



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of these immortality may be taken as a crucial example. And again, some things might be said of the nation, which were not, at least so readily, said of the individual. Israel was Yahwè's "son" (Hos. xi. 1): but did the individual Israelite so regard himself?

The fact is, Prof. Robertson gives too much weight to Smend's claim that the Psalter was the hymn-book of the second Temple. Putting that claim entirely out of sight, we are still left with the exegetical problem—How far does personification in our Psalter extend? We cannot escape the discussion, for personification is indisputably there (Psalm cxxix), and it would be manifestly absurd to limit its presence to the single Psalm, in which, by a happy chance, the peculiar rhythmic structure of the poem gives the author of the poem an opportunity for stating directly that he is personifying Israel (v. 1 b). A careful study of the Book of Lamentations will be found to be as good a preparation as any for approaching this difficult but important exegetical problem of the Psalter.

That the titles imply an individualistic interpretation does not prove that the original meaning of the Psalm was individualistic. For we have many instances of writers individualizing manifestly general expressions. The "son" whom Yahwè called out of Egypt was unquestionably to Hosea the whole people of Israel: but the author of the first Gospel interprets the expression of Jesus (Matt. ii. 15); and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 5-9) individualizes the purely general subject of the statements in Psalm viii. 5 f.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

NOTES ON PROF. JASTROW'S EDITION OF HAYYÛĠ.

GOETHE's saying that "old age possesses what youth wishes for" is, in all its true and melancholy significance, applicable to our study of Hebrew grammatical research during the Middle Ages. That which was eagerly wished for in that direction in the forties of the present century, when that study was still in its infancy, has been supplied in rich abundance during the two last decades. The works of the greatest master of the classical period of that branch of learning, Abulwalid Mervân Ibn Ganach, or at least so much of them as is still extant, are accessible to all, partly in the original Arabic, partly in Hebrew translations. And another work also, which was written towards the end of the tenth century, and which became the basis of a future grammatical science of the Hebrew

language, lies now before us in its original Arabic garb¹. The writings of the "first grammarian," as Ibn Ezra calls its author, on the weak and geminative verbs, can be studied now in the very shape in which they exercised their extraordinary influence at a time when in Spain the newly-aroused mental activity plunged eagerly into the exploration of the laws of the forms of the Hebrew language. In the original Arabic we are struck by the clearness and conciseness of the work of Jehuda ben David Hayyûg, after having all along been obliged to be content with the two Hebrew translations. The latter, although the work of Moses ibn Gikatilla (edited by J. W. Nutt in 1870) and Abraham ibn Ezra (edited by L. Dukes in 1844), both masters of the subjects, has, however, been preserved only in a mutilated form, and afford, moreover, all those difficulties which are inseparable from an accurate study of Hayyûg from translations.

Prof. Jastrow, who in the first instance published a chapter of the original Hayyûg in 1885 in Stade's *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, has now the great merit of having for the first time made accessible to all students both above-named works in a splendid edition. (Hayyûg's third book, the Kitâb el-Tankit, has been edited before by Nutt.) His edition is based upon the only two complete MSS. extant, the property of the Bodleian Library at Oxford. A copy of these MSS. made by Neubauer, and belonging to the late Professor Magnus of Breslau, was utilized by me when I undertook the explanation of the Hayyûg's grammatical terms *Die grammatische Terminologie des Jehuda Hajjûg*, Vienna, 1882, in the Reports of the Philosophical-Historical Division of the Imperial Academy, vol. C, part 2. Jastrow was unable to make use of the numerous fragments of Hayyûg's works existing in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg; but the kindness and literary zeal of Professor Paul von Kokowzoff, who has become famous by his writings on subjects of Judæo-Arabic literature, enabled our editor to embody in the work a large collection of various readings taken from those fragments. They form the conclusion of the Introduction (pp. xxxi-lxxxv), and are a valuable assistance towards a correct understanding of the text, besides being a contribution to its history. Kokowzoff collated with Jastrow's text not less than two large and twenty-five smaller fragments of the Petersburg Library, and noted down the various readings. It ought to have been observed that the additions to p. 27, l. 14 (p. xxxix)

