דָּל v. 12, the monosyllabic prepositions עַל, עַל, and עַם and the conjunction כִּי are proclitic and throw the tone on the following word, cf. Sievers, §§ 144-5 and 149, 2.

v. 6.-*a'* renders עַל־נוּ by ἐπὶ κουράν. *Graet'* and the other Greek versions give ἐπὶ πόκον, with which בְּנֵותָה בְּלִי, בְּלִי in *vellus*, and Hier. *super vellus* agree. Graetz proposed the emendation נָגָן. Cheyne (1904) emends כְּמַטֵּר עַל־נוּ to *Maacath and Amalek* (!).

On the authority of *Graet'* and *Graet'* ὡσεὶ σταγῶν ἢ στάζουσα and בְּלִי מִזְמְתָא אֲזָה דְּנַמְתָא, we may change the traditional division of the consonantal text, as at the time the text of our

psalm was written there was *scriptio continua* and no *matres lectionis*, join the final מ of כְּרָבִים with the ἀπαξ λεγόμενον זָרַח, point it as מָרַח, and read the sg. כְּרָבֵב. Cf. Prof. Haupt's paper "Lea und Rahel", *ZAT*, 29, 286, n. 5, where the participle מָרַח is referred to a stem זָרַח, which is identified with the stem זָרַח and is found also in the Syriac *zârîṣtâ*, "shower of rain". The word מָרַח, because followed by אָרֶץ, has recessive accent and should be accented on the penult, cf. GK, § 29, e, and Sievers, §§ 169-176, particularly § 174, 1 and 2.

Baethgen, who retains מָרַח as a noun in the sense of "shower" or "sprinkling", gives examples of similar quadrilateral, or pluriconsonantal, forms in ancient and modern Syriac with the repetition of the first radical in the third place.

Wellhausen thinks a verb is concealed in מָרַח. Hupfeld proposed the emendation יָזַרְחֵי, which was adopted by Bickell and Cheyne (1888). Graetz, following Krochmal, read דָעַט (befruchten). Halévy suggests יָזַרְחֵה "saturates, waters", and Duhm proposes the reading יָזַרְחֵת. So also Buhl, who gives also alternative readings יָזַרְחֵי and יָזַרְחֵה, and compares Syr. צְרַח to Heb. זָרָם. Briggs reads יָזַרְחֵי and regards the י in מָרַח as transposed. Cheyne (1904) emends the second clause to *Rehobothites and Zarephathites*. Ehrlich retains מָרַח and considers מָרַח a predicate noun and אָרֶץ in the accusative depending upon the idea of motion expressed in מָרַח.

V. 7.—With the majority of modern commentators, including Hare, Street, Lagarde, Oort, Graetz, Krochmal, Wellhausen, Duhm, Baethgen, Cheyne (1904), Ehrlich and Buhl, we must read צְדָקָה for צְדָקֵךְ, on the authority of the ancient versions 6, 3, Hier., and 8 and three MSS. Briggs suggests either צְדָקָה or צְדָקֵה with a preference for the latter, as in v. 2 it is also שְׁלֹמָה.

Cheyne (1904) emends בְּיַמֵּי to בְּאַרְמָה.

Hitzig considered דְּבָרָ שְׁלֹמָה or לְבָרָ שְׁלֹמָה a corruption of which, together with v. 8, he regarded as a quotation from Zech. 9:10. Halévy thinks the second hemistich of v. 7 is corrupt and reads לְבָרָ for דְּבָרָ, an emendation also suggested by Lagarde. Cheyne (1904) considers vv. 7b and 8 glosses to v. 6 and emends 7b to יְרֵד יִשְׁמְעָל וַיְרַחֲמָל וַיְרַחֲמָל and v. 8 to יְרֵד יִשְׁמְעָל וַיְרַחֲמָל. Ehr-

lich reads וְלֹבֶן and שָׁלֹם for מִלְּבָד and renders *Und volle Sicherheit herrsche auch in mondloser Nacht.* Briggs omits וְלֹבֶן as an interpretative gloss to שָׁלֹם. Buhl suggests וְלֹבֶן or יְלֹבֶן. The former emendation is to be preferred.

