



1935

An Investigation of the Triliteral Root [Baal] in the Massoretic Text

Herbert C. Albrecht

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/grtheses>



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Albrecht, Herbert C., "An Investigation of the Triliteral Root [Baal] in the Massoretic Text" (1935). *Graduate Thesis Collection*. 243.

<https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/grtheses/243>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Scholarship at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE TRILITERAL ROOT

ז ל נ IN THE MASSORETIC TEXT

by
Herbert C. Albrecht

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
College of Religion

Division of Graduate Instruction
Butler University
Indianapolis

1935

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Eugene Wolf

Several in regard to certain renderings of the Deutero-

LD
701
.B6
A46

72882

PREFACE

If certain important words used in the Massoretic Text were studied individually, the several instances of their occurrence compared with each other and each form interpreted in the light of its own setting, and in the light of other similar instances of its usage, there can be little doubt that many useful suggestions would result. All these suggestions would tend toward a more accurate reproduction of the original Hebrew in the English translation of the Bible. In the present thesis we have undertaken a study of what we consider a very important Hebrew word in the Massoretic Text, namely the word composed of the three radicals, beth, ayin, lamedh (ב י ם). By a comparison of the ancient and modern versions of the Old Testament and by a study of the individual contexts, we shall attempt to determine the various meanings of this word, paying special attention to difficult passages, and offering corrections and suggestions to the best of our ability. Whenever changes are suggested they are stated as improvements of The Bible, an American Translation, since that is the latest English version available. It would be of little value to make changes in earlier versions, since they have been superseded by the one mentioned.

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Toyozo Wada Nakarai in regard to certain renderings of the Peshitto.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| PREFACE | 1 |
| I INTRODUCTION | 2 |
| A. THE RIVALRY AT BAALISM AND JAHWISM | 2 |
| B. THE PURPOSE AND METHOD OF OUR STUDY | 4 |
| C. THE TRANSLITERATION AND PRONUNCIATION OF עַמַּל 7 | 7 |
| D. THE MEANING OF SYMBOLS | 9 |
| II THE ACCEPTED MEANINGS OF עַמַּל | 10 |
| A. עַמַּל AS VERB | 10 |
| 1. TO "MARRY" | 10 |
| 2. TO "BE LORD" | 13 |
| B. עַמַּל AS NOUN | 17 |
| 1. GOD | 17 |
| 2. NOMEN | 21 |
| 3. OWNER | 23 |
| 4. MASTER -- MISTRESS | 25 |
| 5. HUSBAND -- WIFE | 28 |
| 6. LORD | 30 |
| 7. MAN | 32 |
| 8. IN PROPER NAMES | 35 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| III DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMATIC PASSAGES | 38 |
| A. PASSAGES IN WHICH THE AM. T. IS UPHELD | 38 |
| 1. I CHRONICLES 4, 22 | 38 |
| 2. ISAIAH 54, 5 | 41 |
| 3. ISAIAH 62, 4.5. | 43 |
| 4. JEREMIAH 3, 14 | 46 |
| 5. JEREMIAH 37, 13 | 48 |
| 6. HOSEA 2, 18 | 49 |
| B. PASSAGES IN WHICH THE AM. T. IS NOT UPHELD ... | 53 |
| 1. LEVITICUS 21, 4 | 53 |
| 2. NUMBERS 21, 28 | 58 |
| 3. II SAMUEL 1, 6 | 61 |
| 4. ECCLESIASTES 12, 11 | 63 |
| 5. JEREMIAH 31, 31 | 66 |
| IV. DISCUSSION OF PREFERABLE RENDERINGS | 70 |
| A. A PREFERABLE RENDERING FOR <i>אֲנִי וְעַמִּי</i> (PROVERBS 18, 9) | 70 |
| B. A PREFERABLE RENDERING FOR <i>עַמִּי וְאֲנִי</i> (JUDGES 9, 51) AND PARALLEL CONSTRUCTIONS | 71 |
| V. CONCLUSION | 77 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 81 |
| GRAPHICAL SURVEY OF THESIS | 85 |
| LIST OF PASSAGES TREATED | 86 |

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE TRILITERAL ROOT

𐤀 𐤍 𐤃 IN THE MASSORETIC TEXT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. THE RIVALRY OF BAALISM AND JAHWISM.

The Triliteral root 𐤀 𐤍 𐤃 is used in various connections in the Massoretic Text, and has in past been taken to mean different things, one of the most prominent meanings ascribed to it being "Baal". It is quite generally agreed that Baal is a designation for a god, or in its plural form for gods. "Baal" seems to have been the chief rival of Jahweh among the Hebrews, and because of the rivalry and warfare waged against the devotees of Baal by the adherents of Jahweh, and especially by the Hebrew prophets, the name, Baal, occurs very frequently in the Old Testament. The root of the name for Jahweh, the tetragrammaton 𐤅 𐤄 𐤀 𐤁, has been very extensively investigated, but the root for the name of the rival of Jahweh, Baal, which is 𐤀 𐤍 𐤃, is something into which scholars have not often delved. It shall be our subject of study in this thesis.

Baal was, it seems, a Canaanite deity, whom the Hebrews adopted upon contact with the Canaanites. The motive for adopting Baal as an object of worship is well summarized in the following quotation:

Both economic considerations - the effort to secure by divine favor good crops, multiplying flocks, and abundant offspring and the gratification of bodily appetites united to draw the Hebrews to the worship of the Baalim and Ashteroth of Canaan, even though they might continue to recognize Jahweh

as the great God who had delivered them from Egypt, and had cared for them in the wilderness.¹

Perhaps one of the main reasons why the Hebrews succumbed to the lure of the worship of the Canaanite Baals was intermarriage. Upon marrying members of the Canaanites, the Hebrews found it hard to persuade their Baalistic mates to give up the worship of Baal entirely, and as a consequence the Baal worship of the Canaanites began to spread among the Hebrews.² Having once gotten a start the nature of the worship of Baal would tend to keep it alive and to spread it, for it embodied some very appealing characteristics. The Canaanitish religious customs are well summarized in the following excerpt:

The Canaanite Religion was the nature-worship of an agricultural population. Baal gave grain, oil and wine. For this his worshippers prayed to him and for this they thanked him. Baal was identified with nature. Its yearly revival and death were a revival and death of the god. In this revival and death his worshippers took part. In connection with the latter it was their Religion to mourn and mutilate themselves; in connection with the former, to give themselves over to the most unbridled merry-making. Baal was the giver of all life, but he was also the destroyer of life. As the latter men sought to appease his wrath by offerings, even of their children, as the former men reveled in his bounty with the wildest orgies. The life of nature appearing to them to rest on a mystical process of generation, sexual immortality was a feature of their worship of the gods.³

The appeal which Baalism had is shown quite unmistakably by the prevalence of it in the Hebrew nation, so that during Elijah's day it seemed to him that he was the only one who had not adopted Baal as his god.⁴ Mainly the work of the prophets, however, kept Baalism

-
1. Fowler, Henry Thatcher, Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion, pp. 40-41
 2. Cf. 1 Kings 16,31 for an example of Baalism being introduced by marriage. See also Judges 3,6; 5,8; 6,10; 10,6.
 3. Peters, J. P., Religion of the Hebrews, p. 112.
 4. 1 Kings 19, 10 and 14.

from displacing Jahwism entirely. It was, indeed, not at all uncommon among ancient peoples that two or more gods be worshipped, yet the Hebrew prophets resisted bitterly the invasions of the religious cult of Baal. Concerning the war waged between true Jahwism and Baalism

Wardle says:

In most oriental religions it is a perfectly natural thing to combine two gods. A new god can easily be worked into a pantheon. Indeed there were times in the history of Israel when Jahweh himself had to endure the presence of other deities in his temples. But the true Jahwism took very unkindly to these forced alliances, and the intolerance of Elijah makes him in this respect its most splendid representative.¹

Perhaps the above will suffice to indicate the rivalry of Jahweh and Baal, or the Baals.

B. THE PURPOSE AND METHOD OF OUR STUDY.

There are other meanings, however, for the triliteral root $\text{ב} \ \text{ל} \ \text{ב}$, besides that of a god, as we shall attempt to establish in the present thesis. Concerning these other meanings a very interesting and very recent theory is the one set forth by Wallis. We shall allow his own words to convey his theory:

After the Hebrew nation, took form in Canaan, it consisted primarily of an upper class, with a right wing resting on the walled cities and a left wing based on villages in the open country. A member of the upper class was called a "Baal", i. e. an owner, or proprietor, of land, houses, cattle etc. The plural of baal is baalim; and the Hebrew aristocracy as a whole comprised all the individuals who were known by this collective term. Below the baalim was an inferior social class consisting of slaves, or Abadim, together with landless aliens, or strangers, called gerim, who were hired laborers.²

1. Wardle, W. Lansdell, Israel and Babylon, p. 114.
2. Wallis, Louis, God and the Social Process, p. 8.

We are in this thesis, of course, not interested in any particular sociological theory such as Wallis sets forth, and yet we cannot neglect any light which his studies might cast on our subject of research. He states that a member of the upper class in the Hebrew Commonwealth was called a "Baal". However that may be, i. e. whether the people of the upper class, or those with property were called "Baals" or not, the fact remains that in very many places בַּל cannot refer to a class of people, as the present thesis will demonstrate. We are not interested in destroying or proving the tenets of Wallis, but if, in our studies of בַּל , we find that some passage is naturally and best interpreted in the light of Wallis's theory, we shall adopt it.

Whether the above mentioned theory can be corroborated by some extraordinary interpretation of the passages in which בַּל occurs, will be left to others to investigate, but we shall study these passages with the aim of finding their logical interpretation, and the one fitting into the context most naturally. This thesis, then, has no theory to corroborate or prove, but is solely interested in the meaning of בַּל as it stands in each individual passage of the M.T.

Now it is quite true that בַּל occurs outside of the Massoretic Text, especially in Aramaic Papyri. It also occurs in Phoenician, Assyrian, Arabic, Ethiopian and other languages. The Assyrian "Bel", for example, is the same word as the Hebrew "Baal". Concerning the principal meaning of בַּל in the above mentioned languages the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics has the following statements:

Primarily it is a common noun denoting 'possessor', 'owner', . . . The ba'al of a house, field, ditch, or animal is its proprietor; the ba'alath its proprietrix.¹

This view, that $\text{בא} \text{ל}$ meant primarily to "possess" something, or as a noun, the "possessor" of something, is quite generally held by scholars, but doubtlessly many of its meanings in the Massoretic Text today are far removed from this original idea, if this tenet of scholars is a correct one. We are in the present work not primarily interested in reducing all the occurrences of $\text{בא} \text{ל}$ in the Massoretic Text to this basic meaning, nor shall we attempt to establish any other basic concept for $\text{בא} \text{ל}$, but we shall merely investigate the usages of $\text{בא} \text{ל}$ in an attempt to determine the meaning for each particular case. We shall not start out with a preconceived notion of finding any certain basic meaning for $\text{בא} \text{ל}$ in the several occurrences of this root in the Massoretic Text, but our purpose in this thesis, let us repeat, is to establish the true meaning of $\text{בא} \text{ל}$ for each individual passage in which it occurs.

The method we shall follow in finding the true meaning of each individual passage will be the following: We shall investigate the best translations thus far produced, to find how these have handled the passage under discussion, and next make a careful study of the context before and after the word in which we are interested.

1. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Vol. II, p. 283. "Baal-Beel-Bel".

C. THE TRANSLITERATION AND PRONUNCIATION OF בַּל .

Before we proceed to a study of the meaning of בַּל , however, as it occurs in the Massoretic Text, let us consider the transliteration of בַּל from the Hebrew text into English, for in this thesis both " בַּל " and "Baal" will be used. The following is designed to explain the difference between בַּל and Baal.

As the Massoretic Text gives this trilateral root it would have to be transliterated "Ba'al", for the Hebrew consists of the three radicals Beth, Ayin, Lamedh, and these have been pointed by the Massorettes thus: " בַּל ׀ ". Of course, in certain other connections these pointings vary, and thus in the plural we find it pointed as follows: * בַּלְּמִי * . The pointings were not originally in the Hebrew text, but, as was indicated above, were added by the Massorettes from about the sixth to the eighth century A. D. These men recorded, by a code of dots and dashes, written below or above the text usually, the accepted traditional pronunciation for the unpointed Hebrew characters.

We have another source of information in regard to pronunciation and transliteration of the Hebrew text, and that is the LXX.¹ When we compare the transliterations of בַּל with the pronunciation as indicated by the Massorettes, we find them to be identical in many cases, but very dissimilar in others. A few examples of similarity

1. LXX = The Septuagint (Greek version of the Old Testament).

of transliteration might be cited:

| | Massoretic Text | Septuagint |
|--------------------|-----------------|------------|
| Judges 20, 33 | רָחֵף זַמְצָ | Βααλ Θαμάε |
| 1 Chronicles 4, 33 | זַמְצָ | Βάαλ |
| 1 Chronicles 5, 23 | זַמְצָ | Βάαλ |
| Jeremiah 32, 29 | זַמְצָ(ז) | Βάαλ |
| Hosea 13, 1 | זַמְצָ(צ) | Βάαλ |

We might list many more examples of identity or great similarity between the Massoretic Text and the LXX.

However, we must not overlook the fact that at very many places, and especially in the case of city names the Massoretic Text and the LXX read quite differently. For example:

| | Massoretic Text | Septuagint |
|----------------|--------------------|------------|
| Numbers 32, 38 | וַיִּנְחָז זַמְצָ | Βεελμεών |
| Numbers 33, 7 | וַיִּנְחָז זַמְצָ | Βεελσεφών |
| Joshua 11, 7 | גַּזְזָ זַמְצָ | Βαλαγάδ |
| Joshua 13, 5 | גַּזְזָ זַמְצָ | Γαλαά |
| Hosea 9, 10 | וַיִּנְחָז--זַמְצָ | Βεελφεγώε |

How many of these and other differences between the Massoretic Text and the LXX are due to errors of copyists (c.f. Joshua 11, 7 and Joshua 13, 5 in the LXX) is hard to say, but in most cases it seems that the Greek transliteration was set down as we have it today. What should have moved the translators to transliterate the root זַמְצָ in Hosea 13, 1 as Βααλ, and the same root as Βεελ - (φεγώε) in Hosea 9, 10? Did the text which they possessed

read slightly different from our Massoretic Text? Did the pronunciation of city and other names vary; — in other words, was there no stable and absolute pronunciation for this Hebrew word, and perhaps others? — These are all very interesting questions, but we cannot stop to speculate over them.

