THE NOTE-LINE

HEBREW SCRIPTURES

THE NOTE-LINE

HEBREW SCRIPTURES

COMMONLY CALLED

PĀSĒQ, OR PĔSÎQ

BY

JAMES KENNEDY, D.D.

ACTING-LIBRARIAN IN NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH

PREFACE.

———◆———

THE following treatise is the result of a special inquiry
subsidiary to more extensive research into the Hebrew
Text of the Old Testament. While examining passages
presenting difficulties in the shape of peculiar words, or
forms hard to explain, the writer observed that 'Pāsēq'
was frequently associated with these phenomena. The
coincidences were so numerous as to suggest the ques-
tion whether the association was intentional, or merely
accidental. Careful examination led to the conclusion
that the line must have been purposely placed beside
these remarkable readings in the Massoretic text. The
important clue thus found proved a valuable guide
in further investigation. But at every step the field
widened, and it then became necessary to form new
categories under which different occurrences of 'Pāsēq'
could fitly be placed. In this way, a survey has been
made of the entire Hebrew Scriptures. The conclusions
are now placed before students of the Old Testament as
a contribution towards a better understanding of certain
phenomena presented in the Massoretic text.

Among recent writers who have already treated of this sign may be mentioned Julius Olshausen (in his *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache*, § 43), William Wickes (*Treatise on the Accentuation of the Prose Books of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1887, chap. xiv.), E. von Ortenberg (in an essay on 'Paseq und Legarmeh' in Stade's *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1877, p. 301 ff., and in a Programm published in 1887, *Ueber die Bedeutung des Paseq für die Quellenscheidung in den Büchern des Alten Testaments*), F. E. König (in his colossal *Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, part i. p. 122, part ii. p. 358; and in special papers contributed to the *Zeitschrift für kirchl. Wissenschaft* for 1889, pp. 225 ff. and 281 ff.), Felix Perles (*Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments*, München, 1895, p. 30), and F. Prätorius (in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 1899, p. 684). None of these writers, however, take quite the same view of the subject as is presented in the following pages.

The Author's warmest thanks are due to the Publishers for their uniform courtesy in giving effect to his suggestions throughout the preparation of this treatise.

CONTENTS.

I. INTRODUCTION.

II. CLASSIFICATION OF CASES.

III. RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION.

APPENDIX.

THE

NOTE–LINE IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

COMMONLY CALLED

PĀSĒQ, OR PESÎQ.

———◆———

I.

INTRODUCTION.

1. GENERAL ACCOUNT OF THE SIGN.

THE sign currently known by the name of Pāsēq, [1] or
Pesîq, is a perpendicular line, [2] occasionally [3] inserted
between two words [4] in the Hebrew text of the Old
Testament. There may be two or more points, in the
same verse, at which the mark is found [5].

1. The term פָּסֵק signifies 'separating' or 'sepa-
rator,' and פְּסִיק means 'separated.' Both are in-
appropriate designations applied by later Jews * in

---

* The root פסק does not appear in the Scriptures, but belongs to
post-biblical Hebrew.

I

ignorance of the origin and true function of the sign, which, though placed between words, was not always intended to mark a separation.* To correct at once the current but false conceptions regarding the use of the sign, it may for the present suffice to direct attention to 2 Kings 18[14], where the line appears after three consecutive words, which certainly present no special necessity for being separated from the word preceding; and to Josh. 8[33], in which the line appears four times, with no distinctively separative force.†

2. The *length* of the line varies in accordance with the taste of the scribe or editor. In some printed editions, its length equals the height of the consonants, as seen in כֹּה ׀ אָמַר יְהוָֹה, while in other editions it is short and inconspicuous: thus כֹּה ׀ אָמַר יְהוָֹה.

3. On the whole, the sign is not quite common. In an ordinary Hebrew Bible, it may be found only once or twice in some chapters, and not at all in others. Thus, Gen. I (see vv.[5. 10. 21. 27. 29. 30]) exhibits it more frequently than any other chapter in the same book; in chap. 2, it appears thrice (vv.[5. 21. 22]); in chap. 3, it occurs four times (vv.[14. 15. 22] *twice*); in chaps. 4. 5, it does not occur at all; in chap. 7, it appears four times (vv.[2. 21. 23] *twice*); in chap. 8, it is once found (v.[20]); in chaps. 9. 10, it does not appear; in chap. 11, it is found once (v.[4]); and so on. A

---

* See p. 38. The form פְּסִיק (passive participle) is specially objectionable; see Baer's *Hebrew Text of Genesis*, p. 91, footnote. As to the rare conditions under which the line might legitimately be regarded as a separator, see p. 38, footnote.