For יְלֹבֶן Buhl would read פָּקַד as in Isa. 5 14.

This verse is an explanatory gloss to v. 6. The monosyllable וְלֹבֶן is proclitic, because of its close connection with שָׁלֹם, and gives it the tone, cf. Sievers, § 162, 1b.

V. 8.—Giesebrecht, Baethgen, Beer and also Duhm consider vv. 8-11 a later insertion. Briggs adds also v. 12 and v. 17b. According to Duhm and Baethgen, v. 8 is taken almost word for word from Zech. 9 10. Duhm considers מִלְּבָד a scribal error caused by תְּנֵי at the beginning of v. 6, and substitutes מִלְּאָלָל from Zech. 9 10.

שָׁמַר and אֲפָתָג “rivers” may be *plurales amplificativi* for the great river, the Euphrates, cf. *Crit. Notes on Prov. (SBOT)*, p. 34, l. 31, and *Crit. Notes on Kings (SBOT)*, p. 295, l. 3.

In the phrase שָׁמַר אֶת־אַרְצָה, because of the proclitic preposition תְּנֵי (cf. Sievers, § 145), we should expect the tone to rest on the final syllable of אֶת־אַרְצָה. But then we should have two accented syllables following each other, as אַרְצָה־אֶת־אַרְצָה. According to GK, § 29, e, the tone could not rest on the first syllable of אֶת־אַרְצָה, because it is closed, but we know from GK, § 29, g, that our rule is not without its exceptions. On the question of the recession of the accent, cf. also Sievers, §§ 169-176, particularly § 174, 1 and 2. Sievers suggests in § 175 changing the accent of the second word, in this case אַרְצָה to אַרְץ, but this is impossible as אַרְץ is a monosyllable (cf. GK, § 84, a). It is only fair, however, to Professor Sievers to state that he considers the segholates dissyllabic,⁴¹ cf. *Metrische Studien*, § 193, 6.

V. 9.—שָׁמַר points to a reading אֲמִים for מִלְּבָד. Cheyne (1904) reads עֲרָבִים and for אֲמִים צָרִים. Olshausen's emendation restores the parallelism and is to be preferred. This has been adopted by Graetz, Hupfeld, Halévy, Dyserinck, Bickell, Cheyne (1888), Oort, Siegfried-Stade, Wellhausen,

⁴¹ They are dissyllabic in certain modern Arabic dialects, cf. *kelleb* or *kalb*.

Duhm, and Briggs. Because of the preceding לְפָנֵינוּ, it is not necessary with Buhl to read צַרְיוֹן.

V. 10.—Cheyne (*EB*, 4899, article “Tarshish”) emends *Tarshish* to ’*Ašhûr* or ’*Aššûr* and defines it as “a N. Arabian district of somewhat uncertain extent, also known perhaps as Geshur”. In 1904 he reads *Jerahmeelites* and *Asshurites* for מלְכִי תְּרַשִּׁישׁ וְאֶשְׁׁעִים and omits *Jerahmeelites* as an incorrect variant to *and Asshurites*.

Bickell and Cheyne regard סְבָא as a later insertion, cf. *EB*, 4342, article “Seba”, and Cheyne (1904), where he reads סְבָאים.

Hitzig considered אֲשָׁכָר a corruption of אֲשָׁפָר, which occurs in 2 Sam. 6:19 and 1 Ch. 16:3. The meaning of אֲשָׁפָר, however, is doubtful. For אֲשָׁכָר, Cheyne (1904) reads אֲשָׁר תְּרֵץ, considers it a gloss on תְּרַשִּׁישׁ, and omits v. 10b as dittography.

We must omit מְנֻחָה יִשְׁבוּ as a prosaic explanatory gloss to סְבָא שָׁבָא before מלְכִי and also as glosses.