All, then, that we can say regarding the pronunciation or transliteration of בַּאֵל is this, that as far as we can tell, it was "Ba'al", but perhaps "Be'el" in certain proper names as the LXX indicates. Since there is no special consistency, however, in the LXX transliteration, we prefer to take the pronunciation of the Massoretic Text, namely "Ba'al". In our future reference, however, to this transliteration we shall write only "Baal", as is the common practise in the English versions.

D. THE MEANING OF SYMBOLS.

It might be well to include a list at this point of the main symbols we shall use in the following discussion. Because of the frequency of their occurrence it seems advisable to adopt a symbol for many books. The symbols to be used are the following:

Am. T. -- The Bible, an American Translation.

Ger. -- German Version of the Bible, Die Bibel.

G. H. L.-- Wm. Gesenius, Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon.

K. J. V.-- King James Version of the Bible.

LXX -- Septuagint (Greek Translation of the Old Testament)

M. T. -- Massoretic Text (Hebrew text)

Vul. -- Vulgate. (Latin translation of the Bible).

Note: For fuller information regarding date of publication, edition, publishers, and exact title see Bibliography.

CHAPTER II

THE ACCEPTED MEANINGS OF זָנַךְ

In treating the Hebrew trilateral root זָנַךְ as found in the M. T., we shall first of all consider the meanings it may have about which there can be very little question.

A. זָנַךְ AS A VERB.

1. TO "MARRY".

When used as a verb, זָנַךְ has first of all the meaning to "marry". In this sense it is used in Deuteronomy 24, 1. The original Hebrew words in which we are interested read thus: *וְזָנַךְ אִישׁ אִשָּׁה וְיָשָׁב עִיָּהּ*. The LXX translates the word *וְזָנַךְ* with, *καὶ οὐνοικησὼν αὐτήν* (Literally: "and he (should) dwell with her"). The term "dwell with" seems to indicate clearly that a marriage relation was in the minds of the translators, and thus indicates that זָנַךְ had some meaning similar to "marry". It would seem that the LXX is translating זָנַךְ rather freely.

The Vul. likewise does not translate זָנַךְ with marry, but it clearly indicates a marriage relation when it translates thus: "si acceperit homo uxorem, et habuerit eam" (if a man will have accepted a wife, and will have had her). We notice at once that the Vul. also translates זָנַךְ quite freely.

The prominent translations of our day render the word under

consideration in this particular passage "marry". The Ger. reads: "Wenn jemand ein Weib nimmt and ehelicht sie"; the K.J.V. reads: "When a man hath taken a wife and married her"; and the Am.T: "if a man takes ~~a man takes~~ a wife and marries her".

The above will suffice to show that in the past לָקַח has here always been connected with marital relations, and since an entering into such relations seems to be spoken of (if a man takes a woman), we conclude that the best English equivalent is "marry".

However, let us stop to reexamine our conclusion that לָקַח can as a verb mean to "marry". Could the passage before us be translated intelligently in any other way? It would seem not, for the text is evidently speaking of marriage, since it speaks of a man taking a woman, and immediately following treats the matter of divorce. There can be little doubt, therefore, that לָקַח here means to "marry", for not only does a comparison of the prominent early and modern versions lead us to that conclusion, but the context clearly demands this translation.

A second passage, in which לָקַח is used as a verb in the sense of to "marry" is Proverbs 30,23. The Hebrew text reads thus: $\text{אִשׁ רָעָה אִם יִקַּח אִישׁ טוֹב$. The LXX version reproduces the above Hebrew phrase as follows: *μισογενὴς γυνὴ εἰς τὸν καλὸν ἄνδρα ἂν γάμοις* ("a hateful woman if she should marry a good man"). We notice at once that the translators of the LXX added something, namely, "good man". This addition, however, merely goes to certify the correctness of translating לָקַח as "marry", for it is an unmistakable indication of what was in the translator's minds,

after having read the above Hebrew words. To them זָמַן meant to "marry" in the above connection. The Vul. strengthens this view, when it renders the passage in question: "per odiosam mulierem, cum in matrimonio fuerit assumpta" (through a hateful woman, when she has been taken into marriage). The Ger. has the same when it translates: "Eine Feindselige, wenn sie geehelicht wird"; and the English translations, the K.J.V. and the Am. T. render it respectively: "an odious woman when she is married", and, "an unpopular woman when she is married".

But now let us stop and reconsider the above verse. Shall we, despite the above evidence, perhaps find some other meaning for the verb זָמַן ? The context seems to demand a meaning similar to "marry", for it speaks of things that make the earth quake, and things under which the earth cannot bear up, and it would seem to indicate that, although an unpopular or hateful woman might be a thorn in the flesh of all who contacted her in whatever walk of life she might be in, yet in the role of a wife she would be so huge a thorn in her husband's flesh especially, that the earth, one should expect, would quake in her presence. Besides fitting excellently into the context, the meaning to "marry" is also given by all the main translators of the passage in hand. We accept, therefore, the translation to "marry", for the above verbal stem זָמַן . Other passages of the M.T. where זָמַן means to "marry" are: Deuteronomy 24,1; Proverbs 30,23; Malachi 2,11.

2. To "BE LORD"

As a verb לָמַד may also have the meaning "be lord". This is mainly based on the passage found in Is. 26,13 (8th century).

Here the pertinent words of the M.T. read thus: $\text{לָמַדְנוּ לְיָיָהּ לְיָיָהּ}$

Our first move, of course, in trying to establish a translation

for this phrase, and particularly for the word לָמַדְנוּ , is to

consult the LXX. There we read these words: Κύριε ὁ Θεός

$\text{ἡμῶν ἡγήσασθαι ἡμᾶς}$ (O Lord our God, ~~take~~ take possession of us).

The Vul. has: Domine Deus noster, possedernut nos domini absque Te

(O Lord our God, lords beside thee have taken possession of us.).

The Am.T. reads: "O Lord our God, other lords than thee have

had dominion over us." And the Ger. version renders this passage

thus: "Herr, unser Gott, es herrschen wohl ander Herren über uns, denn du."

We notice that in the above renderings the following terms were employed in translating the word we are studying particularly, namely לָמַדְנוּ :

The LXX "take possession of".

The Vul. "take possession of".

The KJV "have dominion over".

The Am.T. "be lord".

The Ger. "rule over".

The first two agree in translating: "take possession of", and the last three agree quite well in this that they give the idea of "ruling over", of "being lord" as a translation for the word we are

treating. But what, we ask, is the reason for the difference between these two groups? It is a matter that is well worth looking into.

The whole verse (Is. 26, 13) reads thus in the M.T.: $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יְהַלְלֶנּוּ אֱלֹהֵי$
 $\text{יְהוָה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יְהַלְלֶנּוּ אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה$. There are two difficulties which lie in the path of the translator here. They are:

- (1) Everywhere in the M.T. אֱלֹהֵי is used with a negative
- (2) $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יְהַלְלֶנּוּ}$ cannot be satisfactorily explained.¹

We cannot ignore these entirely in our discussion of $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יְהַלְלֶנּוּ}$, but we must take them into consideration to some extent.

We consult first of all the G.H.L. and find the following statement: " אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהֵי lords other than thou".² And for the translation of the last part of the verse, reading, $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יְהַלְלֶנּוּ אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה}$, we may quote again from the G.H.L. the following: "as adv. of limitation, Is. 26, 13 only through thee do we celebrate thy name".³ We might quote also the Am.T. as the latest opinion of prominent scholars. For the former phrase, the Am.T. has: "other lords", which is the same thing as is given in the G.H.L. However, the latter phrase is rendered thus by the Am.T.: "But thy name alone will we celebrate". If we compare the translation found in the G.H.L. with the one last cited, we find that they do not agree absolutely, and it would seem that the Am.T. is not as literal as it might be. Therefore we shall use: "only through thee do we celebrate thy name"

**

-
1. Cf "International Critical Commentary" on Isaiah Vol. I. P. 448
 2. G.H.L. P. 265
 3. G.H.L. P. 94, see Isaiah P. 448

as given in the G.H.L.

But we must come back to the important part of our verse. If we consult Davidson's Analytical Hebrew Lexicon,¹ we find that יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ is listed as a Qal, perfect, third person plural form with a third person plural suffix attached. If now we apply the meanings we found used by the various versions to the verse as we have thus far established it, we will have the following translations: "Jahweh, our God, lords other than thou have taken possession of us, (but) only through thee do we celebrate thy name;" or, "Jahweh, our God, lords other than thou have been our lords, (but) only through thee do we celebrate thy name."

Now it is quite obvious that the LXX does not translate the exact Hebrew words which are in our M.T. today.² Nevertheless, the verbal stem לָקַח, regardless of its exact form, seems to have been translated by the LXX as "possess". The Vul. employs the same meaning, but it seem to be translating a different form than the one which the LXX translators had before them. However, the two agree in giving לָקַח the meaning of "possess" or "take possession of".

But when we compare the above meaning given to it by the more modern translations, we find that the meanings are not as irreconcilable as they might at first glance seem. The meaning of the modern translation is, as was mentioned before, "rule over" or "be lord".

1. Davidson, B. Analytical Hebrew Lexicon P. C III.

2. For the words which the LXX translation represents cf. "International Critical Commentary" Isaiah I P.448

Is it not the same now, whether we say "other lords have had (taken) possession¹ of us", or "other lords have been our lords (have ruled over us)? Does not "take possession" or "possess" as used above mean to "rule over" or "be lord"? We have then the same idea given by all the versions treated for the verbal stem occurring in this passage, namely the idea of "rule over" or "be lord".

But we must not ~~leave~~ the matter stand as it does without applying our translation to the text itself, and to the context. Therefore we ask whether our translation will be intelligible. It is, of course, not within the sphere of this thesis to establish the meanings of the other words in this verse besides לַאֲדֹנָי , but we dare not establish a meaning for לַאֲדֹנָי which will not at the same time fit a sane and sound translation of the rest of the verse. We have before translated: "Jahweh, our God, lords other than thou have been our lords, (but) only through thee will we celebrate thy name." It is apparent at once, that the last phrase, "only through thee will we celebrate thy name", is perhaps the one most liable to be vague or meaningless. However, we need only suggest some of the things which might move the Hebrew to celebrate the name of God through him. We might suggest the following: "through Thee" i.e. because of your grace, or your help, or your defending us, through or because of the

1. Because of the Qal perfect, third person plural form, we cannot translate as the LXX does, and besides an imperative as the LXX has could not fit into the rest of the sentence as we are translating it.

peace you grant us, - we celebrate Thy name"

The foregoing context, and the one following verse 13 seem somewhat to support the last suggestion, for in V.12 we read:

"O Lord, establish peace for us",¹ and in verse 14 we read:

"So hast thou visitest them with destruction".

"And wiped out all remembrance of them

"But the nation hast thou increased, O Lord."²

Thus it would seem that the translation cited above, gives at least a very possible rendering, and, therefore, there seems to be nothing in the way to hinder our adopting the meaning "be lord" or "rule over", for the verbal stem $\text{ל} \text{מ} \text{ד}$ used in this verse.

B. $\text{ל} \text{מ} \text{ד}$ AS A NOUN.

Having thus far considered the meaning of the word $\text{ל} \text{מ} \text{ד}$ when used as a verb, we shall now proceed in our investigation and see what it means when it is used as a noun.

1. GOD.

By far the most prominent use of the noun $\text{ל} \text{מ} \text{ד}$ in the M. T. is its use in reference to a god. In the following discussion the typical use of $\text{ל} \text{מ} \text{ד}$ in connection with the name of a god is demonstrated.

We shall treat as our first instance of the use of $\text{ל} \text{מ} \text{ד}$ in the M. T.

-
1. We quote the Am.T.
 2. We quote the Am.T.

the passage found in 1 Kings 16, 32. The original Hebrew of this passage reads thus:

וַיִּבֶן בָּעֵלְבֵּית בְּעֵלְבֵּית בָּאָל וַיִּשְׂבֵּט אֶת-בְּנֵי-הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר-עָבְדוּ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וַיִּבֶן בָּאֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וַיִּשְׂבֵּט אֶת-בְּנֵי-הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר-עָבְדוּ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים
 וַיִּבֶן בָּאֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וַיִּשְׂבֵּט אֶת-בְּנֵי-הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר-עָבְדוּ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים
 The LXX renders this passage in its characteristically unliteralistic fashion: καὶ ἔθηκεν οἰκοδομήματα ἐν οἴκῳ τῶν προσοχθισμάτων αὐτοῦ ὅν ᾤκοδόμησεν ἐν Σαμαρεία (And he set up an altar to Baal in the house of his abominations, which he built in Samaria.

The Vul. renders thus: "Et posuit aram Baal in templo Baal, quod aedificaverat in Samaria" (And he placed into the temple of Baal, which he had built in Samaria, an altar for Baal.)

Coming to more modern versions, we find the translations of the LXX and the Vul. borne out by the K.J.V., the Am. T., and the Ger. The K. J. V. reads thus: "And he reared up an altar for Baal in the house of Baal, which he had built in Samaria". The Am. T. has these words: "Thus he erected an altar for the Baal in the house of the Baal, which he built in Samaria". The Ger. has: "Und richtete einen Altar auf im Hause Baals, das er ihm bauete zu Samaria".