† It will afterwards be shown that the distinction usually drawn between 'Pāsēq' and 'Legarmeh' rests on no real difference: see p. 17.

full list of the Scripture passages in which it occurs will be given later.* The apparent reasons for its insertion will be fully considered afterwards.†

Considerable variety obtains between one manuscript and another, and between different printed editions of the Hebrew Bible, regarding the insertion of the note-line. Thus, in Ps. 1¹, some copies exhibit it after the first לֹא, while it is absent from others ; in v.², similarly, it sometimes appears after כִּי, but is wanting in other editions; in Ps. 100³ it is sometimes found after וְלֹא, but in other copies it is absent. The probable reason for such variations will be more fully discussed hereafter.‡

4. The *position* of the line, as well as its length, distinguishes it from other perpendicular lines used in the Hebrew text. (*a*) 'Sillûq' is a short perpendicular line placed *under* a consonant and after the vowel in the *last* tone-syllable of every verse in the Hebrew Bible: thus, Gen. 1¹ הָאָרֶץ, v.² הַמָּיִם, v.³ אוֹר.§ (*b*) 'Metheg,' like Sillûq, is a short line placed under a consonant and after a vowel, but this in *any* wòrd within a verse, and there for the purpose of keeping open a *secondary* syllable which might otherwise be regarded as closed by a following sheva, as in חָכְמָה Zech. 9².

5. In Josh. 1, the line appears twice in v.¹¹, and twice in v.¹⁵; in 8³³ it actually occurs four times.

(*a*) The sign is found *twice* in the following verses : — Gen. 3²², Ex. 34⁶, Lev. 10⁶˙ ⁹, Deut. 8¹⁵

---

* See Appendix, p. 117. † See p. 34 ff. ‡ See p. 105 ff.
§ See Kautzsch's edition of Gesenius' *Grammar*, § 15, 3; *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, p. 22, footnote.

16^{16}, Josh. 1^{15} 19^{51}, 1 Sam. 4^{18} 14^{47}, 1 Kings 20^{25}, 2 Kings 7^1, Isa. 6^2 11^{11} 21^2 22^{13} 24^3 37^4 65^{13}, Jer. 21^7 38^4, Ezek. 3^{27} 9^2 33^{25} 34^8 35^{12} 38^8 39^{17} 41^{16} 42^{13}, Ps. 5^5 10^{13} $18^{1, 7, 50}$ 19^5 32^4 44^{24} 66^7 73^{28} 74^2 $89^{9, 50}$ 104^{35} 106^{48} 127^1 131^1 137^7 144^1, Prov. 30^{15}, Job 1^{17} 11^6 16^9 20^{29} 27^{13} 32^6 37^{12} 42^8, Esth. 1^6, Dan. $9^{18, 19}$, Neh. 8^7 13^{15}, 1 Chron. 20^1 21^{12}, 2 Chron. 4^4 19^{10} 35^{21} etc. etc.   See list in the Appendix, p. 117 ff.

Regarding the 'double note-line' (in Num. 32^{33}, Ps. 27^1 84^4, Jer. 29^{32} 44^{26}, Ezek. 33^{11} etc.), see later remarks.*

(b) Passages in which the note-line occurs *thrice* within the same verse are the following:—Gen. 18^{15}, Ex. 20^4 = Deut. 5^8, Josh. 19^{51}, 1 Sam. 17^{25} 18^{10}, 1 Kings 12^{32}, 2 Kings 18^{14}, Isa. 66^{20}, Ezek. 48^{21}, Ps. 10^{14} 84^4 141^4, Prov. 30^4, Ezra 6^9.   In some of these instances, two adjacent pointers may really prove to be a 'double note-line,'* as in 2 Kings 18^{14}, enclosing 'to Lachish.'

(c) The line appears *four times* in Josh. 8^{33}, 1 Chron. 27^1.

Additional remarks will afterwards be made on the repeated insertion of the note-line in one and the same verse.†

2. ORIGIN AND OBJECT OF THE NOTE-LINE.

This sign was introduced long ago by observant and scrupulously careful scribes, who sought to conserve the text of the Hebrew Scriptures as correctly as possible.   By the simple and primitive expedient of inserting this per-

* P. 28.   † P. 8.

pendicular line, *they desired to call attention to a note-worthy reading,* and especially sought thereby to *assure the reader that the text as transmitted to him was what actually lay before them in the earlier manuscript from which they copied*—even though this reading might appear strange, or might justly be suspected as due to a slip previously committed in the course of transcription, and thus requiring correction.

> Abundant illustrations will afterwards be given,* but for the present it may suffice to present the following specimens as types of different categories:—Gen. 22[11], where the repetition of the same word (אַבְרָהָם ׀ אַבְרָהָם) is certified; Deut. 5[4], where concurrence of similar forms (פָּנִים ׀ בְּפָנִים) is marked; Ex. 23[17], where the form of the Divine name (הָאָדֹן ׀ יְהֹוָה) is noted as unusual; Ex. 32[1], where an abnormal construction (זֶה ׀ מֹשֶׁה) occurs; Judg. 1[7], where a questionable reading is noted (שִׁבְעִים ׀ מְלָכִים 'seventy kings,' an astonishingly large number, for which we should rather read 'seven kings'); 1 Sam. 25[34], where a superfluous word (כִּי) is marked; Ps. 33[12], where the omission of the relative (אֲשֶׁר) is noted.