¹ Abû Zakariyya Jahya Ibn Dâwud from Fez, known as Hayyûg: *The Weak and Geminative Verbs in Hebrew*. The Arabic text, now published for the first time by Morris Jastrow. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1897, pp. lxxxv and 271, 8vo.

was taken from Abulwalid's *Mustalhak* (*Opuscles*, p. 15)¹. Many of the *variae lectiones* reproduce the text as read by Ibn Ezra, e. g. those to 59. 4, 61. 18, 68. 9.

Jastrow utilized the list of various readings for the purpose of correcting the errors that still remained in his text. With the aid of the various readings he corrects not only many erroneous passages, but we find in the list also the emendations of such errors as are due to an oversight of the editor's, and faults of the copyists. Nevertheless, many errors, and some of them important ones, remained in the text, which it is my intention to point out in the following pages. This is particularly necessary in regard to the Hebrew portions of Jastrow's text, particularly the quotations from the Bible; the punctuation of the forms constructed by Hayyûg̃ for didactic purposes is often incorrectly rendered; they are sometimes left without any punctuation whatever, although a correct rendering of the latter is indispensable to a right understanding of Hayyûg̃'s meaning. In the latter direction I confine myself only to passages of real importance.

Jastrow has treated the Arabic of his text with much greater care. He has edited his text in Arabic characters, although the MSS. are in Hebrew writing, which was, without doubt, used also by Hayyûg̃ himself. It is only in rare and unimportant cases that he does not transcribe a word (v. infra to 10. 1 sqq.), or transcribes it incorrectly (v. to 30. 9), or that he transcribes a Hebrew word into Arabic (v. to 30. 9, 37. 9); otherwise I found only very few inaccuracies of the Arabic text which have not been noted in the list of various readings (v. to 30. 8, 47. 9, 71. 9, 83. 13, 90. 6, 232. 3).

Jastrow deserves thanks for marking chapter and verse of Hayyûg̃'s citations from the Bible; and it is only in a few cases that he did not recognize the citation as such, which causes, of course, such passage to be misunderstood (v. infra 49. 12, 50. 3, 97. 1, 166. 8, 191. 5).

Jastrow describes in bold outlines the significance of Hayyûg̃ and his writings, and gives an account of his own labour as editor (pp. vii-xxx). I communicated some observations on the Introduction in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, April 16, 1898 (n. 15, col. 587 sq.).

My sole object in publishing the following notes is to make more complete the meritorious and praiseworthy work of the first editor of the Arabic Hayyûg̃. This classical work of ancient research in the field of Hebrew grammar deserves to be cleared even of the

¹ Cf. v. 1. to 178. 7. Taken from the *Mustalhak* are also the vv. 11. to 197. 9 (p. lxx) [*Opusc.* p. 189], to 210. 18, vid. *Opuscles*, p. 170; to 237. 15, vid. *Opuscles*, p. 179.

slightest impediments to its proper understanding, and to gain the amount of clearness and correctness aimed at by Hayyûg̃ in his works.

Page 1. In the first six lines the rhymes of the piece written in rhymed prose ought to have been marked.

P. 6, line 2. Read פתחים for פתחים.

10. 1. For תא read תא; for תא read תא. Hayyûg̃ designates the ת, with or without dagesh, with the two corresponding Arabic letters. Similarly l. 2 תא או תא; l. 4 read خا כמוצה او الكاف, thus it is in my copy. Similarly l. 5 بعد خا او كان (خ = Heb. ט, ך).

15. 5. For וקוי יה Ps. xxxvii. 9 read וקויי ה' Is. xl. 31¹. For Hayyûg̃ gives instances of the same word being pronounced sometimes with ו, sometimes ך. He mentions as the last instance of the kind the passage in Isaiah, and then קוי Is. xlix. 23.