V. 11.—Instead of בְּלָמְלִיכִים פָּגָן read *omnes reges terrae*, with which גֶּרְיָה and גָּזָה agree.—Cheyne (1904) regards v. 11 as a gloss to v. 10b.

The monosyllabic pronominal forms לוּ and בּוּ in the phrases יְתַבְּרָכְרָבוּ v. 11, עֹזְרָלוּ v. 12, וַיִּתְגַּלְוּ v. 15, and וַיִּשְׂתַחַווּלּוּ v. 17b are enclitic and throw the tone on the preceding syllable, cf. Sievers, § 165.

V. 12.—Beer (*op. cit.*, p. 59 f.), following Giesebrecht and Baethgen, thinks this verse is most naturally connected with v. 7.

גֶּ, Hier., § read מְשֻׁעַת for מְשֻׁעַ. So also Ehrlich, in the sense of “magnate”. Cheyne (1904) reads מְשֻׁקָּם.

This and v. 13 are to be omitted as mere repetitions of the thought of v. 14. Briggs omits v. 12 as a gloss and a mere variation of v. 4. Vv. 12-13 may be illustrative quotations from some other poem, added by a later hand.

V. 14.—Duhm considers מְתֹזֵן and מְחַטֵּם variants and omits the latter (so also Buhl). Cheyne (1904) thinks that מְתֹזֵן probably represents *Maacath* and מְחַטֵּם is a corrupt form of *Cusham*, which is a gloss to *Maacath*. We must, however, point מְתֹזֵן

(from stem תְּכַל, cf. Syr. *tâkâ*) with Hitzig and Duhm.⁴² מִתְחַמֵּט is an explanatory gloss to the more unusual word מִתְחַנֵּן, with *Waw explicativum*, which frequently accompanies glosses (so also Baethgen and Briggs).

Instead of וַיַּקְרֵב, we should point וַיַּקְרֶב with Olshausen and compare 2 Kings 1:13. α' καὶ τιμηθήσεται seems to point to a reading וַיַּקְרֶב.

For דָּם, בָּתְלָה read שְׁמָם. בָּתְלָה and בָּתְלָה have τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.

V. 15.—Cheyne (1888) considers this verse a quotation from an intercessory prayer for the king, which was written by one scribe in the margin and incorporated into the text by another. Baethgen adopts this view for the first clause only and in his third edition (1904) finds a confirmation of his view in the different meter (*Vierer* = tetrameter, i. e., 2 + 2 beats) in this clause from that of the rest of the verse (*Doppeldreier* = double trimeter, i. e., 3 + 3 beats). Buhl omits this clause as a later addition and Beer as a marginal gloss incorporated in the text. Duhm finds in it two distinct glosses, the first of which, יְחִי, he thinks is taken from Ps. 49:10 (Heb.) and refers to the poor man, while the second has the king or the Messiah as its subject. Briggs inserts the words after המלך לעולם: “It is probable that an ancient copyist used יְחִי for the longer formula, and that a later scribe misunderstood his abbreviation”.

Cheyne (1904) considers a variant to v. 18, and “they give him of the gold of Sheba” a paraphrase of v. 10b. For כל־הַיּוֹם וַיַּתְפַּלֵּב עֲבֹדוֹ מַאֲדּוֹם and for מִירָחָמָלִים יַפְּרַקְנוּ, יַבְּרַכְנוּ.

Ehrlich reads for יְחִי the Pi'el יְחִי “may he live!” and compares German *leben lassen* and Arabic *hayya*, II *hayyâ* “to greet, salute”. He considers the subject of this verb as well as the suffix in לו and the subjects of the verbs יַתְפַּלֵּב and יַבְּרַכְנוּ as indefinite.—Graetz puts all the verbs in this verse in the plural and emends לו to לֻמּו.