It may now be obvious that the line was mainly intended to serve the general purpose of a *nota bene* addressed to the eye of the reader. The word or words with which it was placed might really form the genuine reading, though peculiar; or they might be of questionable authority; or

they might even be unintelligible, and thus require cor-
rection.   But in no way whatsoever did these reverent
Hebrew scribes give any expression of their opinion beyond
the fact that they deemed the reading remarkable.*   Just
as we are now accustomed to insert [*sic*] at a point in a
quotation which, with this mark, we prefer accurately to
reproduce, and do not venture to correct, though we
are convinced that an error exists,—so did these early
transcribers simply transmit the very reading which
they found in the copy before them, though they had
a strong suspicion that it was faulty.   Actual criticism
and correction of the text, accordingly, did not begin
with the insertion of this line ; but its introduction formed
an important and valuable preparation for later work
by the Massoretes, or mediæval editors of the present
Hebrew text.†   This simple and primitive sign, how-
ever, may now be utilised as a valuable guide in
the search for a better Hebrew text than we now
possess.‡

Such being the original design and use of this sign, the
misleading designation ' Pāsēq,' applied by later scribes
who were ignorant of its origin and purpose, should be
discarded in favour of another that is more appropriate
and correct.   To fix on a neat and fitting substitute is
somewhat difficult ; but if the mark were re-named the
' pointer - line,' or the ' note - line,' or even simply the

---

* Contrast the course followed, later, by the Massoretes in sug-
gesting what they deemed the correct reading (see p. 12).

† See subsequent remarks at p. 11 ff.

‡ For illustrations, see pp. 9 ff., 78 ff., 98 ff.

'pointer,' we should obtain a more correct idea regarding its true character and functions. Accordingly one or another of these more appropriate names will preferentially be used hereafter in this short treatise.

> *Obs.*—The rarity or complete absence of the sign may sometimes * be regarded as indicating a comparatively pure text. Thus, in Ps. 31, containing 24 verses, the line appears six times; in Ps. 32, consisting of 11 verses, it occurs four times; in Ps. 33, with 22 verses, once; and in Ps. 34, consisting of 23 verses, it is not found at all; in Ps. 35, which has 28 verses, it appears five times. Ps. 83, with 19 verses, is free from the mark; in Ps. 119, containing 176 verses, the line occurs only five times, but in every instance it marks a textual difficulty.
>
> Though the passages in these Psalms, marked by the line, are by no means all that require emendation, we may at least draw a fairly correct conclusion regarding the relative purity of the text, in each case, from the presence or absence of the sign.

3. NUMBER OF INSERTIONS IN ONE VERSE.

As regards the frequency with which the line may be found in one and the same verse, the following remarks embody the main facts:—

(*a*) It is only to be expected that the pointer should be placed beside a *single* noteworthy reading in a verse.

* Not always ; see subsequent remarks at p. 105 ff.

Thus, in Gen. 15[13] גֵּר is marked as abnormal, for
we should expect this form, with its accompanying
verb, to be in the plural rather than in the singular;
in Gen. 19[16] וַיִּתְמַהְמָהּ is noted as a remarkable form,
for which וַיִּתְמַהּ should perhaps be substituted; in
Gen. 21[14] בַּבִּקֶר is marked as really superfluous; and
so on.

(*b*) When *more than one* remarkable reading occurs,
the sign should naturally appear with each. This is
actually the case in the following passages, which present
two peculiarities:—

Lev. 10[6] exhibits a double change of construction,
first, in the expression of the 'datives' ('to Aaron,
and to Eleazar and Ithamar'), and then in the pro-
hibitive particles (from אַל to לֹא); in 10[9] attention is
first called to the singular instead of the plural form
of the verb ('drink ye not'), which we should rather
expect, and then to the copulative וְ instead of the
separative אוֹ. In Josh. 20[6] we are invited first to
note וְיָשַׁב and then יָשׁוּב, which, though similar in
form, are carefully to be distinguished. In 2 Sam. 19[7]
attention is directed to two expressions remarkably
similar ('for thou hast declared this day that . . .'
and 'for I know this day that . . .'), found in close
proximity. See also Ps. 19[5], Isa. 11[11], 2 Kings 19[4],
and list in the Appendix, p. 117 ff.

So also the line sometimes appears three times in a few
verses, which contain as many peculiarities.*

(*c*) On the other hand, even with a plurality of remark-
able readings in one and the same verse, the notating

* See the list on p. 14.

scribes frequently contented themselves with inserting a *single* line. This was placed—

Either (1) absolutely at the beginning,* as a general forewarning to expect strange readings further on; †

Or (2) merely with the *first* of several instances, the later being deemed easily discernible by intelligent readers.