23. 13. For وقتت read وقتت.

26. 13. Read תאִתְּבוּ.

28. 11. Read האחיו; l. 12 מִאֲחוֹ; l. 15 for واصله read واصل.

30. 8. For اقواء read اقوى (Ibn Ezra translates יותר נכון; Ibn Ġikatilla יותר חזק). Correct in the same way p. 64, l. 19.

Ib. 9. For فتح read פתח; for Hayyûg̃ means the Hebrew name of the vowel-point. Pp. 32. 17, 33. 2, 58. 19 correctly פתח.

33. 4. Read اصفاه.

34. 16. For וְאֶעֱשִׂיר read וְאֶעֱשִׂיר; l. 17, for וְאֶעֱנֶה read וְאֶעֱנֶה. L. 20, for וְאֶאֱבֹרֵךְ read וְאֶאֱבֹרֵךְ, for Hayyûg̃ does not mean the Hiphil, but the Piel, vid. p. 25, l. 2 sqq.

36. 5. For הַשְּׁלַחְנָה, with the allegation Job xxxix. 2, read הַשְּׁלַחְנָה Ezek. xxiii. 40. Cf. 45. 20 and 91. 4, where Jastrow gives the correct points.

37. 9. For الجلوت read الغلوت. H. gives the Hebrew for exile, which in its Arabic form is written جالوت.

40. 20. For كلمة read كلم, cf. 73. 4. The note (p. xlv) gives the v. l. كلمات.

45. 13. For יחמתי יחם read יחם יחמתי For פֶּעַלְתִּי read פֶּעַלְתִּי.

47. 9. For מַעֲדָא read מַעֲדָא. It is the term for the transitive verb (Ibn Ez. ויצא, Ibn Ġik. מחרער אל פעול). Similarly alter 60. 8, 65. 13. The word is punctuated correctly 189. 14. It occurs without punctuation with the article 195. 9 and 200. 9 المعدى (vid. note to the latter passage p. lxx).

49. 11. For פֶּעַלְתִּי read פֶּעַלְתִּי, and for פעלתונו (left unpunc-

¹ According to the Kerê, vid. Kimchi.

tuated), הַפְּעִלְהוּנִי; for these are the standard forms for the biblical forms—צַמְתוּנִי (Zech. vii. 5) and הַעֲלִיתוּנִי (Num. xx. 5). Jastrow seems to have identified them with the forms supra l. 10, and to have left them, therefore, without punctuation and allegation.

50. 3. For שׁוֹסִיחִי read שׁוֹסִיחִי (Is. x. 13). L. 14, for הַשְּׁפוּר read הַשְּׁבוּר.

52. 10. Read יִסְדָּה.

54. 6. To שְׁמַרְנִי, compl. the citation Gen. xxviii. 20. Ibid. In אֵינְעַם delete the Sheva.

58. 12. The article יקר commences with the example יקר חסדך (Ps. xxxvi. 8). Then follows יקרת (Is. xliii. 8). Therefore Hayyûg̃ did not read יִקְר but יִקֵּר. This was already observed by Abulwalid in his Lexicon, s. v. יקר; who adds, however, that the reading יִקֵּר, adopted by Hayyûg̃ in the Psalm, is erroneous. The same is referred to by Kimchi in his Lexicon, s. v. יקר, at the commencement: זכר ר' יהודה: מה יקר חסדך אלהים פעל עבר ואולי מצא בספרו הקו"ף פתוחה.

59. 4. For פְּעִילִים read פְּעִילִים; for יְקוּשִׁים Jer. v. 26 has active meaning.

61. 1. For אִירַע חִירַע read אִירַע חִירַע.

63. 9; 64. 5. For פֶּתַח read פֶּתַח, v. supra 30. 9.

64. 15. For וַיִּפְעֵלְנָה read וַיִּפְעֵלְנָה For it is a question of a posited Piel.

Ib. 19. Vid. supra 30. 8.