Having noted the unanimous translation of this passage by all ancient and modern versions, let us stop to reexamine the verse to determine just what the mention of Baal here signifies. Quite obviously it would seem to signify a god of some sort or other, for in the preceding verse we are told of Ahab's worshipping Baal, and serving him, and this verse goes on to mention how a house was built for Baal, and an altar established in it, and by all this the following context indicates that Jahweh was greatly displeased. All of

There are thus many instances in the M. T. where Baal either alone or in conjunction with a second noun indicates a god. We might list the following passages besides the two just treated.

| | | | |
|-------------|-----------|---------------|---------|
| Numbers | 22,41 | 1 Chronicles | 5, 8 |
| | 25,3 | | |
| | 25,5 | II Chronicles | 17, 3 |
| Deuteronomy | 4,3 | | 23, 17 |
| Joshua | 13, 17 | | 24, 7 |
| Judges | 2, 11 | | 28, 21 |
| | 2, 13 | | 33, 3 |
| | 3, 7 | Psalm | 106, 28 |
| | 6, 25 | | |
| | 6, 28 | Jeremiah | 2, 8 |
| | 6, 30 | | 2, 23 |
| | 6, 31 | | 7, 9 |
| | 8, 33 | | 9, 13 |
| | 9, 4 | | 11, 17 |
| | 10, 6-10 | | 12, 16 |
| 1 Samuel | 7, 4 | | 19, 5 |
| | 12, 10 | | 23, 27 |
| | | | 32, 29 |
| | | | 32, 35 |
| 1 Kings | 16, 31 | Ezekiel | 25, 9 |
| | 16, 32 | | |
| | 18, 18 | Hosea | 2, 10 |
| | 18, 22 | | 2, 15 |
| | 18, 25 | | 2, 19 |
| | 18, 26 | | 11, 2 |
| | 18, 40 | | 13, 1 |
| | 19, 18 | | |
| | 22, 54 | Zephaniah | 1, 4. |
| II Kings | 1, 6 | | |
| | 1, 16 | | |
| | 3, 2 | | |
| | 10, 18-28 | | |
| | 11, 18 | | |
| | 17, 16 | | |
| | 21, 3 | | |
| | 23, 4 | | |
| | 23, 5 | | |

2. NOMEN.

The Semites seem to have had the custom of occasionally incorporating the name of a deity in their personal names¹, and thus we find the trilateral root זכב used in the M. T. in much the same way. For convenience sake we shall adopt the Latin term "nomen" to designate a personal name.

The main instance we shall cite to demonstrate and prove the usage of זכב in a nomen is 1 Chronicles 8, 30, for here we have the simple trilateral root, unaugmented by an elongating syllable or by an auxiliary word. The passage, as it occurs in the Hebrew reads thus: $\text{וְהָיָה אֲבִדֹן בְּרִישׁוֹ וְזֹר וְכִישׁ וְזָבָד וְנָדָב}$ (His first-born son was Abdon, then Zur, and Kish, and זכב and Nadab.) The LXX has for זכב the word $\beta\alpha\alpha\lambda$, and the Vul. likewise has " $\beta a a f$ ".

The rest of the prominent translations of the Old Testament also agree in making this man's name " $\beta a a f$ ". There is no doubt about the use of זכב to signify a man's name, for that a man is spoken of is quite evident from the words of the text. "His (Jeuel's) first-born son was Abdon, then Zur, and Kish, and Baal, and Nadab." These words plainly make זכב a nomen. Two other passages where זכב is plainly a nomen are 1 Chronicles 5,5 and 1 Chronicles 9,36.

A second instance of the occurrence of the trilateral root זכב in a nomen is Judges 9,5. This, however, is not the simple form זכב as in the above instance, but this nomen has another syllable or

1. Cp. The name of the deity " $\beta e f$ " in the name "Belahazzar". Also "Ja", a shortened form for Jahweh (יהוה), in Elijah, Hezekiah, Zephaniah.

word added to it. It reads thus יְרֻבָּאֵל (Jerubaal). The LXX transliterates $\text{I} \epsilon \rho \beta \alpha \alpha \lambda$. The "o", however, is not so serious a deviation as it may seem, for in the unpointed Hebrew text it could well be either a "u" or an "o", and though in this instance the M.T. and all modern versions adopt "u", the LXX translators apparently preferred to make it "o". The Vul, it seems, followed the LXX rendering and reproduces the "Jerobaal"; but the vowels, as we have indicated, mean very little in Hebrew, and an "o" and a "u" are indistinguishable in the unpointed text. The massoretes, who pointed the text which we use today, preferred to make the name "Jerubaal", and their vowel pointing has been followed by subsequent scholars.

That "Jerubaal" is a man's name is beyond a doubt, for his name occurs in other places, and his sons are spoken of in this passage. Thus we have established the usage of יְרֻבָּאֵל with an appended word as a nomen. We have other examples in the M.T. of this very thing, namely Judges 6,32, I Chronicles 12,5, and Jeremiah 40,14.

Passages where the second word has been separated from יְרֻבָּאֵל , but belongs to the nomen nevertheless, are the following: Genesis 6,38,39; I Chronicles 1,49; I Chronicles 1,50; I Chronicles 27,28. - In all of these passages the nomen "Baal-hanaa" occurs.

Thus we hope to have established the usage of the trilateral root יְרֻבָּאֵל as an "independent nomen, and as a component part of a compound nomen.

3. OWNER. In Daniel 4, 20. The pertinent words in this passage are: Next we shall treat עֲרֵב as the Hebrew vocable for "owner". In Exodus 22, 10-14 the word יְרֵבֵק occurs several times, and everytime the LXX reproduces it as *κύριος*. Now *κύριος* means "lord", and not specifically "owner", and yet it can mean nothing short of owner here, since an ass, ox, sheep or other animal is spoken of, and the "lord" (*κύριος*) of the ass, ox, or sheep is referred to. Obviously the LXX means the "owner" of these, as we today would say. Indeed, the word *κύριος* contains the concept of owner, or at least can easily appropriate such a meaning, i. e. a "lord" of something can easily be, and often is, the owner of it. The Vul. renders עֲרֵב "dominus", a word which means the same as the *κύριος* of the LXX. Now, however, turning to the more modern translations, we might expect that there be a more appropriate word available than the words employed by the Greek and Latin versions, but the Ger. has the same word, when it reproduces the Hebrew, "des Gut's Herr". The English, however, reproduces the sense of the original much better by the use of "owner" than by "lord", and therefore the K.J.V. employs the word "owner". The Am. T. supports the K.J.V. on this point and also uses "owner".

Upon reconsidering the above it would seem quite unquestionable that "owner" is the best English translation in the above passage, and despite the fact that the LXX, the Vul., and the Ger. translate "Lord", it is quite evident that they really mean to convey the same idea carried by the English word "owner".

Another typical instance of עֲרֵב as used to mean "owner"

no better equivalent for it in English than "owner", or "possessor", the whole phrase thus being translated: "the owner of the horns".

There are other instances in the M. T. where עֲמִיד is used as "owner". They are:

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| Deuteronomy 15, 2 | Ecclesiastes 5, 10 |
| | 5, 12 |
| Exodus 21, 28 | 7, 12 |
| 21, 29 | 8, 8 |
| 21, 34 | 10, 11 |
| 21, 36 | 10, 20 |
| 22, 7 | |
| 22, 15 | Isaiah 41, 15 |
| Job 31, 39 | Daniel 8, 6 |
| Proverbs 1, 17 | Nahum 1, 2 |
| 1, 19 | |
| 3, 27 | |
| 16, 22 | |
| 17, 8 | |

4. MASTER - MISTRESS.

Another meaning of עֲמִיד which is perhaps not so far removed from the one we have just considered is found in Judges 19, 22. The words of the M. T. in which we are here interested are $\text{וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו עֲמִיד בֵּיתְךָ}$ (And they said to the man, the עֲמִיד of the house). The LXX says thus: κύριον τοῦ οἴκου , "lord of the house". The Vul. has: "clamantes ad dominum domus". The Latin "dominus" is, of course, the same as the Greek κύριος , and so the two early versions take this as meaning "lord" or "master". The latter term undoubtedly fits better in the above connection.

The K. J. V. also has: "master of the house" as has the Am. T. The Ger. renders the עֲמִידָה "Hauswirth", which is approximately the same as "master of the house".

As indicated above the usage of עֲמִידָה as "owner" and its usage in this connection may not have been far removed from each other to the Jewish concept, but we must make a distinction when we translate, for to say "owner" here would not reproduce the usage of עֲמִידָה in this connection as accurately as another English word, namely "master". The man referred to above was most probably the owner of the particular house mentioned in the passage, but the idea of ownership of the house is not the primary consideration of the writer, but rather the head of the particular household is what he refers to. The man called עֲמִידָה of the house could be the head of the household, and yet not be the owner of the house. In order to avoid confusion, therefore, עֲמִידָה has heretofore been translated "master" in this and other passages, in order in this case to avoid unnecessary inaccuracy by an overly-literal rendering. We have then established another meaning which עֲמִידָה may have, namely "master".

There is, however, also a feminine form of עֲמִידָה , namely אֵתְמִידָה , which we shall treat in this connection. It is found in I Kings 17, 17. The pertinent words of the M. T. are: $\text{אֵתְמִידָה בִּתְּהֵימָה וְהָאֵתְמִידָה בִּתְּהֵימָה וְהָאֵתְמִידָה בִּתְּהֵימָה}$ (The son of the woman, the mistress of the house fell sick), which words the LXX renders thus: $\text{καὶ ἠρρώσθησεν ὁ υἱὸς τῆς γυναικὸς τῆς κυρίας}$

τοῦ οἴκου. The term used for אֵלֶּיךָ is κυρία the feminine form of κύριος. The Vul. deviated a trifle at this point, for it reads: "aegrotavit filius mulieris matris familias"¹ (The son of the woman, the mother of the family fell sick). It has "matris familias" (the mother of the family), instead of, as one might expect, "dominae domus" (mistress of the house), if it were following the LXX. But "the mother of the family", as the Vul. has it, is evidently a translation of the sense, and not the words, for there is no evidence anywhere that אֵלֶּיךָ might mean "mother", and on the other hand the "mother" of a family is usually the mistress of the house. The Latin translation really does not at all contradict the translation of the LXX, nor the more modern translations. The K. J. V. gives "mistress" for אֵלֶּיךָ, and the Am. T. does the same. The Ger. has "Hauswirtin", which could perhaps be no better rendered in English than by "mistress of the house".

As was the case with the word "master", we here likewise maintain that no other word in the English language would reproduce the sense of the original Hebrew, except "mistress", used in the sense of the feminine form of "master". This meaning may also not be far removed from "owneress" in the Hebrew mind, but this word would not leave a correct concept in the mind of a reader who has no knowledge of the original Hebrew.

We conclude then that אֵלֶּיךָ may have the meaning of "master" in the M. T., and that, when the feminine form, אֵלֶּיךָ, occurs, it may mean "mistress". Another instance where אֵלֶּיךָ is generally translated "mistress" in English is Nahum 3, 4. Passages where אֵלֶּיךָ is generally translated with "master" are: Judges 19, 23. Isaiah 1, 3.

5. HUSBAND - WIFE.

Another very prominent use of $\zeta \nu \delta$ is that with the meaning of "husband". If we look up Exodus 21, 22 in the M. T. we find the following Hebrew expression: $\text{וְהָיָה לְאִשׁוֹ} \zeta \nu \delta$, which the LXX renders: $\delta \text{ \acute{a}\nu\eta\rho\epsilon \tau\eta\varsigma \gamma\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\lambda\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma}$ (the husband (man) of the woman). Upon reference to the Vul., we find the Latin at this point to be: "maritus mulieris" (the husband of the woman).

The modern versions do not deviate from those just quoted, for the K. J. V. translates: "the woman's husband", and the Am. T. has these same words. The Ger. has: "des Weibes Mann". Thus we see that both ancient and modern versions have taken $\zeta \nu \delta$ in the sense of "husband" in this particular passage.

Upon reexamination of the above passages to make sure that we have not gone amiss in our conclusions, we might point out that the context of the passage, which speaks of the punishment of anyone who should hurt a pregnant woman seriously, and the penalty which should be demanded by the $\zeta \nu \delta$ of the woman, seems to be sufficient evidence to corroborate the translation of all prominent ancient and modern versions. Here then is a case where $\zeta \nu \delta$ is to be translated "husband".

Exceedingly interesting and closely connected with our study of $\zeta \nu \delta$ as "husband" is the passage, Deuteronomy 22, 22, for here the interesting combination $\zeta \nu \delta \text{ \acute{a}\nu\eta\rho\epsilon \tau\eta\varsigma \gamma\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\lambda\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma}$ occurs. The LXX at this point expresses itself: $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha} \gamma\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\lambda\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma \sigma\upsilon\nu\omega\chi\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma \text{ \acute{a}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\iota}\nu}$ ("with a woman married to a man"). The Vul. reads: "vir cum uxore

alterius" (a man with the wife of another). The K. J. V. says: "a woman married to an husband", while the Am. T. merely says: "a married woman". The Ger. reads thus: "ein Weib, die einen Ehemann hat". All of these translations, it will be noticed, agree in making זֶרַח a married man, and אֵשֶׁת זֶרַח a married woman in this passage.

This is evidently the correct meaning, for the word אִישׁ is used for man in general in the first part of the verse, and אִשָּׁה for woman in general thus: "If a man (אִישׁ) is found lying with a woman (אִשָּׁה)", but when the important consideration is brought in, patently that of marriage, the terms are changed, and the text goes on with אֵשֶׁת זֶרַח . How could אֵשֶׁת זֶרַח be rendered otherwise than "the wife of a husband" in this connection? Evidently the difference in meaning intended here between אִישׁ and זֶרַח is that זֶרַח is conceived as being a husband, a "married man", whereas אִישׁ is just "man" in general, with no reference to his matrimonial or non-matrimonial state. The distinction evidently intended to be made by the writer between אִשָּׁה and אֵשֶׁת זֶרַח is that אִשָּׁה is "woman", with no reference to matrimonial connections, while אֵשֶׁת זֶרַח is a "married woman", — a "wife" of a man.

In order to render the Hebrew אֵשֶׁת זֶרַח literally and accurately in English we would have to say: "a wife of a husband", and this, we conclude, is the true meaning of the phrase.

Thus we have established another usage of זֶרַח in the M. T., for the masculine form may mean "husband", and the feminine form אֵשֶׁת זֶרַח may mean "wife". Other passages where אֵשֶׁת זֶרַח means

wife are Genesis 20, 3 and Isaiah 54, 1. Passages where זָרָה is generally understood as husband are:

| | |
|--------------------|----------------|
| Genesis 20, 3 | Esther 1, 17 |
| | 1, 20 |
| Deuteronomy 21, 13 | |
| 24, 4 | Proverbs 12, 4 |
| Exodus 21, 3 | 31, 11 |
| | 31, 23 |
| II Samuel 11, 26 | 31, 28 |

6. LORD.

Quite akin to the translation "master" may be that of "lord". When we look up the passage, Isaiah 16, 8, we find the following Hebrew expression: $\text{אֲדָמָה} \text{ 'אֲדָמָה}$. This expression has not been translated by the LXX, but it merely gives $\text{καταπινοῦτες τὰ ἔθνη}$ ¹ (swallowing up the nations), evidently translating $\text{אֲדָמָה} \text{ 'אֲדָמָה}$ with only τὰ ἔθνη , or "the nations". We can, then, derive little aid in this case from the LXX, and accordingly we turn to the Vul. It has: "domini gentium", i. e., "lords of the tribes" (heathen tribes).