> An excellent illustration is Ps. 10[8], showing the line at the opening word, יֹשֵׁב, which must be corrected into יָשֵׁר ; but this is merely the first of several emendations required. Similarly, the line near the beginning of Ps. 22[16] merely marks the first of several alterations necessary before a satisfactory meaning can be educed.‡ Ps. 56[7] affords another example; Nah. 1[12] similarly presents difficulties at nearly every step. See also Zech. 8[17].

(*d*) Of the cases in which *two* lines appear in the same verse, the first, placed near the beginning, sometimes proves to be merely premonitory to the second, which more precisely marks the point on which attention is to be fixed.

> Thus, in Gen. 3[22], the first pointer, placed immediately after the opening word in the verse, merely anticipates the second, whose specific function is to note the obvious anacolouthon,—for, after the introductory 'lest,' we certainly expect the expression of a resolve. But the conclusion is wanting.

---

* After the first word, or combination of words, as will be explained hereafter : see p. 22.

† See illustrations on p. 25 (Section 4).

‡ See the critical commentaries on these passages.

Again, in Deut. 16[16], the first pointer seems need-
less, except as a preparation for the second, which
calls attention to the anthropopathic expression,
'to appear before the Lord.' *

4. EARLY ORIGIN OF THE NOTE-LINE.

It is of the utmost importance to bear in mind that
*the 'note-line' really dates far back in the history of the
Old Testament text,*† where it has long stood as probably
the only mark superadded, at an early stage, to the
original Scriptures in their purely consonantal form.
Accordingly, this simple and most convenient sign must
carefully be distinguished from the marks forming the
elaborate 'Massoretic system,'[1] which were added much
later,[2] being merely superinduced on the then existing
text, in which the 'note-line' had long previously found
a place.   Unfortunately, however, the origin of this
mark had already become so thickly veiled in the mists
of antiquity, and its real purpose so completely misunder-
stood, that later editors,—even before the days of the
Massoretes, — failing to perceive its proper place and
function, gave it an inappropriate and positively mis-
leading name ('Pāsēq,' or 'Pesîq').‡   Moreover, those
who afterwards invented and applied the 'accents' merely
increased the confusion, by taking account of the line,

* Further remarks regarding the repeated insertion of the pointer
in the same verse will be made at a later stage : see p. 106 ff.

† Fuller remarks on the high antiquity of the pointer will be made,
more appropriately, at a later stage : see p. 19.

‡ See the remarks already made on p. 1.

wherever it occurred, as if it were a factor to be considered in applying their system of signs.*

(1) By the ' Massoretic system' proper, we mean the following :—

(a) The frequent marginal note commonly called ' Qěrî ' (see p. 12).

(b) The 'vowel-points,' with which we associate kindred marks, all latterly invented and applied for guiding readers to the correct *pronunciation* of the sacred text.†

(c) The *accents.*‡   Among accents, however, we must *not* include the note-line, though ' Paseq ' is still too frequently regarded as belonging to the accentual system.   For, in fact, the Massoretes were not the first to invent and insert this sign, nor did they give it the name by which it has long been currently known.   *They found it already existing in the text* that had been handed down to them, and bearing the appellation by which they were themselves misled ; and they have, unfortunately, but confirmed the delusion for later readers.   Viewing ' Paseq ' as if it were really a mark occasionally inserted to separate words in a sentence, they adapted their accentual arrangements in accordance with this erroneous idea, as they deemed best in every passage where it occurred.§

(2) The origin and completion of the ' Massoretic system' must be assigned to an uncertain period in

* Strangely, Wickes regards ' Paseq ' as a comparatively late addition, introduced *after* the accents had been applied to the original text ('Treatise on the Prose Accents,' p. 127).

† See p. 14.   ‡ See p. 15.   § See below, p. 17.

the Dark Ages, somewhere between the seventh century and the tenth century of the Christian era. To Jerome, who lived in the fifth century, vowel-points and accents were quite unknown; but when we reach the tenth century, these superadded signs are already in common use.

5. RELATION OF THE LINE TO LATER SIGNS AND MARKS.

The relation of the 'note-line' to the Massoretic marks, properly so called, will be better understood on comparing its true function with the different purposes for which other signs, included in the later system, were introduced. We shall consider—

(1) The 'Kethîb' and the 'Qerî.' The marginal note known as the Qerî (קְרִי, *i.e.* 'read' *) indicates what the later Jewish scribes or editors confidently proposed to substitute, instead of the Kethîb (כְּתִיב, i.e. *written*), which they thereby marked as a faulty reading in the consonants of the traditional text.

> Thus, in Ps. 100³, and Ezra 4², for the Kethîb וְלֹא ('and not'), the Qerî is the similarly sounded וְלוֹ ('and to him'); see also Isa. 9². In Jer. 17¹⁹, for the obviously incorrect עָם, the Qerî is הָעָם ('the people'); in Ezek. 14⁴, for the erroneous Kethîb בָה, the similarly sounded בָא must be read.