Max L. Strack in his *Dynastie der Ptolemäer* (Berlin, 1897),

⁴² On a similar use of תַּחַנֵּן for תַּחַנָּה, cf. 2 Sam. 1:26a and Professor Haupt's paper “David's Dirge on Saul and Jonathan”, *JHUC*, No. 163, p. 67a, n. 27.

pp. 12-17, considers כָּל־הַיּוֹם יִבְרְכֶנּוּ as an explanatory gloss, added by an orthodox Jew to prevent the preceding clause from being taken to mean divine worship of the king.

We must omit the first part of v. 15 as an explanatory gloss, appended to v. 14 by some reader, in the same style as אֲנָכָּנוּ עֹשָׂק v. 4.—For the sgs. יִתְפַּלֵּל and יִבְרְכֶנּוּ we should in each case read the plural.

V. 16.—For מִזְרָחֵי we should read יְהִיה.—For the ἀπαξ λεγόμενον פְּתַת, Lagarde, Graetz, Cheyne and Wellhausen propose פְּטַת שְׁפָעָת “fullness”. Hupfeld cites this emendation with approval, cf. Hupfeld-Nowack *Die Psalmen* (3rd ed., Gotha, 1888), p. 205. Duhm's conjecture of פְּתַת “sufficiency” on the basis of the Syriac מסחת “contentment” (1 Tim. 6 6) is unsatisfactory. Cheyne (1904) reads מִשְׁפְּטָת. פְּתַת has been referred to the stems פְּשָׁת (Arabic *fašā*, Mishnic פְּסָת) and פְּסָד to spread out but it is probably phonetic reading for פְּתַת from a stem נְפָשָׁת, akin to Assyrian *napâšu* “to be abundant”, Aram. נְפָשָׁת “to be numerous”, and Arabic *nafisah* “great riches”. Cf. *Peshitta* סְגָלָא דְּעַבְרוֹא = Assyr. *napâš ebûri* “abundance of grain” and the footnote by Professor Haupt in *BA*, 5, 471 f. The form פְּשַׁת, then, which we should perhaps read instead of פְּתַת, may be referred to this verb, or, as verbs Prima Nun and Prima Waw frequently interchange, to a stem *napâšu* (for *napâšu*). פְּשַׁת, then, would be formed from a biconsonantal theme שְׁפָ, just as Heb. שְׁנָה, which is usually referred to שְׁנָה (for שְׁנָה), and Syriac שְׁנָחָא with the same meaning, cf. Nöld., Syr. Gr., § 105. If we retain the pointing פְּתַת, we may compare with it the analogical post-Biblical word שְׁפָה “drop” from שְׁפָה.—The words בְּרֵךְ and שְׁמַשׁ in v. 17a receive the tone after their constructs, which are regularly proclitic, cf. Sievers, §§ 158 and 159, 2. Cheyne (1904) considers בְּרֵךְ miswritten for בָּאָרֶץ and reads יְהִי for בָּרָא הַרִּים. יְהִי must be omitted as a gloss by a Palestinian reader, as there are no mountains in Egypt. For בָּרָא שְׁמַשׁ Cheyne (1904) reads כְּבָרָא שְׁמַשׁ.

Ewald, assuming a hypothetical stem רָאשׁ (*gipfeln*) as identical with רָאשׁ, emended מִירָאשׁ to יְרָאשׁ, cf. *Jahrbücher d. Bibl. Wissenschaft* (Göttingen, 1853) 5, 173. Graetz proposed the emendation יְיַצֵּר “may it be rich (or abundant)”. Duhm reads

דַי עֲשֵׁב לְבָנָן אֶל for יְרֻשָּׁה בְּלִבְנָן by Kraut and translates by *genug*. On the basis of Job 5:25 and 21:8, he joins with לְפָנָיו, which he emends to צָאָגָא מַעַן, places פָּרִזְוֹ אֶל after מַעַן, and renders the whole: *Vor ihm (dem Könige) seien die Sprösslinge seines Leibes, seine (Leibes-)Frucht.*—For אֶל שְׂעִיר, Cheyne (1904) reads יְלַקֵּשׁ “it will strike root”. Buhl thinks יְרֻשָּׁה corrupt and would put the Sôph Pâsûk immediately after it.