But what have men in more modern day taken this phrase to mean? The K. J. V. takes this to be the meaning: "the lords of the heathen", and the Am. T. says: "The Lords of the nations". The German also agrees and says: "die Herren unter den Heiden".

But now let us see whether these versions have not erred in their

1. τὰ ἔθνη is the Greek equivalent for אֲדָמָה in Hebrew, and when used as such in the LXX and the New Testament bears with it the connotation of "heathen nations".

rendering of this passage. They translate לַמֶּלֶךְ with "lord", but could לַמֶּלֶךְ here not as well or perhaps better be translated "man"; so that we would have "men of nations"?

Let us look at the context to see whether it will give us any clue. The prophet is speaking of Moab, and is describing its destruction, mentioning how the fields will languish and the grape vines of Sibmah will be beaten down.

In references to the vines of Sibmah the New Century Bible comments thus:

"The vines of Sibmah were celebrated, and the wine of this vintage was drunk in many a lordly banquet and intoxicated the revellers".¹

If the wine made at Sibmah was of such extraordinary quality it seems quite logical to suppose that it was not available to the ordinary man, but on the other hand that it would be in great demand among the lords of the land, or the upper classes. And, indeed, we do know that the upper classes indulged much in wine. We might again quote the "New Century Bible" in this connection.

The wide prevalence of drunkenness in the upper classes of Canaanite society is often referred to in the pre-exilian prophets: cf. Isaiah V: 11, 22; XXVIII: 1, 3; Amos VI, 6; and other passages.²

In view of the practise of drinking which was prevalent among the nobles or lords of the Canaanites, we may well assume that these passages are a reference to this very thing. In mentioning the vines of Sibmah the writer probably had in mind the superb virtue

1. "New Century Bible" Isaiah, Vol. I, p. 213.

2. Ibid.

of these particular grapes, mentioning that they had intoxicated, "laid prostrate", as the Am. T. puts it, even the "lords of the nations".

It is not unreasonable to assume that if the vines of Sibmah produced such excellent wine that the lords would use it extensively and that the ordinary man would not be able to afford it. Therefore, since ל מ ד occurs in connection with the vines of Sibmah it would appear that it is best rendered "lord".

We may conclude then that ל מ ד here means "lord", and that, ל מ ד ל מ ד is to be rendered, "lords of the nations", because of the precedent of the Vul., the K. J. V., the Am. T. and the Ger., and because of the witness of the context. Thus we adopt another meaning for ל מ ד , namely that of "lord".

7. MAN.

The trilateral root ל מ ד may also be translated as "man", and therefore, in the following we shall study a few passages where this meaning is found.

The first passage which is an example of this usage of ל מ ד is Proverbs 22, 24. The Hebrew words we are particularly interested in are these: אִישׁ לַמְדָּה (ל מ ד of anger). The LXX has *ἀνδρὶ θυμώδη* (a man of anger); and the Vul. paraphrases: "Noli esse amicus homini iracundo" (Do not be a friend to an irascible man).

The K. J. V. agrees in translating ל מ ד as "man", saying:

"Make no friendship with an angry man. The Am. T. does not deviate when it translates אִתּוֹ זָרָע as "hot-tempered man", nor does the Ger. when it renders it as "zornigen Mann". Thus there is no deviation in the translation which has in the past been given for these words. However, there are corroborating features that should not be left unsaid in attempting to establish this particular meaning of זָרָע . In order to show these we shall quote the translation of our verse from the Am. T.:

"Form no friendship with a hot-tempered man,
And with a passionate man go not."

The "passionate man" in the second part of the verse is written אִתּוֹ אִישׁ in Hebrew. The word אִישׁ (man) is placed as a parallel expression to זָרָע . Both evidently refer to types of men, and can very well be translated "man". At least since אִישׁ is "man", זָרָע must also be "man", because it is in a parallel expression, and is patently meant to be a parallel term. Therefore we conclude that זָרָע means "man".

The parallels of Hebrew poetry are well suited to demonstrate the usage of a word, and therefore we shall quote another passage from the book of Proverbs to demonstrate the possibility of translating זָרָע as "man".

In Proverbs 29, 22 we find the following Hebrew: $\text{אִתּוֹ זָרָע יִדָּבֵר וְאִתּוֹ אִישׁ יִשְׁמָד}$. The LXX translates it thus: $\text{ἰγείραει νεῖκος, ἀνὰ δὲ δεξιῶν ἐξώρεται ἀμαρτίαν}$ ("A furious man stirs up strife, and a passionate man digs up sin"). The Vul. has a strange translation for this passage. It has: "Vir

iracundus provocat rixas; et qui ad indignandum facilis est, erit ad peccandum proclivior". (A passionate man provokes strife, and who becomes indignant easily will be more prone to sin.) The word which is used to translate זמן is "qui", a pronoun, which, however, refers back to "vir" (man) for its subject, and thus it is quite evident that the translator of the Vul. understood זמן as "man".

The K. J. V. renders the passage in hand thus: "An angry man stirreth up strife, and a furious man aboundeth in transgression". The Am. T. translates it:

"A passionate man stirs up discord;
And a hot-tempered man is the cause of much mischief".

The Ger. has "Ein zorniger Mann richtet Hader an, und ein Grimmiger thut viele Sünde".

We disregard the deviations in translation which occur in the above versions, for they deal with words with which we are in this thesis not concerned, but we note that all understand זמן as meaning "man".

The passage before us is composed of two parallel statements as one will readily recognize upon reference to the Am. T. rendering quoted above. In the first of these parallels, the word אדם (man) is used and in the second the word זמן is used as subject. The first word means "man", and it is but natural to assume that the second, namely זמן also means "man" or something very similar.

But now let us reexamine the passage, and stop a moment to

reflect upon whether "man" is the correct translation. The context is perfectly fulfilled by the translation "man", and as we saw above, אִישׁ has been taken to mean "man" by all the most important translators. We conclude then that אִישׁ is to be translated "man" in Proverbs 29, 22.

Thus, upon the basis of the above two instances, we add the rendering "man" as a possible meaning for אִישׁ . Passages in which אִישׁ is used in this sense, besides the two just treated are:

Genesis 14, 13
37, 19
49, 23

Exodus 24, 14

II Samuel 21, 12

II Kings 1, 8

Proverbs 23, 2
24, 8
29, 22

Isaiah 50, 8

Nehemiah 6, 18

8. IN PROPER NAMES.

There remains yet the usage of אִישׁ in proper names as of mountains, cities, and other locations.

To illustrate this usage of אִישׁ we shall treat Judges 3, 3. The words of the M. T. in which we are interested read $\text{אִישׁ הַר הַבַּלְעָמֹן}$ $\text{לִי וְהַר הַבַּלְעָמֹן}$ (From the mount of Baal Hermon). The LXX renders ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους

Γοῦ Ἡερεμῶν omitting the "Baal" from the name, but the Vul. has: "de monte Baal-Hermon", and so it has always been taken by all more modern versions.

Evidently the important thing in the name of this mountain is $\gamma \iota \theta \gamma \eta$ (Hermon), but the $\epsilon \mu \omega$ is added to it for some reason or other which is not as clear to us today as it might be.

W. Robertson Smith says the following:

When a god is simply called "the Baal", the meaning is not "the lord of the worshipper, but the possessor of some place or district, and each of the multitude of local Baalim is distinguished by adding the name of his own place.¹

Thus it quite probably is that the word $\epsilon \mu \omega$ became prefixed to certain place-names, for the god of a district assumed the name of that district, and it seems that later the compound name was used to designate the place. In this way, it would seem, many names of cities or other locations were developed.

An example of $\epsilon \mu \omega$ being used in the name of a city is found in Joshua 18, 14, where the words $\epsilon \mu \omega \text{ } \eta \text{ } \gamma \rho \text{ } \epsilon \mu \omega$ occur in the M. T. The LXX reads: *Καριαθ Βαάλ*, and the Vul. agrees with it when it gives, "Carjath baal" for $\epsilon \mu \omega \text{ } \eta \text{ } \gamma \rho$.

The three more modern translations we have been quoting transliterate: "Kerjath-baal"—The use of vowels being arbitrary, we shall disregard the fact that the LXX and the Vul. both have "a" for a first vowel, while the M. T. and recent translations have "i".

Another interesting case of $\epsilon \mu \omega$ occurring in a city-name is $\eta \text{ } \epsilon \mu \omega$ (Baalah), a city in Judah mentioned for example in

1. Smith, W. Robertson, The Religion of the Semites, p. 94.

Joshua 15, 29. The LXX has " $\beta \alpha \lambda \alpha$ " for this, and the Vul. "Baala". The Ger. has "Baelah", but the K. J. V. and the Am. T. agree on "Baalah".

DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMATIC PASSAGES

Again it is in place to remark that the vowels are not rigid in Hebrew as are the consonants, and that therefore the above variations in vowels are insignificant. Baalah is a very striking instance of the usage of $\text{ב} \text{א} \text{ל}$ in names of cities and other locations. All scholars agree on referring this usage of $\text{ב} \text{א} \text{ל}$ to the name $\text{ב} \text{א} \text{ל}$ as used for a god of a locality, but just how a city name like Baalah could develop is something about which we can only conjecture.

This will suffice to illustrate the use of $\text{ב} \text{א} \text{ל}$ in geographical names.

The passages in which $\text{ב} \text{א} \text{ל}$ is used to designate some location as a city or mountain, upon which discussion will be dropped are the following:

| | | | |
|----------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Numbers | 32, 38 | II Samuel | 5, 20 |
| | 33, 7 | | 6, 2 |
| | | | 13, 23 |
| Joshua | 11, 17 | | |
| | 12, 7 | I Kings | 4, 16 |
| | 13, 5 | | 9, 18 |
| | 15, 9 | | |
| | 15, 10 | II Kings | 4, 42 |
| | 15, 11 | | |
| | 15, 24 | I Chronicles | 4, 33 |
| | 15, 29 | | 5, 23 |
| | 15, 60 | | 13, 6 |
| | 19, 44 | | 14, 11 |
| Judges | 20, 33 | II Chronicles | 8, 6 |
| I Samuel | 28, 7 | Hosea | 9, 10 |

CHAPTER III

DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMATIC PASSAGES

Having established certain meanings for $\epsilon \mu \gamma$, and having listed the passages where the translation of $\epsilon \mu \gamma$ is quite definitely agreed upon, let us next turn to such passages in which there is some problem connected with the rendering of $\epsilon \mu \gamma$.

We shall divide these problematical passages into two classes. Such passages in which the Am.T. is upheld, and such in which the Am.T. is not upheld in the final conclusion of each discussion. The reason for giving the Am.T.¹ such a prominent place in our discussion, is, as was mentioned in the preface, that it is the latest English version, and is, therefore, the one to be considered primarily in any correction or suggestion.

A. PASSAGES IN WHICH THE AM. T. IS UPHELD.

I. I CHRONICLES 4, 22.

The first of these passages to be considered is found in

I Chronicles 4, 22. The words we are interested in are: $\epsilon \mu \gamma \alpha \nu$

$\alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu \epsilon \nu \mu \omega \alpha \beta$. They are translated in the LXX in the follow-

ing manner: $\alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu \epsilon \nu \mu \omega \alpha \beta$ (who dwelt in Moab). The

Vul., however, translates: "qui principes fuerunt in Moab" (who were

1. Am. T., it will be remembered stands for The Bible, An American Translation, published 1931.

chief men in Moab).

The K. J. V. renders: "who had the dominion in Moab". The Am. T. says: "who ruled in Moab". And in the German we find: "die Hausväter wurden in Moab".

We cannot help but notice the deviation of the LXX from the other versions in the above. The LXX translates $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu$ with $\kappa \alpha \tau \acute{\omega} \kappa \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ (they dwelt in), while the rest of the versions take $\epsilon \nu \nu$ here in the sense of "ruling", or "being lord". Which of the two represents the meaning the author intended this word to have?

According to the context it is very possible that $\epsilon \nu \nu$ should here rather be "dwell in" than "rule", for immediately following the verse we are treating comes this statement: "These were the potters and inhabitants of Netaim and Gederah; they resided there with the king for his work."¹ It is quite natural to assume that these men were skilled workers who were hired by the King of Moab to make pottery, who later, if we follow the rendering of the Am. T.,² "returned to Bethlehem". In view of the fact that these men were potters and only lived in Moab a while, as it seems, it might be best to follow the suggestion of the LXX and translate here as "dwell in". However, we have not been able to establish any such meaning for $\epsilon \nu \nu$. Shall we establish a new one merely because it might fit very well here? Let us investigate to see

1. We quote the Am. T.

2. The vul. also has this rendering, but the LXX, the K. J. V. and the Ger. have different renderings.

how the translation "be lord" or "rule over" might work out.

It is, indeed, not very probable that potters should be great political figures, and especially, since they did not really live in Moab, it is most improbable that they should have been great men politically, or nobles in that country. However, they might have been prominent men in their field of activity, i. e., pottery-making. They may have been the foremen of the king's pottery factory, or the king's chief potters, and thus in a certain sense have been "chief men" as the Vul. has it. If, then, we modify our meaning "be lord" a little, to make it "be a chief man", then we need not take an entirely new meaning for the verb ז מ ד here, nor need we disregard the renderings of the other versions besides the LXX.

The meaning of ז מ ד then, as it is found in I Chronicles 4,22, we take to be: "be lord", to be translated, however, in this particular case "be chief man". In doing thus we are only disregarding the LXX rendering, but have the corroboration of the Vul., the K. J. V., and the Am. T. The Ger., indeed, embodies the idea of "be lord", when it renders: "die Hausväter wurden", but this, to say the least, can be misunderstood very easily. In fact there would seem little doubt about it that the average reader would not understand "Hausväter" in any other sense than that of "pater familias", or "the master of a household". We would suggest then that the Ger. be changed in some way, so that the reader could not fail to understand the sense of the M. T., which we believe to be "be lord". Perhaps the German word, "Herren" substituted for "Hausväter" would be more appropriate. The Ger. would then read: "die Herren wurden".

2. ISAIAH 54, 5.

Another passage which presents some difficulty is Isaiah 54, 5. Here we have the Hebrew expression $\text{יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ הוֹצֵאֲךָ מִן הַבֵּית}$, which the LXX translates thus: $\delta\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\nu}\ \kappa\tilde{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\ \pi\omicron\lambda\tilde{\upsilon}\nu\kappa\ \sigma\tilde{\epsilon}$ ("For it is the Lord that made thee"), but the Vul. renders thus: "Quia dominabitur tui, qui fecit te" (For he rules you, who made you).