Note.—One of the strongest supports of the posi-

---

* Kautzsch is probably right in contending that this form is rather the *imperative* קְרִי than the passive participle.

tion that the pointer-line was really designed to call special attention to noteworthy or suspected readings, but that this design was afterwards forgotten, though the line itself was still inserted in the text by faithful copyists, is presented in the fact that we occasionally find *both* the ancient pointer and a later ' Qerî' note at the same suspected spot. Thus, in Ps. 9²¹, *both* the line and the marginal note call attention to the abnormal form מוֹרָה, which should be מוֹרָא. In Ps. 10⁵, *both* marks are attached to דרכו, which should be דְּרָכָיו. In Prov. 1²⁷, similarly, כְּשֹׁאֲוה is marked by both signs, and must be corrected into כְּשׁוֹאָה. In 1 Sam. 2¹⁶, the reading in the received text is וְאָמַר י לוֹ, but the marginal Qerî gives לֹא for לוֹ; most probably, however, we should rather read וְאָמַר לֹו לֹא (' then he used to say to him, No! '). See also Deut. 28⁵⁷, 2 Sam. 14¹⁹, Ps. 55¹⁶ 84⁴ 100³ (in most editions), Isa. 63⁹, Prov. 3²⁸ 27¹⁰, Job 38¹, Ezra 4², Neh. 2¹³, Esth. 1⁵· ⁶.

Obviously, if the Massoretes had really understood the reason for the presence of the line in the text, they would have felt that there was no need for adding their co-incident Qerî.

(2) The 'Sebîrîn' (סְבִירִין, i.e. *supposed* [correct readings]). The comparatively few cases thus designated are, like the Qerî, suggestions of better readings than those still left in the text uncorrected by those editors who, more confidently, provided us with the notes known as the 'Qerî.' The latter have commonly been regarded as more valuable and important. But there does not appear to be any good reason for making such a distinction. The

Sebîrîn are, rather, *supplementary* corrections of the text
derived from other schools of Massoretes — especially
the Eastern or Babylonian—than those that gave us the
'Qerî.' In fact, some MSS. show that 'Sebîr' and
'Qerî' are used interchangeably.*

Instances of Sebîrîn are found in Num. 32²⁵ and 1 Sam.
16⁴, where, instead of וַיֹּאמֶר, it is reasonably suggested
that the plural form וַיֹּאמְרוּ is more correct; and in 1 Sam.
19¹⁰, where, instead of בַּלַּיְלָה הוּא, we should read בַּלַּיְלָה
הַהוּא. Other cases are found in Ex. 25³⁹ 26³¹ etc. See
also Num. 33⁸, Deut. 4²³⁴ ⁴², Jer. 5².

> *Note.*—Like some cases of Qerî,† the Sebîrîn
> occasionally attest the higher antiquity of the Note-
> line; for the latter is sometimes found with the
> mark indicating Sebîr, obviously because the reason
> for inserting the pointer had long been forgotten.
> Thus, in Gen. 32²³, the defective reading בַּלַּיְלָה הוּא,
> introduced by the premonitory line, is further marked
> as one of the Sebîrîn, and the correct reading ex-
> pressly given as בַּלַּיְלָה הַהוּא.

(3) *Vowel-marks*, and *kindred aids to pronunciation.* —
The ancient Hebrew, as written, was purely a language
of *consonants.* In reading or speaking, however, the re-
quired *vowels* had to be supplied, in order to make out
the exact sense, which could generally be perceived with
ease, on considering the context.‡ So long as the

---

* See C. D. Ginsburg's learned *Introduction to the Massoretico-
critical edition of the Hebrew Bible*, p. 187 ff.

† See above, p. 12, *Note.*

‡ The same holds true of the later or Rabbinical Hebrew.

language continued to be spoken, no pressing necessity was felt for visibly representing the proper vowels which had to be supplied. But when the Hebrew was threatening, in the early Christian centuries, to become a dead language, means were adopted for preserving the traditional pronunciation of every word and letter in the Sacred text, by attaching to the consonants certain signs representing the proper sounds.

With the vowel-signs we here class other helps to pronunciation likewise devised and applied to the consonants for determining the *quality* of sound in certain letters. These additional marks are 'Dagesh' and 'Mappîq,' which require the hard sound of the letters in which they are placed; and 'Raphé,' which demands the soft sound of the consonant over which it appears.

> *Note.*—As these pronunciation‑signs are *closely attached* to the consonants which they affect, and were placed there long after the pointer had been introduced into the text,—where it is placed *outside* words (though *between* them), and for another purpose than to indicate pronunciation,—the note-line cannot be put in the same category with these vowel-marks.