For פָּרִזְוֹ, Wellhausen reads פָּרִי as a genitive depending on לְבָנָן and renders it *a Lebanon of fruit* “a hyperbolical plural of fruit-tree — a vast number of fruit-trees”. Baethgen (*Die Psalmen*², 1897) emends it to יְפָרוּ “may they be fruitful”, connects it closely with what follows, and thinks that יְפָרוּ was perhaps originally a gloss to אֶל. In his third edition (1904), he gives up the idea that יְפָרוּ was a gloss. For בְּלִבְנָן אֶל, Cheyne (1904) reads כָּאָרֶן בְּלִבְנָן, supposing that has fallen out, owing to the resemblance of אֶל to פָּרִזְוֹ.

For וַיְצִיטָּה מַעַיר אֶל, Graetz proposed the emendation וַיְצִיטָּה מַעַרְתָּה. For וַיְצִיטָּה מַעַד כְּעֵשֶׂב הָאָרֶץ עָרִים. For וַיְצִיטָּה מַעַרְתָּה כְּעֵשֶׂב הָאָרֶץ, Cheyne (1904) reads וַיְצִיטָּה מַעַרְתָּה כְּעֵשֶׂב הָאָרֶץ, omitting מַעַרְתָּה as a corruption of וַיְצִיטָּה, which he considers a variant to מַעַרְתָּה. For אֶל וַיְצִיטָּה אֶל, Ehrlich reads וַיְצִיטָּה אֶל. אֶל is probably haplography for פָּשָׁן. We may omit הָאָרֶץ as a gloss.

Briggs (*Psalms*, 1907) omits בָּרָה as an explanatory gloss, reads שָׁה for יְרֻשָּׁה, regarding it as probably representing “may sheep pasture”, of which יְרֻשָּׁה then would be an explanatory gloss to שָׁה, and renders the first part of the verse: *May there be an aftergrowth in the land, on the top of the mountains sheep.* For אֶל בְּלִבְנָן פָּרִים he reads בְּלִבְנָן פָּרִזְוֹ *kine on Lebanon*, basing his emendations on οὐ πέρ = בְּ and that לְ is “often error for מְ”. For מַעַיר he changes to מַעַרְתָּה and renders the last clause of the verse: *And may flowers bloom out of the forests as herbs of the field.*

Baethgen (1904), for metrical reasons, thinks a foot is lacking after הָאָרֶץ at the close of the verse and that we must supply some word like יְפָרָה or צַמְחָה (*sprosst*).

V. 17.—For remarks on the first two clauses of v. 17, cf. first paragraph of note on v. 5.

The last clause of v. 17, with the insertion of the article before נִזְמָם and the omission of יִאֲשַׁרְהוּ as an explanatory gloss to the preceding, should be put after the last clause of v. 16 to form the first line of the second couplet (vv. 17 and 5) of the second stanza (vv. 6, 16, 17, 5) of the poem.

Cheyne (1904) omits **וְ** and considers it a distortion of שָׁמֵן, written too soon. For שָׁמֵן, he reads לְפָנֶיךָ, emends עַזְנִים to פָּנִים (so also Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Graetz, Ehrlich, and Briggs on the authority of **G**, **I**, **C** and one Heb. MS), and renders: *Before Thee let his name endure.* Duhm thinks we have a conflate reading in **וְ**, יְהִי שָׁמֵן לְעוֹלָם **וְ**, for which **G** shows the original text. He accordingly substitutes שָׁמֵן for בָּרוּךְ (Buhl בָּרוּךְ for יְהִי בָּרוּךְ) and considers **וְ** a mistake for נִזְמָן from a stem נִזְמַן = נִצְמַן. Cheyne (1904) considers this latter emendation "an improbable Aramaism". Buhl in Gesenius-Buhl's *Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterbuch* (15th ed., 1910), s. v. נִזְמָן, infers from **G** διαμενεῖ the reading נִזְמָן "remain" from נִזְמָן on the basis of Gen. 6:3. Nestle conjectures a form from לוֹן or לוֹן, see *ZAT*, 25, 201.