The K. J. V. has: "For thy Maker is thine husband". The Am. T. has about the same, though it inverts the phrase to make it: "For your husband is your maker". The Ger. likewise translates יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ with "husband" for it says: "Denn der dich gemacht hat ist dein Mann".

The obvious difficulty, of course, is this, that the LXX and the Vul. translate יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ as "one who rules over", or "one who is lord", while the more recent translations cited agree in making יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ "husband". Which of these two concepts seems to be the better one here? Or is there a third, which might be preferable?

Let us look at the M. T. more closely before we go further in our quest for a translation. The form יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ is the present active participle of the verb עָלַם , and to it is appended the second person, singular, feminine suffix or pronoun. The following term יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ is the same form as יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ with the same pronoun attached. The translation of יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ is quite obviously: "he who made you". And since the suffix "י" is feminine, the "you" must be a reference to Israel under the picture of a "wife" (cf. v. 6). The word יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ then, must also refer to Israel under the picture of a wife, since it is obviously a parallel form to יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ , and has likewise a second

person, feminine, singular suffix. If we apply the suggested translations of the LXX and Vul. we get these two possibilities: "your maker is your lord (or ruler)," or "your maker is your husband" (or "the one who married you"), for we have previously established these two possibilities for the verbal use of עָוָה . There may, of course, be more possibilities than these two, but, as long as we have no reason to look for a new meaning we shall not do so. In this case either of the suggested translations gives good sense, and so it becomes a matter of determining which is the better of the two.

Our next step is a consideration of the foregoing and following contexts. Beginning with the first verse of the fifty fourth chapter we find the writer referring to Israel as a woman, and in verse 6 he says:

"For like a wife forsaken, and embittered in spirit,
The Lord has regarded you—

Like a wife of one's youth, when she is cast off".¹

Here the person referred to, when the writer says $\text{כְּאִשְׁתּוֹ הַיָּתוּמָה}$, is compared to a wife. — In view of this we ask, which would be the better translation for עָוָה , "be lord" or "marry"? We naturally decide for the latter, because the whole context speaks in terms of marriage relations, and the suffix attached to עָוָה definitely links the word with the context. It would seem then that the idea of "rule over", - "be lord", would not fit as well as "marry".

1. Quoted from the Am. T.

Now, how will we translate this passage to give it intelligibility in English? A literal rendering would be: "He who made you, is he who married you", but a more idiomatic rendering would be that given by the Am. T., namely: "your husband is your Maker".

3. ISAIAH 62, 4,5.

We shall treat, as our next passage, Isaiah 62, 4 and 5. The discussion of these two verses will be centered around the Hebrew words:

עֲמֻנָהּ יִשְׁכְּנָהּ . . . וְעַמְּהָּ יִשְׁכְּנָהּ (4)

וְכַדְּמֹן וְכַדְּמֹן וְכַדְּמֹן וְכַדְּמֹן וְכַדְּמֹן (5)

The LXX renders these words as follows:

(4) καὶ ἡ γῆ σου, οἰκουμένη . . . καὶ ἡ γῆ σου συνοικηθήσεται

(5) καὶ ὡς συνοικῶν νεανίσκος παρθένω, οὕτω κατοικήσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ σου.

(4) "And thy land (shall be called) inhabited . . . and thy land shall be inhabited. (5) "And as a young man lives with a virgin, so shall thy sons dwell in thee."

The Vul. translates thus: "et terra tua inhabitata . . . et terra tua inhabitabitur. Habitabit enim juvenis cum virgine, et habitabunt in te filii tui" (And your land inhabited sc. vocabitur i. e. "will be called") . . . and your land will be inhabited. For as a youth lives with a virgin, your sons shall also live in you).

The next step is to investigate more recent translations. In the K. J. V. we find: "And thy land (shall be called) Beulah (marginal reading: "married") . . . and thy land shall be married. For as a

young man marrieth a virgin, so shall thy sons marry thee." It will be noticed that $\xi \nu \tau$ is not translated "inhabit", or "live with", but "marry". The Am. T. has the same: "And your land (shall be named) 'Married'; . . . and your land shall be married. As a young man married a maiden, so shall your Builder marry you." The Ger. does not give the identical rendering for these verses. It reads: "dein Land (so//), lieber Buhle heissen, . . . denn . . . dein Land hat einen lieben Buhlen. Denn wie ein lieber Buhle einen Buhlen lieb hat, so werden dich deine Kinder lieb haben". This does not translate $\xi \nu \tau$ as "marry", but "dear lover", or to "be a lover", but this seems to be a very remote translation and we may, therefore, disregard it.

We have now the translation "live in", "dwell" given by the LXX and the Vul., and the translation "marry" given by the K. J. V. and the Am. T. We ask, which is probably the most correct translation? To determine this the next step in our procedure is to examine the immediate context in which $\xi \nu \tau$ occurs.

It would seem that the words immediately following those we are treating:

"And as a bridegroom rejoices over his bride,
So shall your God rejoice over you,"¹

tend to indicate that "marry" is the correct rendering. For "bride" and "bridegroom" clearly indicate that a marriage relation is in the mind of the writer, and therefore it is but natural to assume that the foregoing also is based upon the same thought. It must also not be overlooked that the meaning "marry" goes very well with the words

1. We quote the Am. T.

under discussion, and we need only quote the first part of verse 5 to amply demonstrate the great propriety of "marry" as a translation of the verbal stem $\text{ז} \text{ו} \text{ן}$ in this section:

"As a young man marries a maiden,
So shall your builder marry you".¹

However, we must not disregard the rendering of the two very early translations, the LXX and the Vul. They translate $\text{ז} \text{ו} \text{ן}$ as "live in", "dwell", and indeed this translation would seem to give very good sense. The first part of verse 4 speaks of Jerusalem being "forsaken", and the land being "desolate", and to follow up these expressions by saying as the LXX does: "your land shall be called 'inhabited'", and as the Vul. does: "your land shall be 'inhabited'", gives good sense. In verse 5 this meaning would also give very good sense. We quote the LXX: "And as a young man lives with a virgin, so shall thy sons live in thee; and it shall come to pass that as a bridegroom will rejoice over a bride, so will the Lord rejoice over thee". This gives a very definite sense, and even the last part of the verse treating the bridegroom's rejoicing over the bride might very logically flow from the above statement: "as a young man lives with a virgin". Though it would seem that the verb "marry" might here be the better word to use, yet the translations of $\text{ז} \text{ו} \text{ן}$ employed by the LXX and the Vul. are certainly very appropriate.

How, then, shall we decide to render this passage? Shall we translate $\text{ז} \text{ו} \text{ן}$ as "live in", "dwell" or "marry"? We recall that in the first part of this thesis we established the transla-

1. We quote the Am. T.

tion "marry" for לָבַד , as a verbal stem, but we have no other passage where לָבַד means to "live in", "dwell". This consideration then, it would seem, would throw the balance quite definitely and indisputably in favor of "marry". Our conclusion for the above discussion is that Isaiah 62, 4 and 5 are best translated thus:

4. "No more shall you be named "Forsaken",
Nor your land be named "Desolate";
But you shall be called "My delight is in her"
And your land "Married";
For the Lord delights in you,
And your land shall be married.

5. As a young man marries a maiden,
So shall your Builder marry you;
And as a bridegroom rejoices over his bride,
So shall your God rejoice over you."¹

4. JEREMIAH 3, 14. The fourth passage we shall treat in this chapter is Jeremiah 3, 14. The Hebrew phrase in which we are interested is

$\text{כי־אני־אֶהְיֶה־לְךָ־כְּאִשְׁתְּךָ}$. How will we translate כְּאִשְׁתְּךָ here?

As usual we look to the LXX for the first suggestion. We find the following: $\text{διότι ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ κτελέσω ὑμῶν}$ (for I will rule over you). Next we note the rendering of the Vul, which is: "quia Ego vir vester" (because I am your husband).

The K. J. V. has: "for I am married to you", and the Am. T. has: "for I am your Lord". The Ger. has: "denn Ich will euch mir vertrauen". The word "vertrauen" does not, according to German

1. Quoted directly from the Am. T.

Dictionaries, have any connection with marrying, and as far as we can tell is a mistranslation, for the root עָוַן is never rendered as "trust" (vertrauen) to our knowledge, and all the versions fail to give the Ger. any support.

From the above translations we may list the following as the most plausible renderings:

| | |
|---------|----------|
| be lord | marry |
| LXX | Vul. |
| Am. T. | K. J. V. |

The question seems to be "which shall it be, to 'marry', or 'be lord'?" To the Hebrew mind perhaps there was no distinction, for when a man married a woman, he probably became her lord. It may have been that to the Hebrew mode of thought, marrying was the process of a woman passing into the lordship, so to say, of her husband, but to our minds "marrying" is not a thing connected with "being lord" over someone, and "marry" is an entirely separated concept. But what, then, to our minds did the Hebrew writer of these words mean?

Let us look to the context for suggestions. It would seem that the whole tenor of the following context indicates the conception of Jahweh's being the lord of Israel. Verse 14 begins: "Return, apostate children". Would the word children be used if it had been intended in the next statement to call Jahweh the "husband" of these children, or married to them? —In other words would Jahweh call the Jews his children, and immediately state that he was married to them? We never think of anyone marrying his own children, and therefore, the meaning to "marry", does not appear to be so good.

It would seem then that the translation "be lord" is the best for this particular passage.

Upon the basis of the above considerations and the precedent of the LXX and the Am. T., we adopt for this passage the translation: "for I am their lord".

5. JEREMIAH 37, 13.

A passage which might also engage our attention is Jeremiah 37, 13. We find these words in the M. T.: $\eta \gamma \rho \theta \zeta \nu \alpha \delta \delta \psi$, and the following translation of them is given in the LXX: $\kappa \alpha \iota \ \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \hat{\iota} \ \delta \nu \theta \epsilon \omega \pi \omicron \varsigma \ \pi \alpha \epsilon \prime \ \hat{\omega} \ \kappa \alpha \tau \ \epsilon \lambda \nu \epsilon$ (and there was a man with whom he lodged). The Vul. has the following: "erat ibi custos portae per vices" (a keeper of the gate was there in his turn).¹

Let us next consult the K. J. V. It has: "a captain of the ward was there". The Am. T. has: "a sentry who was posted there". And turning to the Ger. we find: "da war einer bestellt zum Thorhüter". We notice at once that all versions give the words $\eta \gamma \rho \theta \zeta \nu \alpha \delta$ the translation of "sentry", except the LXX. Why the Greek version translates as it does is a mystery, and whether its differing is due to a corrupt text having been used by the translators, or ours is an altered text, or the words of the LXX have been tampered with, is hard to say. However, the Vul. and the other versions except the LXX translate $\eta \gamma \rho \theta \zeta \nu \alpha \delta$ as "sentry" or "sentinel".

1. Per vices - "by turns" or "one after another"
cf. Harper's Latin Dictionary - 1907, p. 1986, see "vices".

The original Hebrew text reads as follows: $\text{וְיִשִּׁי} \quad \text{וְיִשִּׁי}$

$\text{וְיִשִּׁי} \quad \text{וְיִשִּׁי} \quad \text{וְיִשִּׁי} \quad \text{וְיִשִּׁי} \quad \text{וְיִשִּׁי} \quad \text{וְיִשִּׁי} \quad \text{וְיִשִּׁי} \quad \text{וְיִשִּׁי}$

The LXX translates the verse thus: $\text{καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ λέξει κύριος καλέσει με ὁ ἀνὴρ μου, καὶ οὐ καλέσει με ἔτι βααλείμ}$ (And it shall be in that

day, says the Lord, that she shall call me 'my husband', and shall not call me Baalim any more.) In the Vul. we have about the identical rendering. It has "vir meus" for וְיִשִּׁי , and "Baali", for וְיִשִּׁי

In the K. J. V. we have a transliteration of both וְיִשִּׁי and וְיִשִּׁי . It reads thus: "thou shalt call me Ishi; and shalt call me no more Baali". In the margin "My husband" is given for the word "Ishi", and "My lord" for "Baali". The Am. T. reads: ". . . you will call me, 'My husband', And you will no longer call me, 'My Baal'". The German has the following: "Alsdann wirst du mich heissen mein Mann; und nicht mehr mein Baal heissen".

All of the above translations agree in transliterating the trilateral stem שׁוּב , instead of translating it, with the exception of the marginal reading of the K. J. V.

However there are scholars who prefer not to take שׁוּב in the sense of a direct designation of Jahweh as a Baal, but who rather prefer to give it the meaning of "owner", i. e., "owner", or "lord" in the sense that a husband who holds a slave-wife is her "owner", or her "lord". The distinction might well be expressed by the terms "owner-husband", and "loving-husband". Some scholars understand שׁוּב , as here used, in the sense of "owner-husband". The following is a quota-

tion of The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia:

There is no evidence that the Israelites ever called Jehovah by the name of Baal; for the passage in Hosea ii: 16, which has been cited as such, only contains the word baal as the sterner, less affectionate representative of husband.¹

The "New Century Bible" voices a similar opinion when it makes the following comment:

in the Phoenician religion Baal, i. e., Lord, was the Lord of the land. He held it as a man held a woman whom he has bought and used. Israel had lowered her relation with God to this base connexion. Yahweh was merely her Baal. He will be to her in her regeneration Husband.²

In the "International Critical Commentary" we likewise find the same view as to the translation of יְהוָה. It first of all gives the meaning of "Ishi" and "Baali" as being "my husband", and "my Baal" respectively. Then it makes the following statement a few lines farther on.

The two words Ishi and Baali express practically the same idea, but the use of the latter is condemned on account of its connection with the Baalim.³

The authors of the above quotations evidently took the passage we are treating to mean that the Hebrews should call Jahweh "my husband", i. e., "my loving-husband", and they should no longer call him "Baal", i. e., "owner-husband".

However, there is the other view, which is also well taken, namely that the Hebrews should no longer call Jahweh by the name of "Baal". This is a very good view to hold, and to anyone who prefers to inter-

1. Fallows, S.; Zenos, A.; and Willett, H., The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia and Scriptural Dictionary. p. 199. see "Baal".
2. "New Century Bible" Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, p. 23
3. "International Critical Commentary", Amos and Hosea, by W. H. Rainey, p. 234.

pret $\text{ז} \text{א} \text{ד}$ here as being a name for Jahweh, we have nothing to say. However, because of the close relation between $\text{א} \text{ד} \text{א}$ and $\text{ז} \text{א} \text{ד}$ in this passage, and because the former is evidently to be rendered "my husband", it seems to us that $\text{ז} \text{א} \text{ד}$ had best be taken in some meaning closely related to "husband".