(4) *The Accents.*—Speaking generally, the system of 'accents' was invented and applied to the Hebrew text (*a*) to show the logical or syntactical relation, intimate or remote, deemed to subsist among the different words in a verse. But these signs frequently also (*b*) mark

the *tone*-syllable * in each word, or group of words, in a
verse.   It is further affirmed by some (*c*) that the accents
were likewise intended to be guides for musical inflection
of the voice in reading the Scriptures ; if this be true, it
must be confessed that their value in this respect is now
practically very small.   Only with the first of the positions
just indicated have we special concern at present.

Most unfortunately, ' Paseq ' has somehow come to be
erroneously regarded by many as one of the accents, and
thus frequently to be classed with them.   In accordance
with this assumption, syntactical functions have been
baselessly ascribed to the sign.   That it really has no
place among them, however, will become evident after
considering the following facts.

(*a*) It is noteworthy that whereas the true accents are
placed either *above* or *below* the consonants, ' Paseq ' is
unique in taking its place *between words*, and thus standing
in the same line with the consonants.   This difference of
position surely indicates a difference of *purpose*.

See any instance of its occurrence, as in Gen.
$1^{5, 10, 21, 29, 30}$ $2^{5, 21, 22}$ $3^{14, 15, 22}$ etc.

(*b*) ' Paseq ' never has been and never can be proved,
even by those who claim for it a place within the accentual
system, to possess *independent* force as an ' accent.'   Its

---

* Certain of the accents, however, are uniformly attached to the *first*
letter of a word (and are accordingly called ' prepositive '), even though
the tone falls at a later point ; others are invariably placed on the *last*
consonant (and are thus called ' postpositive '), though the tone may
fall earlier,

most strenuous advocates are forced to acknowledge that, even according to their own account, *it is always combined with one of the accents proper*, from which it derives support.

> For instance, in the ordinary ('prose') books of the Hebrew Scriptures, when preceded by the sublinear 'conjunctive' accent Munach (thus $\iota \, \tau$), and immediately followed by the 'great distinctive' accent Rebhia ($\div$), the compound is currently known as 'Legarmeh'; see Gen. 3^{15} 17^{14} 19^9 etc. The same combination of Munach with 'Paseq' (viz. $\iota \, \overline{\tau}$), if immediately followed by any other accent than Rebhia, is simply called 'Munach-Paseq'; see Gen. 7^{21} 13^{10} 18^{21} 19^{14} (double instance), etc. Less common collocations are 'Merka-Paseq' ($\iota \, \overline{\tau}$) found in Gen. 30^{16}, 'Darga-Paseq' ($\iota \, \overline{\varsigma}$) which occurs in Gen. 30^8 etc. All such distinctions have merely an artificial or theoretical basis, inasmuch as the real origin and purpose of 'Paseq' have been misconceived.
>
> Moreover, when 'Paseq' happens to be omitted * in certain MSS. or printed editions of the Hebrew Scriptures, no practical inconvenience results from the accent becoming simple Munach, Merka, etc.

It is further to be noted that, considering the proper meaning of 'Paseq' (viz. 'separating') and its alleged function, all such combinations of this sign with a conjunctive accent are self-contradictory. The resultant of such (supposed) opposing forces (*i.e.* separative and connective) might safely be regarded as an equilibrium.

(*c*) Finding 'Paseq' practically incapable of being

* See the remarks at pp. 3 and 105 ff.

2

legitimately assigned to a fitting place among the accents,
some writers on the subject relegate the treatment of this
sign to an appendix in which its irreducible character is
acknowledged.   Such is the course pursued by Dr. W.
Wickes in his learned and laborious treatise on the Prose
Accents.*   When even the Massoretes, in superadding
the accents to the Sacred text, took into account the
presence of ' Paseq,' which they already found there, and
modified their arrangements accordingly, it is not surpris-
ing that later scholars have continued to show similar
deference.

> The views of Wickes regarding the origin and
> purpose of the line are thus presented by himself:—
> ' After the verse had been arranged musically, ac-
> cording to the rules . . . two or more words might
> be left joined by the accents, which it might never-
> theless seem desirable, for the sake of effect in the
> reading, to separate by a slight pause.   The sign
> Paseq . . . was placed between the words for this
> purpose.   The meaning of the term (" cutting off,"
> " separating ") indicates its function.   This sign had
> no proper musical value, and was therefore not
> numbered among the accents.' †

PARTIAL SUMMARY OF RESULTS.

From what has been already stated, it will be obvious
that ordinary readers of a modern Hebrew Bible have

* P. 121.
† *Treatise on the Prose Books of the Old Testament,* p. 120.

before them, on the printed page, what is really *a series of different strata, deposited at various stages in history,*—the later being superimposed on the earlier. Though the whole has now assumed a semblance of unity, the successive layers are really distinct, and still separable by intelligent observers. For our present purpose, it is essential that we should place and retain clearly before our mental vision only the following :—

1. The Hebrew consonants, which form the primary portion of the sacred writings.

2. The note-line, which formed the first addition made to the original text.

All later additions—the vowel-signs (except as helps in fixing the exact reading of words), the accents, and such marginal notes as the 'Qerî' and 'Sebîrîn'—must be practically excluded from thought during our investigations.