66. 4. The editor puts after شروحا a "sic"! I do not know what is meant by it. The meaning of the word is clear. Ibn Ġik. translates it by פירושים וביאורים; it denotes explanations of all kinds with which Hayyûg̃ introduces the lexicological portions of his work. Cf. 67. 11, 69. 6, 87. 12, 131. 10.

68. 13. For فَارَقَ read فَارَقَ.

71. 9. For أَن read إِن.

76. 10. Read החילותי for הַחִלּוּתִי.

80. 9. Read מוֹשֵׁב מוֹנֵף מוֹרֵם.

81. 11. For الفتح read الفتح.

82. 8. Read فَتَّصِير (without Tashdîd). Ibid. l. 15, read וַיִּבּוֹנוּ.

86. 4. For נִאֹר read נִאֹר. L. 13. The editor in his note (p. liv) expunges the former of the two words أفعال أفعَل. But the second word should rather be removed. أفعال is correct, but still more correct would be أفعالا.

88. 11. In אוסיפך delete י.

89. 7. Hayyûg̃ cannot possibly have written אֹרֵר אֹרְרִי. It should be read אֹרֵר אֹרְרִי, as the supposed forms to which אֹרֵר (1 Sam. xiv. 29)

belongs. Hayyûg himself says later that אִוֵר is the perfect, and a contracted form from אָוִוֵר. Cf. 95. 1, where דוֹחָתִי is correctly punctuated, but not so דַח for דוֹחַ; 98. 8 זור זורתי has remained unpunctuated.

Ib. 18. For הָאוֹר read הָאוֹר.

90. 5. For מصلحي read مُصْلِحِي or مصلحو, as on 148. 6. L. 6 for اٰتِيَّة read اٰتِيَّة (partic.).

91. 15. פִּעְלָה must be punctuated פִּעְלָה.

93. 8. Delete יְבוֹשְׁשׁוּ, and put in its place יְבוֹשְׁשׁוּ which appears at the beginning of the line, for the latter is the pausal form of יְבוֹשְׁשׁוּ.

Ib. 20. For استعمالا read اُسْتُعْمَالًا.

94. 19. The editor observes in a note to اسكنت تشديد (p. lv) that the Petersburg MS. F "correctly omits تشديد." But the word can be retained, and اسقط be read instead of اسكنت. My copy of the Oxford MS. has אמסקטת.

95. 2. In the note (p. lv) הַרְיִיח is corrected into הַרְיִיח. But the correct reading is הַרְיִיח.

Ib. 10. Punctuate הַרְיִינִי.

Ib. 12. For שְׁדוֹן read שְׁדוֹן; for בּוֹן, דוֹן read בּוֹן, דוֹן.

Ib. 15. For הַרְיִין read הַרְיִין.

96. 10. Punctuate פִּעְלָם. Ib. last line but one, for הַהִימוֹתִי read הַהִימוֹתִי. Cf. the rule on 74. 4 sqq.

97. 1. For הַהִימְנָה read הַהִימְנָה. For הַקִּים הַקִּימְנָה read הַקִּים הַקִּימְנָה, Jer. xlv. 25 (cf. 118. 17).

Ib. 5. For הַהִינוֹתִי read הַהִינוֹתִי. L. 6, for 49. 9 read 49. 4.

Ib. 15. Delete זֹלְתִי at the end of the line.

Ib. 20 and 21. For זועה זועה read זועה, and for זועה read זועה.

99. 1. For הַחִילוֹתִי read הַחִילוֹתִי. L. 4, for تصاعف read تصاعف. L. 19, for הַחִישוֹתִי read הַחִישוֹתִי.

107. 17. Delete the dagesh in והוסג. The note to the word (p. lvii) is incorrect; for it is the supposed form of the word which is meant here, and not the one occurring in Isaiah lix. 14, and mentioned before (l. 10).

108. 1. Read סוֹף instead of סוֹף.