What shall we conclude, then, is the best method of rendering $\text{ז} \text{א} \text{ד}$, shall we translate it or transliterate it? If we wish to translate it, what English equivalent is there which we could employ which would not need any explanation to bring out the full sense of the Hebrew? If "owner" were used, we would have to explain in any interpretation of it, that it was used in the sense of an "owner-husband", rather than as a "husband" in the ordinary sense of the term. Because no adequate term can be found which would express the idea of the Hebrew term, and it might be mentioned here, because of the patent connection of the word $\text{ז} \text{א} \text{ד}$, with the word "Baalim", in the next verse, and because of the precedence of all the versions treated above, we deem it best to allow $\text{ז} \text{א} \text{ד}$ to be transliterated in the text of any English version.

Let it be clearly understood that we do not understand $\text{ז} \text{א} \text{ד}$ as a name for Jahweh here, but we understand it as "owner-husband" in contradistinction from "husband". However, for the reasons mentioned in the previous paragraph, we uphold the policy of previous versions in that they transliterate $\text{ז} \text{א} \text{ד}$ in this particular passage.

B. PASSAGES IN WHICH THE AM. T. IS NOT UPHOLD.

Having treated the problematical passages where the conclusion reached accords with the rendering of the Am. T., we shall proceed to a consideration of passages where the translation finally decided upon as preferable in each discussion is not identical with that of the Am. T.

1. LEVITICUS 21, 4.

The first of these passages we shall treat is Leviticus 21, 4. The M. T. reads as follows: $\text{לֹא יִשְׁבֹּץ אֶת־עַמּוּתוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ$, and the translation for this phrase is the problem before us.

Let us look into the LXX to see how this phrase is rendered there. It reads thus: $\text{ὁὐ μὴ ἀνθίσταται ἐξάπτενα ἐν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ εἰς βεβήλων αὐτοῦ}$ (He shall not defile himself suddenly among his people to profane himself). We notice that the word ἐν τῷ is not directly translated, but we might say that the pronoun "he", contained in the verb μὴ ἀνθίσταται (he shall defile himself), is set for it to connect this sentence with the preceding thought. The Vul. reads thus: "sed nec in principe populi sui contaminabitur (but neither in the chief of his people shall he be contaminated). This version translates ἐν τῷ with "chief man" (princeps).

The Syriac translation which we consulted here, employs the word ܐܢܫܐ ¹ to translate ἐν τῷ . The word means "man", the

1. Syrische Grammatik von Arthur Ungnad, p. 65.

German "Mann".

The K. J. V. reads: "But he shall not defile himself, being a chief man among his people, to profane himself", and in the margin we find: "being an husband among his people, he shall not defile himself". This version then takes זֶרַח to mean "chief man" or "husband".

The Ger. translates the verse in question as follows: "Sonst soll er sich nicht verunreinigen an irgend einem, der ihm zugehört unter seinem Volk, das er sich entheiligt". This does not directly translate זֶרַח , but merely gives an idiomatic rendering of the sense of the verse.

We have yet to consult the Am. T. It renders our verse as follows: "he must not defile himself for those related to him by marriage by profaning himself". It seems, that the words: "those related to him by marriage" form an idiomatic translation of the Hebrew expression לְזֶרַח זֶרַח . However, this is perhaps a bit too loose a translation, because the Am. T. treats זֶרַח as a plural form, whereas it is a singular in the M. T., and the words, "by marriage", seem to be introduced without sufficient reason, for the idea does not appear in the original text. Because of its free rendition, the Am. T. does not shed much light on the meaning of זֶרַח .

Let us look at this verse in the original. In the first place, we shall try to determine whether this verse is an independent sentence, or it is dependent on some other construction preceding or following it. Upon careful examination it seems quite plain that it

is in no way connected grammatically with any other construction, but forms an independent statement in itself. And, indeed, as an independent statement it can very well stand as it is, for it is quite complete in itself. It has a subject which may be understood either as being contained in the verb נִשְׁחָט , or as being עַמּוֹ . It has a verb, which embraces the object of the sentence in itself, for נִשְׁחָט is a reflexive of a hithpael form of the verb שָׁחַט (defile). We, therefore, take the verse in question to be a complete sentence in itself, and shall treat it so.

We have above indicated that there are two possibilities for a subject in this sentence. 1. That it is contained in the verb נִשְׁחָט . 2. That עַמּוֹ is the subject. Which of these is the better? If we allow the subject to be contained in the verb, what can we do with the noun עַמּוֹ . It must then become the subject, the object, or an appositive. It cannot be the last, for there is nothing to which it could stand in apposition. Could it then be the object? It would seem not, for נִשְׁחָט is, as was mentioned above, a reflexive form (hithpael imperfect), which is to be translated: "he shall pollute himself". There is then no room for a separate object, and therefore all that is left for עַמּוֹ is the subject. But would the sentence give any sense if we took עַמּוֹ as subject? Let us attempt to formulate the verse using עַמּוֹ as subject. We begin with עַמּוֹ , merely transliterating it for the time being, not suggesting any translation. Then we have the following: "A baal shall not defile himself among his people for his pollution". This seems to be

a perfectly logical, sensible sentence, and, it would seem, the only way the verse can possibly be taken.

But the question before us now is what ܐܠܦ might mean as subject of the above sentence. Let us try the meanings used by the different translations. We recall that the LXX did not directly translate it, and so we look to the Vul. In the Vul. ܐܠܦ was translated: "chief man", and if we apply that to our sentence as it stands above we have the following: "A chief man shall not defile himself among his people".

The Syriac translation had "man". How does this fit? "A man shall not defile himself among his people".

The two usages just quoted are perhaps the best of all the translations, and we shall not record our consideration of the others.

If we go through the list of applicable meanings which we have thus far established, namely, "owner", "husband", "man", "master", and "lord", we find no translation which could be more appropriate than the two gotten from the Peshitto and the Vul., namely "man", and "chief man", which could perhaps be practically identified with "lord".

Now, however, let us look to the context to see just how this sentence fits into the thought of the chapter. Verse one tells us that Moses is here speaking to the sons of Aaron, the priests. He says they should not defile themselves for the life (i. e. loss of

1. ܐܠܦ

life) of any of their people, except for their nearest blood relations, and then he mentions mother, father, son, daughter, brother, or an unmarried sister as such for whom they might defile themselves. Thereupon follows the verse we are treating and are planning to translate thus: "A man (or "chief man") shall not defile himself among his people to profane himself." Either of the translations, namely "man", or "chief man", would fit into the context very well. We certainly will not condemn the Vul. for employing "chief man" (princeps), nor the K. J. V. for using the same (marginal reading), for, as has been shown above, עַלְוִי is used in other places to mean "lord" or "chief man", which can often be taken to mean the same thing. However, it would seem that "man" might here be a better translation, for the following reasons. 1. The priests and the chief men were not quite the same, i. e., not all the chief men were priests, and so it is more probable that here an indefinite, more loose expression should have been intended by the author. 2. These words are spoken to the sons of Aaron, and it is more natural that the expression: "A man shall not . . .", than the expression: "A chief man shall not . . .", should be used.

Let it be rightly understood before we go on, that either "man" or "chief man" might be employed to translate עַלְוִי in Leviticus 21, 4, but to us it would seem that "man" is the better. We would translate the Hebrew phrase quoted above thus: "A man shall not defile himself among his people to profane himself".

2. NUMBERS 21, 28.

A very interesting passage to treat is Numbers 21, 28. On this passage we hope to make a quite definite improvement as regards its translation.

The pertinent Hebrew words taken from this passage are: עֲמֻדֹת אֲרֹנוֹן $\text{וְגִבּוֹרֵי אֲרֹנוֹן}$. For these Hebrew terms the LXX gives: $\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\varsigma \text{ Ἀρῶν}$ (pillars of Arnon). The Vul. translates them: "habitatores excelsorum Arnon" (the inhabitants of the heights of Arnon).

The K. J. V. has: "the Lords of Arnon". The American Revised version, which we consulted in this case has: "heights of Arnon". The Am. T. has practically the same translation. The Ger. has: "die Bürger (citizens) der Höhe Arnon".

We now have the following list of translations: "pillars of Arnon", "inhabitants of the heights of Arnon", and "lords of Arnon". Which is the most accurate, or can we improve upon all of them?

Let us deal with the LXX first of all. It translates עֲמֻדֹת with the word $\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$, which means a pillar, block, or slab.¹ However, we know no such meaning for גִּבּוֹרֵי . It may be that by saying "pillars of Arnon", the "lords of Arnon" are meant, or the pillars, or great men on whose shoulders the obligations of state rested. If this is the case we have the same meaning here as the K. J. V. has, and it will be dealt with later on. But if actual pillars of stone are meant by $\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$ this is a unique rendering, and we must resort

1. Cf. Liddell-Scott. Greek-English Lexicon, 8th ed., p. 1429, see $\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\lambda\eta$.

to our usual speculation, as to whether the LXX was translated from a different Hebrew text than we possess in the M. T. or the translator made a mistake in translating, or the Greek text has been altered. It is not of much benefit to speculate over such matters, however, for the fact remains that we simply do not know why the LXX translates as it does. We know that the M. T., which reads: $\text{יְהוֹדוּ אֲרִיִּלִּים אֲרִיִּלִּים}$, is best rendered not as the LXX renders it, for in the list of meanings for אֲרִיִּלִּים that we possess from the study of the M. T. and of cognate languages, we find nothing that would resemble the rendition, "pillars".

If we look into the Vul. we find a meaning which is a very probable one. It renders the words in question thus: "inhabitants of the heights of Arnon". In order to arrive at the translation "inhabitants" for אֲרִיִּלִּים , the translator of the Vul. apparently understood the literal rendering of the Hebrew to be: "men of the heights of Arnon". The translation of אֲרִיִּלִּים as "man" or in the plural "men" has been established above, and therefore this is a possible, and as we shall see, a very probable translation.

Translating $\text{יְהוֹדוּ אֲרִיִּלִּים אֲרִיִּלִּים}$ with "Lords of Arnon", seems also to be legitimate, and perchance very good. The meaning "lord" has been established above, and gives very good sense in this connection.

A rendition, however, such as is offered by the American Revised version and by the Am. T., namely: "heights of Arnon", seems to avoid, or entirely disregard the word אֲרִיִּלִּים , for "heights

of Arnon" is a translation, it would seem, of simply ܐܘܢܘܢ ܐܘܪܘܢܐ . But dare we eliminate ܐܘܢܘܢ in this connection? It is a part of the M. T. today, and was probably contained in the Hebrew text used by the translator of the Vul., and most probably in the text from which the LXX was taken, and undoubtedly in that form which the Syriac version was taken, for it has a definite term with which it translates ܐܘܢܘܢ , as we shall show later.

Upon studying the context, we find that the two meanings for ܐܘܢܘܢ , which can best be used here are "lords" or "inhabitants" (i. e. "men"). However, we do not believe that the context can help us to decide which of the two is the better, for one fits as well as the other. The "flame from the city of Sihon"¹ could consume the "lords" quite as easily as the "inhabitants" of the high places of Arnon.

But let us not overlook the fact that we have yet another very excellent source which we might consult for an opinion. It is the Peshitto, the Syriac version of the Bible. The Peshitto has for ܐܘܢܘܢ a word which means "cultivator", or "peasant". -- This gives us a very definite clue, for the translator of the Syriac version could hardly have conceived of the $\text{ܐܘܢܘܢ ܐܘܪܘܢܐ ܐܘܢܘܢ}$ as being Lords if the word he used to convey the meaning of ܐܘܢܘܢ were "peasant". It would not be illogical to assume that these peasants were inhabitants, but we cannot conceive of the "lords of the heights of Arnon" being called: "peasants of the heights of Arnon".

1. We quote the Am. T.

Our conclusion is, that זרן here is best translated "men", or "inhabitants". In this we are supported by the Vul., but by none of the other versions. The Ger., indeed, comes close, but it says "Bürger" (citizens) instead of, as we should prefer: "Einwohner (Inhabitants) der Höhe Arnons". For the Am. T., however, we have a suggestion to make, namely that there be inserted into its rendering the word "inhabitants". It would then read: "the inhabitants of the heights of the Arnon", instead of: "the heights of the Arnon", as it now stands.

3. II SAMUEL 1, 6.

Another interesting problem is found in II Samuel 1, 6. The following Hebrew phrase in this verse is the one we shall deal with specifically: $\text{וַיִּרְדּוּ אַחֲרָיו הַכּוֹשֵׁטִים וְהַמִּצְרִיִּם וְהַיִּזְרְעֵלִים וְהַיִּזְרְעֵלִים וְהַיִּזְרְעֵלִים$
 In the LXX we find the quoted phrase translated as follows: $\text{καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔδ' ἄεματα καὶ οἱ ἰππάρχει συνῆσαν αὐτῷ}$
 ("and, behold, the chariots and captains of horse pressed hard upon him"). The Vul. has: "porro currus et equites appropinquabant ei" (At a distance the chariots and the cavalry bore down upon him).

Turning to the K.J.V. we find: "and lo, the chariots and horsemen followed hard after him". The Am.T. has: "and at the same time the chariotry and the leaders of the horsemen were sweeping toward him". The Ger. reads thus: "und die Wagen und Reiter jagten hinter ihm her".

The problem lies in the translation of the Hebrew words, $\square' \omega \gamma \delta \zeta \eta \theta \iota \kappa \lambda \mu$. Shall they be translated "men of horses", i.e. "cavalry", as the Vul., the K.J.V. and the Ger. understand them, or shall they be translated "lords of the horsemen", i.e. "leaders of the horsemen", as the LXX and the Am.T. render them? The word $\square' \omega \gamma \delta \zeta \eta \theta \iota \kappa \lambda \mu$ can mean either "horsemen" or "horses",¹ but the most common meaning of the two seems to be the former.