6. ANTIQUITY OF THE NOTE-LINE.

The early origin of this mark is evidenced in various ways.

(1) The very *simplicity of the sign* seems to prove its ancient date. A mere line is certainly the most primitive mark that could well be conceived. On the other hand, complex marks, and an elaborate system of these, such as are presented in the accents especially, are obviously the product of later times ; the straight and simple line had already been applied to serve a primary purpose. The simplest, as a rule, comes first.

(2) The fact that many palpable difficulties in the text
are now wholly unmarked, suggests the thought that a
large proportion of these difficulties originated *after*—
perhaps long after—the line had been fixed on as a sign,
and inserted at points where earlier slips had been already
detected and noted.   For, had those (presumably) later
ones actually existed when the line was first used, these
also would surely have been marked by the primitive
sign.

> For instance, Prov. 13 and 14 now contain a con-
> siderable number of textual difficulties, not one of
> which is marked ; yet the line notes others elsewhere
> in the same book, as in chaps. 6. 8. 24, etc.

(3) The frequent coincidence of the note-line with a
marginal correction in the form of a 'Qerî,' * shows that
the pointer which earlier scribes had already inserted had
really no significance for their followers in later days.   To
these, it was a meaningless *mark*, but not a *sign*.

(4) Many readings *already marked by the line* as ques-
tionable or unintelligible *are confirmed by the testimony
of the Septuagint* and other ancient Versions as already
existent when these translations were made.   A few
illustrations will make this plain.

> In Ps. 22[16], the line is inserted to mark כֹּחִי (' my
> strength ') as a questionable reading ; nevertheless,
> the Septuagint ($\dot{\eta}$ $\dot{\iota}\sigma\chi\dot{\upsilon}s$ $\mu o\upsilon$) confirms this.   But
> Olshausen, Ewald, and others reasonably maintain

---

* See remarks already made at p. 13.

that the genuine reading is חִכִּי ('my palate'), which accords with the preceding parallel 'my tongue.'

In Josh. 6[19], the first word in the expression וְכֹל ׀ כֶּסֶף ('and all silver'), which is noted by the line as questionable, ought rather to be וּכְלֵי ('and vessels of'), as shown by the succeeding context. But the Septuagint translator, by his rendering (πᾶν ἀργύριον), shows that the questioned reading was already in the Hebrew copy from which he made his Version.

In Ps. 18[9], for the last word—noted by the line—in the anthropopathic expression עָלָה עָשָׁן ׀ בְּאַפּוֹ, we should probably read, in accordance with the parallel clause following ('and fire from his mouth devoured') מֵאַפָּיו ('out of his nostrils'); but the Septuagint (ἀνέβη καπνὸς ἐν ὀργῇ αὐτοῦ) confirms the Massoretic text.

In Ps. 59[8], the pointer marks the first word הִנֵּה as at least questionable; but the Septuagint (ἰδού) confirms the reading, which nevertheless should be corrected into הֵמָּה ('they'). This term thus presents the required antithesis to וְאַתָּה ('but thou') following.

In Ps. 125[3], the *second* occurrence of 'the righteous' seems reasonably marked as superfluous; yet the Septuagint attests its presence in the Hebrew text when this translation was made.

Note.—It seems impossible to determine the pre-Christian century during which the note-line was introduced. But the insertion must have commenced *after* the origin of 'final' forms in certain letters of the Hebrew alphabet; for, in Neh. 2[13] הֵמ (for הֵם) is marked as abnormal, both by the line and in the

marginal Qerî.* Similarly, מַן (for מִן) is doubly noted in Job 38¹ 40⁶.

7. PROPER PLACE FOR THE INSERTION OF THE POINTER.

When we come to investigate the principles according to which the ancient scribes seem to have inserted the note-line, it is only to be expected that the *most natural and fitting place should be, as nearly as possible, the precise point where the peculiarity occurs.* This actually is the general rule, but there are exceptions which cannot all be accounted for. The following observations present the main facts regarding the insertion of the line :—

(1) The pointer always lies *within* the series of words forming a verse, *i.e.* it never precedes the first word, or follows the last.

The very *earliest* stage at which the sign can be introduced is immediately after the first word in a verse, or section of a verse (see Gen. 15¹ 23¹⁷, Ps. 55¹⁶ 59⁸ 96⁵ 118²⁷ etc. etc.) ; and the very *latest* point of insertion is immediately before the last word (see Ps. 10³ 58⁷ 89⁵³ etc.).

(2) Apart from the ruling principle just enunciated, *the line should immediately precede* the point to which the scribe desired to call the reader's attention.