109. 11. Read הַעִיבוֹתִי.

110. 5. Read הַעִיזוֹתִי. L. 10, punctuate פִּעִיל.

111. 1. Add to עלוה, Hos. x. 9. L. 9 read הַעִיפוֹתִי. L. 17 read הַעִיקוֹתִי.

114. 5. For יַפֵּר read יַפֵּר.

115. 19. For **יִצֵר יְצַר** read **יִצֵר יְצַר**.
117. 8. For **יְקוּא תְקוּא יְקוּא** read **יְקוּא תְקוּא**, or (as with **בוּא**) **יְקוּא תְקוּא**.
119. 7. Read **תִּרְנַנָּה**. L. 8 **הַאֲזוּנָה** (Is. xxxii. 9) is corrected in the note to **הַאֲזוּנָה**. Several MSS. and printed copies are, however, mentioned in Ginsburg's Bible (p. 773), in which the **א** has a mere Sheva.
121. 4. Read **אֲתְרוּמִם**.
122. 3 sq. Read **יִשְׁכַּר, נִשְׁכַּר**. Ll. 2 and 12, it is unnecessary to alter **מִתְלָהּ** into **מִתְלָהּ**, as is done in the notes (p. lviii).
- Ib. 19 sq. The **י** in the three posited forms, **יִסְבּוּ, יִשְׁלּוּ, יִסְלּוּ**, must be punctuated with a Chirek, and not with a Pathach.
123. 11. Delete the second **יִרוע**.
124. 9. For **וְתִרְיִץ** read **וְתִרְץ**. Hayyûg explained this spelling of the word (Judges ix. 53) without Yod on 78. 13 sqq.
125. 13. For **רִשֵּׁשׁ** read **רשש** (without punctuation), for Hayyûg means the root of the word.
131. 19. For **קִנְיִתִי בְנִיִּיתִי** read **קִנְיִתִי בְנִיִּיתִי**.
133. 18. For **שְׁבִיתִי** read **שְׁבִיתִי**.
136. 6. For **הִרְאָה הִרְאָה הִרְאָה** read **הִרְאָה הִרְאָה הִרְאָה** (thus correctly punctuated on 140. 8-10).
137. 19. Read **הַמְעֵלָה**.
142. 10. Read **וּלְאִסְמֵן הוּדָה יוּדָה** (thus Ibn Ġik., **וּלְאִסְמֵן הוּדָה יוּדָה**) or **וּלְאִסְמֵן הוּדָה יוּדָה** (as in my copy).
145. 14. For **الفاعل** read **الفاعل**.
146. 9. After **لَا** the word **لَمْ** is missing (Ibn Ġik., **לְפִי שֶׁלֹא יִמְצֵא**; Ibn Ezra, **כִּי לֹא מִצְאָנוּ**).
148. 9. Read **תוֹבָה**.
150. 10. For **אֲלֵיהָ** read **אֲלֵיהָ**.
151. 14. For **יִאֲתָה** read **יִאֲתָה**.
152. 10. **او** is correct, and the remark in the note (p. lxiii) superfluous. Hayyûg gives two explanations of the Kerê and Ketib in Neh. vi. 8. Firstly, it can be assumed that the words were written according to their original forms, but were pronounced differently. They pronounced **בּוּרְדָם**, but wrote **בּוּרְדָם**; but the form of the word was originally **בּוּרְדָם**. Secondly, it can be assumed that some of them (the Hebrews as long as the language was a living one) pronounced **בּוּרְדָם**, and others **בּוּרְדָם**. When the text of the Bible was established, the one form was retained as the written form, whilst the other form was to be used in reading, so as not to allow anything in use in the living language to be lost. This is a theory about the Kerê-Ketib system obtaining in the Massoretic critique

similar to one set up by Ben Asher, who explains in this way several other biblical variations, e.g. the differences between 2 Sam. xxii and Ps. xviii, and those between the two decalogues. Cf. ספר דקדוקי, ed. Baer-Strack, p. 9, and the passage quoted there from the Commentary on the Pentateuch of Jehudah ben Balaam. This, it seems, was overlooked by our editor; otherwise he would have punctuated (l. 11) בּוֹרְאִים, and not בּוֹרָאִים.