But let us look at the context to see whether there might not be some clue as to which rendering would be better. The narrative preceding and following verse 6 deals with the account given to David by a messenger of the death of Saul in battle. The narrator pictures Saul as looking about on the battle field and seeing the chariots of the enemy and also the cavalry coming toward him. It is immaterial whether we translate $\square' \omega \gamma \delta \zeta \eta \theta \iota \kappa \lambda \mu$ as "men of horses", or as "captains of the horsemen", for in the first case it merely means that the cavalry was approaching, and in the second it means that the leaders of several sections of cavalry were approaching, naturally at the head of their respective divisions of riders. As far as the meaning is concerned there is no difference. It is purely a matter of choice as to which words are most apt to convey the correct idea to a reader who has no knowledge of the Hebrew language.

We are inclined to lean toward the translation "men of horses" for two reasons. The first is that $\rho \sigma \tau \upsilon \zeta$ can often be very well

1. Cf. G.M.L. P. 832

reproduced in English by the translation "men", and is, therefore, perhaps the natural word to be taken here. The second reason is this, that to a reader who had no knowledge of the Hebrew, the translation, "captains of the horsemen", would entail the necessity of the reader's picturing the captains as riding at the head of their cavalry divisions. Thus the simpler and more direct expression would be a mere statement of the obvious meaning of the words of the M.T.

We would, however, not condemn the translation of anyone who is of the opinion that here the author actually meant to say that the "captains of the horsemen" were coming, for that would produce virtually the same picture in the reader's mind. But it would seem to us that, for the reasons mentioned above, it would be better to translate "men of horses", which in good idiomatic English would be reduced to one single word, namely, "cavalry".

The entire Hebrew phrase which was quoted at the beginning would then be translated by us as follows: "and behold, the chariotry and the cavalry were sweeping toward him".

4. ECCLESIASTES 12,11

The next problem we shall treat is found in Ecclesiastes 12,11.

The Hebrew words are these: דְּבַר יִקְרְאִים כְּתָבוֹנוֹהַ וּלְעֲרוֹהַ נִסְוֵאִים עַל־מַלְאָכָה

וְהָיָה כִּי יִקְרְאוּ אֵלֶיךָ וְעָלְתָה אֵלֶיךָ וְעָלְתָה אֵלֶיךָ . The translation of the LXX reads thus: λόγους σοφῶν ὡς βούκηντες, καὶ ὡς ἄγγελοι τετυτυμένοι,

οἱ παρὰ τῶν σοφιστῶν ἐδοῦσαν ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνός
 ("The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails firmly fastened,
 which have been given from one shepherd by agreement.") The Vul.
 reads thus: "Verba sapientium ... quae per magistrorum consilium
 data sunt a pastore uno " (The words of the wise ... which were
 given by one shepherd through the counsel of chief men). Who this
 counsel might be we do not know, but it was perhaps composed of
 chief educators. If we are interpreting the Vul. correctly it
 indicates that these words were collected and given out by a
 single man as a result, it would seem, of the action taken by an
 assembly of chief men.

Before we go any further it might be well to take into con-
 sideration the translations in use today, and looking first to the
 K.J.V. we find the following: "The words of the wise are as goads,
 and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are
 given from one shepherd". We note that $\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon$ is translated
 "masters", which is, as we have determined above, a permissible
 translation. However, we might ask: "Is it the best translation?"

Next we might look at the Am.T. It reads: "The words of the
 wise are like goads; but collections which are given by one teacher
 are like nails driven with a sledge". The Am.T. seemingly omits
 the $\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon$ and makes $\eta\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon$ the subject of the second
 clause in the verse. This does not seem to be permissible, for it
 would seem that $\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon$ must add some element to the word to

which it is connected in a construct relation. If we then are interpreting the procedure of the Am.T. correctly, we do not approve of the translation it offers.

We have not yet cited the German version. It reads as follows:

"Diese Worte der Weisen sind Spiesze und NÄgel, geschrieben durch die Meister der Versammlungen, und von Einem Hirten gegeben".

This too translates עֲזָרָה with "masters" (Meister).

It might be well now to sum up our various translations of the expressions עֲזָרָה עֲזָרָה in this passage.

The LXX renders: ---- by agreement

The Vul. renders: counsel of chief men

The K.J.V. renders: masters of assemblies

The Am.T. renders: ---- collections

The Ger. renders: masters of the assemblies.

But which shall we choose as being the best translation? Or is there perhaps some other way of translating this passage to give a new meaning to the triliteral root עֲזָרָה? A new meaning is perhaps unnecessary, for it seems to be quite certain that the phrase,

עֲזָרָה עֲזָרָה, means basically: "men of assemblies", or as the G.H.L.¹ puts it: "members of learned assemblies". And

especially is there little difficulty when we translate in the following way. We would suggest that the passage be interpreted not entirely the way the Am.T. has treated it, yet following its lead in making the "ו" (vav) attached to עֲזָרָה עֲזָרָה(ו) not "and", but

"but". Then by supplying 'ררר before וְיִשְׁלַח 'לְעַמּוּל, or rather bringing the thought down from the first 'ררר to this place, we have a translation which reads as follows: "Words of wise men are like goads, but like driven-in nails are the words of members of learned assemblies given out by one shepherd (or teacher). What, now, is the translation which seems most commendable for 'לְעַמּוּל in this passage? It would seem that "men," is the best rendering possible, but, of course, for this particular situation "members", as the G.H.L. suggests, might be the more idiomatic English rendering. The basic thought, however, behind the root לְעַמּוּל is "men", and a very literal translation, it would seem, would have to render 'לְעַמּוּל "men of assemblies".

5. JEREMIAH 31,31.

Another problem which we might consider is found in Jeremiah 31,31. Here the M.T. has: וְיִשְׁלַח 'לְעַמּוּל, which the LXX renders: καὶ ἐγὼ ἠμείλιχσα αὐτοῦν (and I disregarded them). The Vul. reads: "et ego dominatus sum eorum" (and I have ruled over them).

The K.J.V. has: although I was an husband unto them"; and the Am.T. has: "so that I had to reject them". The Ger. reads thus: "und ich sie zwingen muszte." A glance will tell us that nearly all versions cited above differ from each other.

If we consult the G.H.L. we find the following given for וְיִשְׁלַח 'לְעַמּוּל:

𐤆𐤍𐤊 in this verse: "be lord (husband)".¹ Applying the suggestion of the lexicon we translate this passage thus: "and I was their lord". This, we notice, is about the idea expressed by the Vul. when it says: "dominatus sum eorum". The K.J.V. is not far from this, in rendering: "I was an husband unto them".

On the other hand the rendering of the LXX seems to be supported by the Am.T., the former reading: "and I disregarded them", and the latter: "so that I had to reject them." At any rate, the Peshitto follows the translation of the LXX², and St. Paul employs it in Hebrews 8,9. It would seem then that there is good ground for translating as the LXX, the Syriac version, and the Am.T. do, and so we turn to the reasons why they translated thus. The probable reason for translating thus is given very well by the "New Century Bible". In speaking of the translation: "I was an husband (or lord) over them", it remarks:

"This does not yield a good sense here, and some have wished to give the word the meaning 'to loathe', 'to reject'. This is philologically dubious, but the sense is that required, and a very slight alteration in the Hebrew (*ga'asti* for *baasti*) proposed by Giesebrecht gives it".³

If, however, we were to accept the proposed emendation, we would be removing this passage from the scope of this thesis, for we

1. G.H.L. P. 127

2. Cf. Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown P. 539. A Commentary Critical and Explanatory of the Old and New Testaments P. 539

3. "The New-Century Bible" -- "Jeremiah and Lamentations" Vol.II P. 105

are treating זָנַד , and if we were to substitute זָנַל in the M.T., it would be out of place to consider it here. To all who prefer this correction, on the basis of its fitting into the context much better we would say nothing, for that may be a good view to hold, but the fact remains that we have in the present M.T. not זָנַל but זָנַד , and, if at all possible, we must translate the text as it stands.

Retaining the זָנַד , what could we say as regards a translation for the passage in hand? Obviously זָנַד is here used as a verb, and we have established two meanings for זָנַד as a verb, namely "marry" and "be lord". Which of the two is the better translation here? Nearly all commentators agree that "I was lord over them" is better than "I was a husband unto them", and in following this translation we are following the rendition of the Vul. Let us then temporarily adopt the translation: "I was lord over them".

But does this translation fit unto the context? We can say that it does, though it would seem to be a bit more unnatural than the LXX rendering. The words preceding the statement to the passage under discussion are: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they broke...,"¹

1. We quote the K.J.V.

and here the phrase being treated fits in, the phrase we have determined to translate: "and (although) I² was lord over them".

CHAPTER IV

REMARKS ON THE TRANSLATION

Let us now consider the passage that has given us particular difficulty...

The first of these passages is Proverbs 15, 2, where we find...

It will be necessary to give the other versions besides the English...

... "He who is...".

...

...

...

-
1. We quote the K.J.V.
 2. The "I", it would seem, should be emphasized, for the Hebrew 'אני' is used for emphasis very often, and in this case it stands at the beginning of the phrase to which it belongs, placing it in an emphatic position.

This version also reads...

It is our opinion that the Am. T. represents the sense of the original very well, or at least better than the K. J. V. The latter, the last part of the verse should be translated: "He is to a man, (who is) a great waster." For by it then we

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION OF PREFERABLE RENDERINGS

A. A PREFERABLE RENDERING FOR אִי־אָמֵן לְמַדָּע (Proverbs 18, 9).

Let us now consider some few passages that have no particular difficulty connected with them, but which might in our opinion, be rendered a bit differently in order to make them a more accurate reproduction of the Hebrew.

The first of these passages in Proverbs 18, 9, where we find these words in the M. T.: אִי־אָמֵן לְמַדָּע וְאִי־אָמֵן לְמַדָּע וְאִי־אָמֵן לְמַדָּע

of the meaning, and without giving up good, idiomatic English? Our

It will be unnecessary to quote the other versions besides the English ones, for the meaning of לְמַדָּע is here not in question. It has always been taken as "man", and that, indeed, does seem quite definitely to be the basic meaning. We are here concerned merely with the best possible rendering of לְמַדָּע in the passage before us.

Let us turn to the K. J. V. to see how it translates our verse. It has: "He who is slothful in his work is brother to him that is a great waster." We notice that לְמַדָּע is reduced to a pronoun, and translated "to him", instead of, as it literally should be, "to a man". The Am. T. renders the verse thus:

"He who is slack at his work
Is brother to him who destroys."

This version also renders לְמַדָּע with "to him".

It is our opinion that the Am. T. reproduces the sense of the original very well, or at least better than the K. J. V., for literally, the last part of the verse should be translated: "brother (is) he to a man, (who is) a causer of ruin".¹ Far be it from us to say the Am. T. translates incorrectly, but it seems to us that it does not translate עֲרֹךְ in the best possible way. We should like to suggest a way of translating which does not only reproduce the sense of the original quite as well as the rendition of the Am. T., but which reproduces the very words, and that in good, idiomatic English. We suggest the translation: "A brother is he to a man who destroys." In meaning there is certainly no difference between the Am. T. rendering and the suggested one, but shall we not seek to translate literally, if it can be done without losing any element of the meaning, and without giving up good, idiomatic English? Our suggestion, therefore is, that Prov. 18,9 be translated thus in English:

"He who is slack at his work
Is brother to a man who destroys."

B. A PREFERABLE RENDERING FOR עֲרֹךְ (Judges 9, 51),
AND PARALLEL CONSTRUCTIONS.

Another translation that might be improved upon is that of passages in which עֲרֹךְ is used to designate the inhabitants of a

1. The *Hiphil* Participle, עֹרֵךְ has a causative meaning. It is to be translated: "One who causes ruin", i. e. "a destroyer".

city. The Am. T. has employed the word, "citizen" in its rendering of such passages, but it would seem that "inhabitants" would be a more fitting term.

In the ninth chapter of Judges there are many passages we could treat in detail, but the one best suited to portray the appropriateness of our suggestion is verse 51. It reads thus in the Am. T.:

But there was a strong tower inside the city,
and thither fled all the men and women, all
the citizens of the city, and shut themselves
in, and went up on the roof of the tower.

The words translated, "all the citizens of the city," read thus in the M. T.: $\text{כָּל־אֲנָשֵׁי־עָרֵי־הַבְּרָאָה}$.

The LXX omits these words, apparently deeming them unnecessary. The Vul., however, translates them thus: "et omnes principes civitatis" (and all the chief men of the state). The German has: "und alle Bürger der Stadt." The translation of the Am. T. has been given above.

The rendering of the Vul. is interesting. It translates כָּל־אֲנָשֵׁי with "chief men", which can be understood to mean the same as the English word "lord", which is a permissible rendering, as we have determined above (Chapter II). But, it would seem, that other passages, in which the same construction occurs, would have to be taken into consideration here. Such passages are,

for example, Joshua 24, 11, Judges 20, 5, Judges 9, 2. 46. 47, and I Samuel 23, 11. 12. In all of these the Vul. does not translate רָאשֵׁי אֲדָמָה with "principes" (chief men), but uses another expression, usually "viri". In view of the inconsistency of the Vul. in that it translates "chief men" in Judges 9, 51, and everywhere else, where the same construction occurs, translates differently, we shall pay little attention to the Latin rendition.

The K. J. V. translates rather indefinitely: "all they" but the German and the Am. T. have a definite term for רָאשֵׁי אֲדָמָה , namely "citizen". Let us investigate this rendering more fully.

"Citizen" in our day is generally used in contradistinction to "non-citizen" or "alien". Indeed, the word may have the meaning: "An inhabitant of a city or town, esp. one who enjoys^{its} freedom and privileges as freeman or burgess,"¹ but this is not the way it is commonly used, and besides, according to the above definition, a citizen is virtually an inhabitant. Of course, especially the freemen are meant in this conception of the word "citizen", but the non-freemen, the non-citizens (in the political sense), are also included. Instead of saying "citizen" would it then not be more direct and less ambiguous to use the word "inhabitant"? But even though "citizen" is occasionally used in the sense indicated above, the most common meaning is the following one:

A member of a state; a person, native or naturalized, of either sex, who owes allegiance to a government, and is entitled

¹Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language second edition, unabridged. P. 491 see "citizen."

to reciprocal protection from it;---opposed to alien.¹

In the passage with which we are dealing the meaning is certainly not that all the citizens went into the tower, and the slaves and aliens did not, for the text itself tells us that "all the men and women fled there." It would be far-fetched to assume that the slaves and aliens were not included in the group who sought refuge in the tower. Yes, it seems quite obvious that the expression, אֲנָשִׁים וְאִשָּׁוּת, since it follows immediately upon the words "all the men and the women," intends to make a sweeping statement that all the inhabitants, great and small, fled to the tower.