For the second שָׁמֵן, which Briggs omits as a copyist's error, Ehrlich conjectures שָׁמֵן אֶלְעָלָה and interprets it as meaning "his lucky star", comparing Jer. 15:9 and Kiddushin 72b: עַד שְׁלָא כִּבְתָּה שָׁמֵן אֶלְעָלָה זֶה וְרֹחֶה שָׁמֵנוּ שֶׁל שְׁמוֹאֵל כִּלְמַשְׁפָחוֹת הָאָרֶץ was extinguished, Samuel's star rose".

Beer considers the whole of v. 17a a marginal gloss, incorporated into the text, and Briggs v. 17b a gloss based on Gen. 12:3 18:18 and 22:18.

On the authority of **G**, Kautzsch, Cheyne (1888), G. Buchanan Gray (*JQR*, 7, 679, n. 2), Duhm, Briggs and Buhl supply בְּלִמְשָׁפָחוֹת הָאָרֶץ, the latter putting it after יִאֲשַׁרְהוּ, Graetz בְּלִמְשָׁפָחוֹת הָאָרֶץ, and Wellhausen, Baethgen and Ehrlich בְּלִמְשָׁפָחוֹת הָאָרֶץ. Cheyne (1904) supplies simply משָׁפָחוֹת הָאָרֶץ.

With Wellhausen we may omit יִאֲשַׁרְהוּ as a gloss to the preceding יִתְבְּרָכְנוּ.

V. 18.—Verses 18 and 19, which form the doxology and are no part of the original poem, have no metrical form as they stand. In order to give them a regular meter, we should have

to omit יהוה אלהים v. 18a, שְׁמָךְ 19a, and כְּבָחֹן 19b. Zenner-Wiesmann omit vv. 18-20.

אָלָהִים is omitted by five MSS, 6 and 8. Briggs considers it a "conflation of Elohistic and Yahwistic editors".

V. 19.—It is perhaps better with Duhm, GK, § 121, e, and Cheyne (1904), following 6 Num. 14:21 to read קַל אִמְלָא instead of Niph'al.

V. 20.—The colophon is wanting in seven MSS. On the form תְּהִלּוֹת, Pu'al with ö for ü, cf. GK, § 52, q.

It is not necessary with Graetz, T. K. Abbott in *Hermathena* VIII (1893), p. 76, Cheyne (1904) and Ehrlich to read תְּהִלּוֹת תְּפִלּוֹת for תְּהִלּוֹת תְּפִלּוֹת.

According to Cheyne (1904) **אֶל** has come from *Arab-Ethan* the sons of Ishmael. He considers **אֶל** a corruption of **בְּנֵי שְׁמֻעָל**, which he makes a gloss or variant on **אֶל**, derived from **בְּנֵי שְׁרֵב**. In his opinion, the colophon, which originally referred to what he terms the "Ethanic Psalter", a collection of the earlier psalms entitled "Of Arab-Ethan", was transferred to the end of Ps. 72 to include it also, although it was originally entitled "Of Ishmael", and later on the words, "the sons of Ishmael", were appended to "Arab-ethan".

B. Jacob, in an article entitled "Die Reihenfolge der Psalmen", *ZAT*, 18, 100, n. 1, maintains that **תְּפִלּוֹת אֶל** should be translated *Ended are prayers of David* (i. e., there now follows a series of others), not the *prayers of David*, but, as Nöldeke has shown in *ZAT*, 18, 256, it can only be rendered *the prayers of David*, as the construct is made definite by the following proper noun. *Prayers of David* would have to be expressed by תְּפִלּוֹת לְלוֹד, cf. *a son of Jesse* בֶּן לְיַשְׁעָה, GK, § 129, c.