153. 3. Hayyûḡ wrote in Lam. i. 2 בְּכֹה, and not בְּכוּ; this reading is also otherwise attested (vid. Ginsburg's edition of the Bible).

155. 2. For עָנָה read עֵנָה (the root only, without points).

156. 4. For נָיִיה read גָּיִיה.

157. 2. For הַגְּלוֹת read הַגְּלוֹת. L. 7 read יִגְלוּ.

158. 16. Read תִּתְפַּרְיֵי.

161. 1. Punctuate בְּדַמְיֵיתָנִי.

162. 18. For יְהוּא read יְהוֹא. The form יְהוּא in Kohelet xi. 3 is also explained by Hayyûḡ in accordance with the afore-mentioned theory. Some said יְהוּ (from הוּהוּ, like יְהִי from הִייהוּ), others יְהוּהוּ; the latter form came into the text, the former was retained for the reading.

163. 16. For הוֹרֵג שׁוֹרֵף read הוֹרֵג שׁוֹרֵף.

164. 4. Read הָאָרֶץ.

Ib. 10. Before ואַחֲרַיִךְ the words with which the passive forms are introduced are omitted, viz. والفعل الذى لم يسم فاعله (vid. Ibn Ḡikatilla's translation). As an instance of such passive form זִנְהָה is given (Ezek. xvi. 34), and then the imperfect יִזְנְהוּ formed. Jastrow, overlooking this, punctuates יִזְנְהוּ, which is meaningless.

165. 4. For תוֹרָה, read ותוֹרָה. It is the supposed form, without suffixes, of the immediately following ותוֹרָנִי (2 Sam. xxii. 40).

Ib. 5. רַגַע must be placed here, after אִסְמ. As evident from the note, the editor arbitrarily places it after חֲבִיּוֹן עֵזוֹ, because he only considers חֲבִיּוֹן to be a noun and not חֲבִי. But it is incorrect; for Hayyûḡ actually considered חֲבִי in Isa. xxvii. 20 to be a noun after the forms רָכְמִי, שְׂבִי, which words he quotes as examples. Vid. also Abulwalid's Lexicon, s. v. חֲבָה.

Ib. 11. Read הִתְפַּיְאָה.

166. 3. For חָהָה חִיִּיתִי read חָהָה חִיִּיתִי, for this verb has no Kal form.

Ib. 8. The editor suggests in the note (p. lxiv) to read הִרְבָּה for הִרְבָּה. But this rests on a misunderstanding. Hayyûḡ cites the words הִרְבָּה אֲרָבָה from Gen. iii. 16, especially for the sake of the infinitive form הִרְבָּה, as an analogy to יִאֲחִזְקֵהוּ (Job xiii. 12) explained by יִהְיֶהוּתִי.

167. 11. For the first חָהָה read חָהָה; l. 12, for חָהָה read חָהָה.