Let it not be misunderstood that we are condemning a translation such as that of the Am. T., i.e. "citizen",² but we hold that it can be improved upon. It would seem to us that the word "inhabitants" would be a far more appropriate term, for that is what the Hebrew writer seems to have had in mind when he wrote the verse which we are discussing.

It might be asked, however, why we cannot allow the literal translation of the Hebrew, namely "men" for אֲנָשִׁים, to stand as a rendering. This might be done in some of the other passages where the same Hebrew construction is employed, but in this particular passage it does not work out so well, for the following reason.

The words which precede those we are treating are: "all the

¹Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language

²second edition, unabridged. P. 491 see "citizen."
The American Revised Version also has "citizen".

men and all the women". For "men" the Hebrew word $\omega'p$ is used. But the word used in the following expression $\gamma'x'z'z'z'$, is not $\omega'p$, but a form of the trilateral root $z'z'z'$. Since the author used different terms it is natural to assume that he might have meant to express different concepts. Yes, it would seem that he intended to make $z'z'z'$ a more inclusive term than $\omega'p$, for first he says, "all the men and women", and then, as if to make a sweeping statement, he says, "all the $\gamma'x'z'z'z'$ of the city". Therefore, we shall translate $z'z'z'$ as "man" in the broad sense, i. e., man in general, including men, women, and children. If we apply this broad sense of "man" to the passage before us, we are virtually translating "all the inhabitants of the city", for to say "all the men of the city", meaning by "men" all who come under the category of mankind, is identical, for all practical purposes, with saying: "all the inhabitants of the city".

This is not an unusual translation, for the G. H. L.¹ lists this meaning for $z'z'z'$, and the "International Critical Commentary"² prefers it. It is also used by Cowley in the translation of Aramaic papyri. We shall quote an instance:

$\gamma'x'z'z'z'$ $z'z'z'$ "all the inhabitants of Yeb."³

We may conclude then that $\gamma'x'z'z'z'$ is best translated "inhabitants" in Judges 9, 51.

There are, however, other places, in which the Am. T. renders the identical construction "citizens of ----", instead of, as we should prefer, "inhabitants of ----". Passages where this occurs

¹G. H. L. p. 127

²Moore, G. F., Judges p. 241, 264, 267

³Cowley, A. Aramaic Papyri of

are the following: Judges 9, 2. 3. 6. 7. 18. 20. 23. 24. 25. 26. 39. 46. 47.; Joshua 24, 11; Judges 20, 5; 1 Samuel 23, 11. 12.

In some of the above mentioned passages one might employ the translation "men", as for example, in Judges 20, 5. In this passage, the context seems to indicate that there were no women present in the group designated as "men" ('אָנָד) of Gibeah, but that there were literally only "men" present. However, we are not certain of this, and therefore it is perhaps better to use a wider term such as "inhabitants". It also makes for uniformity if we translate all passages having the same Hebrew construction in the same way whenever this is possible.

We should suggest, then, that in the above mentioned passages instead of "citizens" or "men", or other translations, "inhabitants" be used. Thus also in the Ger. we would have "Einwohner", rather than "Bürger".

The experience and knowledge gained by us in the preparation of this thesis has been manifold, and is to thank many people except for our efforts, but it is hoped that the suggestions we have made in regard to the improvement of the present English version of the Old Testament will bear fruit in the future, and that a more exact English translation of the Old Testament is the future.

In writing up this thesis we have been helped by the following persons: Dr. H. G. L. O. ... of the ... we can not thank ... established. The ...

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

We have examined critically all the instances of the occurrence of $\Sigma\mu\eta$ in the M. T., and have given, what to our mind, was the best translation of each particular passage. We do not claim to have settled all the problems treated definitely for all future generations, but we realize fully that another person might even today disagree with us, and that in the future there is certainly the likelihood that more evidence will accumulate which may corroborate or alter the renderings which we have in this thesis given preference.

The experience and knowledge gained by us in the preparation of this thesis has been manifold, and is in itself a sufficient reward for our efforts, but it is hoped that the suggestions we have made in regard to the improvement of the most modern English version of the Old Testament will bear fruit by helping to create a more exact English translation of the Old Testament in the future.

In summing up the accomplishments of the foregoing chapters, we can say that certain definite usages of $\Sigma\mu\eta$ in the M. T. were established. The usages which were set down are the following:

A. As verb

1. To "marry"
2. To "be lord"

B. As noun

1. God
2. Nomen
3. Owner
4. Master - Mistress
5. Husband - Wife
6. Lord
7. Man
8. In Proper Names

We found, however, that there were a number of passages in which some difficulty attached itself to the rendering of לַדָּבָר in to English. These were given careful consideration, the important arguments briefly discussed, and the renderings preferred recorded for each individual passage. Of the eleven problematical passages treated we found that in five of them we were able to uphold the rendering of the Am. T. In six cases, however, we preferred a translation which differed from that of the Am. T. in some respects. We shall list these passages, showing both the rendering of the Am. T. and the one we preferred.

Leviticus 21, 4

Am. T.

Preferred rendering

...he must not defile
himself for those re-
lated by marriage by
profaning himself.

A man shall not defile himself
among his people to profane
himself.

Numbers 21, 28

...the heights of the
Arnon.

The inhabitants of the heights
of Arnon.

II Samuel 1, 6

...and at the same time
the chariotry and the
leaders of the horsemen
were sweeping toward him.

and at the same time the chariotry
and the cavalry were sweeping
toward him.

Ecclesiastes 12, 11

The words of the wise are
like goads; but collec-
tions which are given by
one teacher are like nails
driven with a sledge.

The words of the wise are like
goads; but like driven-in nails
are the words of members of learned
assemblies given out by one teacher.

Jeremiah 31, 31

...that covenant of mine
which they broke, so that
I had to reject them.

...that covenant of mine which
they broke, and I was lord over
them.

There were certain passages in which there was no difficulty connected with the meaning of עֲמֵל , but where we thought that there could be some change made in the English equivalent for עֲמֵל used, in order to make the English rendering a more exact reproduction of the Hebrew. We preferred to render Proverbs 18, 9 as follows:

He who is slack at his work
Is brother to a man who destroys.

rather than as the Am. T. has it:

He who is slack at his work
Is brother to him who destroys.

In many passages we preferred the rendering, "inhabitants", for יֹשְׁבֵי , in preference to the rendition of the Am. T., "citizens".

In the ninth chapter of Judges there are 15 passages in which this alteration might be made, and besides these there are also Joshua 24, 11; Judges 20, 5; I Samuel 23, 11, 12, where the same suggestion applies.

Bibliography

TEXTS

- (Ger.) Die Bibel Herausgegeben von der Amerikanischen
Bibelgesellschaft. New York, 1894
- (K. J. V.) Holy Bible (King James Version) Concordia Pub-
lishing House, St. Louis, Mo.
- Holy Bible (King James Version newly edited by the
American Revision Committee, 1901)
Thomas Nelson & Sons, 381-385 Fourth
Avenue, New York
- (M. T.) Massoretic Text of the Hebrew Old Testament
Preussische Druckerei, Berlin, 1931
- (LXX) Septuagint Version of the Old Testament with an English
Translation
Samuel Bagster & Sons, 15 Paternoster Row,
London, 1879
- (Am. T.) The Bible, An American Translation
Smith, J. M. F., editor of Old Testament
Goodspeed, E. J., editor of New Testament
Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1931
- The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint
Henry Barclay Swete, Cambridge, 1909
- (Vul.) Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis Sixti V
FRANCOFURTI AD MOENUM
TYPUS ET SUMTIBUS ANDRAE, 1826

COMMENTARIES, DICTIONARIES, ENCYCLOPEDIAS

- Andrews, E. A. (Editor) Harper's Latin Dictionary
Revised by C. T. Lewis and Chas. Short, American Book Co.
New York
- Davidson, B. The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon
Samuel Bagster and Sons, London
- Fallows, Samuel; Zenos, Andrew G.; Willett, Herbert L. (Editors)
The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia and Scriptural
Dictionary, The Harvard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1908
- Feyerabend, K. Fonolexica Langenscheidt Hebrew English Lexicon
4TH edition, Schoenberg, Berlin
- Gesenius, W. Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon
Translator: Edward Robinson, Editor: Francis Brown
Brown, Driver, Briggs revised
Houghton Mifflin Co. New York, 1907
- Gore, C.; Goudge, H. L.; Guillaume, A.
A New Commentary on Holy Scripture
Macmillan Co., New York, 1928
- International Critical Commentary
Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York
- Genesis, Skinner, J. 1910
Numbers, Gray, G. B. 1903
Deuteronomy, Driver, S. R. 1902
Samuel, Smith, H. P. 1902
Ezra-Nehemiah, Batten, L. W. 1913
Job I, Driver, S. R. & Gray, G. B.
Psalms I, Briggs, C. A. & Briggs, E. G. 1906
Psalms II, Briggs, C. A. 1907
Proverbs, Toy, C. H. 1902
Isaiah I, Gray G. B. 1912
Amos-Hosea, Harper, W. R. 1905
Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Smith, J. M. P. Ward. W. H.; Habakkuk,
Obadiah, Joel, Bewer, J. A.
Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Jonah, Mitchell, H. G., Smith, J. M. P.
Bewer, J. A. 1912
- Jamieson, R.; Fausset, A. R.; Brown, D. A Commentary, Critical and
Explanatory on the old and new Testament
S. S. Scranton & Co., Hartford

Liddell and Scott Greek-English Lexicon 8th Edition, Revised
throughout, American Book Co., Chicago, 1897

Muret-Sanders (Editors) Muret-Sanders German Dictionary
Berlin-Schoenberg, Berlin, 1900

New Century Bible

Oxford University Press, New York (American branch)

Genesis, Bennett, W. H.

Exodus, Bennett, W. H.

Leviticus and Numbers, Kennedy, A. R. S.

Deuteronomy and Joshua, Robinson, H. W.

I & II Samuel, Kennedy, A. R. S.

I & II Kings, Skinner, J.

Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Davies, T. W.

Job, Peake, A. S.

Psalms I, Davidson, W. T.

Psalms II, Davies, T. W.

Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Martin, G. C.

Isaiah I & II, Whitehouse, O. C.

Jeremiah, Peake, A. S.

Jeremiah II and Lamentations, Peake, A. S.

Daniel, Charles, R. H.

Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Horton, C. F.

Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi,

Driver, Canon

Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language
2nd Edition, unabridged, 1934

Young, R. Analytical Concordance to the Bible
I. K. Funk & Co. New York, 1897

BOOKS

- Brokelmann, Carl, Syrische Grammatik, Reuthel and Reichard, Berlin, 1925
- Cooke, G. A., North-Semitic Inscriptions, Clarendon Press, London, England, 1903
- Cowley, A., Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C., Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, 1923
- Creelman, H., An Introduction to the Old Testament, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1917
- Fowler, Henry Thatcher, Origins and Growth of the Hebrew Religion, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1916
- Frazer, James G., Golden Bough, Macmillan and Co., London, 1922
- Kent, C. F., Israel's Historical and Biographical Narratives, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1905
- Oesterley, W. O. E. and Robinson, T. H., Hebrew Religion, Macmillan Co., New York, 1930
- Peters, J. P., Religion of the Hebrews, Ginn and Co., Boston, London, 1914
- Smith, W. Robertson, The Religion of the Semites, Adam and Charles Black, London, 1894
- Ungnad, Arthur, Syrische Grammatik, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Oskar Beck, 1913
- Wallis, Louis, God and the Social Process, Chicago, 1935, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Wardle, W. Lansdell, Israel and Babylon, Fleming H. Revell, London and Edinburgh, 1925

ARTICLES

- Meek, T. J., Some Religious Origins of the Hebrews, "American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures", vol. 37 (Jan. 1921) p. 101ff.
- Waterman, Leroy, Bull-Worship in Israel, "American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures", vol. 31 (July, 1915) p. 229ff.

GRAPHICAL SURVEY OF THESIS

| | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Passages treated -- | 209 |
| "God" -- | 74 |
| Proper Names -- | 32 |
| "Man" -- | 30 |
| "Owner" -- | 25 |
| "Husband" -- | 14 |
| Nomen -- | 14 |
| "Master" -- | 3 |
| To "Marry" -- | 3 |
| "Mistress" -- | 2 |
| "Wife" -- | 2 |
| "Lord" -- | 1 |
| To "be Lord" -- | 1 |
| Problematical -- | 11 |
| Am. T. Upheld -- | 6 |
| Am. T. not upheld -- | 5 |
| Preferable Renderings -- | 19 |

| | | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------|-----------|
| I Chronicles | Psalms | Isaiah | Hosea |
| 1,49 | 106,28 | 62,4 | 11,2 |
| 1,50 | | 62,5 | 13,1 |
| 4,22 | | | |
| 4,33 | | | |
| 5,5 | Proverbs | | |
| 5,8 | | Jeremiah | Nahum |
| 5,23 | 1,17 | | |
| 8,30 | 1,19 | 28 | 1,2 |
| 9,36 | 3,27 | 2,23 | 3,4 |
| 12,5 | 12,4 | 3,14 | |
| 13,6 | 16,22 | 7,9 | |
| 14,11 | 17,8 | 9,13 | |
| 27,28 | 18,9 | 11,13 | Zephaniah |
| | 22,24 | 11,17 | |
| | 23,2 | 12,16 | 1,4 |
| | 24,8 | 19,5 | |
| II Chronicles | 29,22 | 23,27 | |
| | 30,23 | 31,32 | |
| 8,6 | 31,11 | 32,29 | Malachi |
| 17,3 | 31,23 | 32,35 | |
| 23,17 | 31,28 | 37,13 | 2,11 |
| 24,7 | | 40,14 | |
| 28,2 | | | |
| 33,3 | | | |
| 34,4 | Ecclesiastes | | |
| | | Ezekiel | |
| | 5,10 | | |
| Nehemiah | 5,12 | 25,9 | |
| | 7,12 | | |
| | 8,8 | | |
| 6,18 | 10,11 | | |
| | 10,20 | Daniel | |
| | 12,11 | | |
| | | 8,6 | |
| Esther | | 8,20 | |
| | | | |
| 1,17 | Isaiah | | |
| 1,20 | | Hosea | |
| | 1,3 | | |
| | 16,8 | | |
| Job | 26,13 | 2,10 | |
| | 41,15 | 2,15 | |
| | 50,8 | 2,18 | |
| 31,39 | 54,1 | 2,19 | |
| | 54,5 | 9,10 | |