168. 10. For דָּל read דָּל .
169. 19. For חַיִּים read חַיִּים .
171. 7. For הַחֲלִיטָה read הַחֲלִיטָה . L. 19, punctuate נִחַנְת .
172. 11. Punctuate יִחַפֶּה . Before المؤت insert مثل المذكّر , although the word was already absent in Ibn Ezra's text. In Ibn Gikatilla (ed. Nutt, p. 79, l. 2) the whole piece is omitted. It must be restored after the original: $\text{[לשון נקבה כמו לשון זכר בשוה רק שההא בלשון [ל] לשון נקבה ולמד הפועל חסר זכר הוא למד הפועל ובלשון נקבה] ההא [ל] לשון נקבה ולמד הפועל חסר}$.
174. 10. For הַחֲתָה read הַחֲתָה . L. 12, תחתה must be punctuated תַּחַתָּה or תַּחַתָּה .
180. 16. There is no ground for the remark "*sic*" after בְּלִיטִי . Hayyûg quotes בלאתי from Ps. cxix. 109, and observes, in regard to the reading without the א , that some pronounced the word with the א , בְּלִאתִי , and others בְּלִיטִי . It is the same view as mentioned supra 152. 10.
184. 1. Punctuate $\text{מְחָה מְחִיטִי מְחָה}$.
- Ib. 5. There is no ground for "*sic*" after قليلًا , for قليلًا ما means "rarely."
185. 6. For גַּבְּמִלְאֹת read גַּבְּמִלְאֹת . It is a supposed form, after the analogy of יְבִשֶׁת (Gen. viii. 7), which instance is quoted in explanation by Gikatilla.
187. 3. For הַמְּסִי read הַמְּסִי .
188. 13. For נְהִי read נְהִי . This word, together with the two following words, are the quotation from Micah ii. 4. After that only follows the form of the first person נהיתי . For this the editor puts incorrectly נהייתי , which is here meaningless, as it belongs to היה (162. 2).
191. 5. For נְשׂוּא יְנִשׂוּא read נְשׂוּא יְנִשׂוּא , Jer. x. 5.
- Ib. 6 sq. The passage on נשא מלכותו (2 Sam. v. 12) was explained by Abulwalid in *Mustalhak* (*Opuscules*, ed. Derenbourg, p. 157 sq.). Abulwalid notices here an error of Hayyûg's, whose remark cannot refer to the passage in 2 Samuel, but only to the parallel passage in 1 Chron. xiv. 2 ($\text{כי נשאת למעלה מלכותו}$).
193. 4. For נְנִשָּׂא read ונשה . This is also the correct reading in 1 Kings viii. 15. In Hayyûg also ש must be written, as he adduces the instance under the root נשה .
- Ib. 11. For סָחָה read סָחָה . The Kal of this form does not occur.
195. 21. Hayyûg quotes Num. viii. 3, העלה את נרותיה . The note (p. lxix) says, "erase את ." Both translators have, however, את . Two MSS. of Kennicott also have the word.
197. 9. For יִצְוִי read צִוִּי , the form corresponding with the word

under consideration, viz. עָרַו (Ps. cxxxvii. 7). [Ibn Ġikatilla also has צו ; in Ibn Ezra the article is missing.]

198. 15. For פָּכַחְתִּי Ibn Ġikatilla has פְּכִיחִי, which accords better with the arrangement of the examples in the articles of Hayyūḡ.

205. 6. For וְקִרְאָהוּ read וְקִרְאָהוּ. Several MSS. of Kennicott read also in Gen. xliv. 29 וְקִרְאָהוּ instead of וְקִרְאוּ.

207. 5. For מְרַאָּה read מְרַאָּה, not מְרַאָּה as demanded in the note (p. lxxii). The participle of the Pua'l (Job xxxiii. 21 רָאוּ) is meant.

208. 13. For הִרְדָּה read הִרְדָּה.

210. 10. אֵל belongs to the following line before אֵל.

212. 8. שׁוֹאָה is either to be deleted or to be placed before שׁוֹאָה (partic. שׁוֹאָה).

Ib. 9. For נִשְׁאִיתִי read נִשְׁאִיתִי.

218. 2. For תִּתְּאוּ read תִּתְּאוּ.

220. 9. Delete the dagesh in וְהֵמָּה.

223. 10. For الضَّمِّ read الضَّمِّ, as 225. 5, 228. 11.

229. 8. For مَبْنِي read مَكْتَبِي (erroneous transcription of מִכְנֵי, the כ being taken as ב). 232. 14 reads correctly مَكْتَبِيَّات.

230. 8. For انفعال read انفعال (Perf. Niphal). Thus correctly infra 231. 4 and 232. 2.

231. 14. For נִבְרַר read נִבְרַר.

232. 3. For وَإِنَّ read وَإِنَّ. This disposes of the editor's "sic."

233. 4. For انفعال read انفعت; a standard form to forms like וְנִבְלָה (Gen. xi. 7), וְנִסְכָּה (Ezek. xli. 7), in which the second of the two geminate letters of the root (בִּלֵּל סִכֵּב) has disappeared.

Ib. 13. Punctuate נִסְכָּוֹת, נִסְכָּוֹת.

234. 3. יִרְרַר, יִרְרַר read יִרְרַל, יִרְרַל, as both translators have it; also the Petersburg MSS., as well as (according to my copy) the Oxford MS. The reading ר instead of ל seems to have been an error of a copyist.

236. 7. For الانفعال read الانفعال.

244. 14. For חוֹנֵנוּ read חוֹנֵנוּ.

Ib. 17. For יִחְנְקֵךְ read יִחְנְקֵךְ.

246. 14. For חֲתַת read חֲתַת (Perf. Hiphil). Punctuate the other words נְחַתְתָּ יְחַתְתָּ יְחַתְתָּ יְחַתְתָּ.

Ib. 16. Punctuate אֲחַת יְחַתְתָּ. L. 17, חֲחַתְתָּ חֲחַתְתָּ חֲחַתְתָּ.

Ib. 18. For החתיות, החתיות read החתיות, inferred from יְחַתְתָּ Jer.

xlix. 37. Both translators read החתיות.

250. 14. For המסוּנֵי read המסוּנֵי.

252. 1. For מִבְּרַת read מִבְּרַת. Hayyūḡ says distinctly המים בקמץ חטף.

255. 8. For וַיִּסַּב read וַיִּסָּב; l 9, for וַיִּסְבוּ read וַיִּסְבוּ.

256. 8. For יָסוּב, יָסוּב read יָסוּב, יָסוּב.

259. 14. Punctuate פְּתַחְתִּי. L. 16, punctuate פְּתַחְתִּי, פְּתַחְתִּי, פְּתַחְתִּי, פְּתַחְתִּי, פְּתַחְתִּי.

W. BACHER.

A NEW COMMENTARY ON THE FIVE MEGILLOTH.

Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament. Die fünf Megillot (Hohelied, Ruth, Klagelieder, Prediger, und Esther). Erklärt von K. BUDDE, A. BERTHOLET, und G. WILDEBOER. Herausgegeben von K. MARTI (Freiburg i. B. : J. C. B. Mohr).

THE contemporaneous publication in Germany of two series of commentaries on the Old Testament of a higher character, and at a comparatively small price, tends to show, if proof were needed, that in that country the scientific study of the Bible is still pursued with unremitting vigour. In the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW for October last I reviewed a recent issue of the *Handkommentar*. We now have before us a section of the *Kurzer Hand-Commentar*, dealing with the five Megilloth. Of these, Budde takes Canticles and Lamentations; Bertholet, Ruth; and Wildeboer, Ecclesiastes and Esther.

The estimate which the student may form of the commentary on the Canticles is likely to be influenced to a very great extent by his regarding with favour or otherwise Wetzstein's view of the origin and structure of the Book; for Dr. Budde is an ardent advocate of Wetzstein's theory, and expresses confidence in its ultimate general acceptance. According to this theory the book is a collection of bridal songs analogous to such as are used during the festive week in which the nuptials of the Syrian peasantry are celebrated; and, indeed, the songs of the Canticles may be regarded as having derived their origin from such celebrations. But the student who compares the details of the Canticles with the array of facts set forth by Wetzstein, or his disciple Dr. Budde, is not unlikely to exclaim *immane quantum discrepat!* Special prominence is, however, given to the procession in Cant. iii. 6-11; and this is compared with a very curious proceeding on the part of the Syrian peasants, who, on the morning after a marriage, fetch, according to Wetzstein, from the barn or other receptacle the threshing-table or threshing-dray, which, placed on a kind of scaffold on the threshing-floor, forms