Among abundant illustrations may be cited Amos 1¹, where attention is called to the shortened form עֻזִּה there used instead of the full form עֻזִּיָהוּ in Isa. 1¹ and elsewhere ; Hos. 13², where, instead of the future יוֹסִפוּ, we should rather probably read the

* See remarks on p. 13.

perfect יְסָפוּ; Gen. 3¹⁵, where the more rare and
poetic form אִשִּׁית is found, instead of the more com-
mon prose form אִשִּׁים; Num. 11³², where יוֹם is noted
as really superfluous; Isa. 63¹¹, where attention is
called to the abnormal form הַמַּעֲלֵם, a participle having
both the article prefixed and a pronominal fragment
affixed; Isa. 37²⁴, where the line notes the unexpected
occurrence of the Divine name אֲדֹנָי instead of יְהֹוָה or
אֱלֹהִים; Isa. 63¹, where, instead of the last word in
the expression מִי־זֶה ׀ בָּא, we expect הַבָּא, but the
article has been omitted after the preceding ה in the
demonstrative. See also Ps. 96¹³, where a needless
repetition of כִּי בָא is marked; Jer. 1¹⁰, where 'this
day' is superfluous; 1 Sam. 10¹⁸, where there is an
unnecessary insertion of the words 'to the children
of Israel.'

(3) A corollary derived from the two leading principles
already stated is,—that whenever the noteworthy form
happens to be the *first* word in the whole verse, or even
the first word in a later clause of the verse, the line does
not precede, but *follows* the form.

    (*a*) We shall first cite instances in which a *single*
word, beginning a sentence or main clause, is
marked by the line placed *after* it.

    In Ex. 9¹⁴, attention is called to the opening
word כִּי, instead of which we should doubtless read
לֹא ('If'), as obviously required by the following
correlative כִּי עַתָּה (introducing the apodosis of a
pure hypothesis) in v.¹⁵; in Ex. 16²⁹, the line after
שְׁבוּ, which begins the second half of the verse,
shows that the word should rather be שִׁבְתוּ ('rest

ye '); in Judg. 16², the line after the first word לְעַזָּתִים ('to the Gazites') notes the need, in front, of some such word as וַיֻּגַּד ('And it was told'); in Ps. 10², the line after יִתְפְּשׂוּ, which begins the second half of the verse, notes the change of form from the singular to the plural; in Ps. 96⁵ and in Jer. 4²², the pointer, following the first word כִּי, marks this as superfluous; in Ezek. 13¹¹, the perfect הָיָה, beginning the second part of the verse, and marked by the line following, is noted as an error for the future יִהְיֶה; in 2 Chron. 23¹⁰, the pointer after וְאִישׁ, which is the first word in the second clause, indicates that the correct reading is simply אִישׁ; in Ps. 45⁵, the mark after the opening word וַהֲדָרְךָ has been inserted to note this form as a superfluous repetition from the end of the preceding verse; in Ps. 65⁶, the line after the first word נוֹרָאוֹת questions the correctness of this form, for which we should perhaps rather read נוֹרָא אַתָּה ('Dreadful [art] thou').

See also Ex. 12¹⁵, ¹⁹, Isa. 18², Jer. 50³⁴.

(b) Similarly, when a *whole clause* is intended to be marked as noteworthy or doubtful, the line is placed after the first word, or series of words. For instance, in the familiar formula, 'Thus saith Jehovah,' the entire expression may be marked, as at least superfluous, by a line inserted after the initial word (כֹּה ׀ אָמַר יְהֹוָה). Examples occur in Nah. 1¹² (the only passage in this book where the formula is found), 2 Kings 3¹⁷, Jer. 2⁵ 9²² 10² 17⁵ and frequently elsewhere. In all these instances the expression may be omitted without injury to the context.* See

* See a fuller discussion on this expression, at p. 48.

2 Sam. 19[7] for *two* remarkably similar expressions,
both noted by the line after the first word in each.

(4) Sometimes, however, the pointer-line is inserted, not
immediately before a peculiarity or peculiarities occurring
in the middle or at the end of a verse, but, by way of
premonition, either (*a*) after the first word in the clause
containing the peculiarity, or even (*b*) at the beginning of
the verse, though the difficulty may be at the end.   In
such cases, the line merely gives a general warning to
look for peculiarities or difficulties further on.

See Prov. 9[7], where the line, though inserted after
the first word in the verse, really points to the last
word, מוּמוֹ, for which מָאוֹם ('contempt') should be
read.   In Ps. 68[5], the line inserted after the first
word merely prepares the mind of the reader for
several difficulties further on (for סֹלּוּ, read צַהֲלוּ; for
בָּעֲרָבוֹת, read בְּעָבוֹת; and for the second שְׁמוֹ, read
שִׂמְחוּ).   In Ps. 135[9], the line at the beginning points
onward to בְּתוֹכֵכִי, for which בְּתוֹךְ is the better read-
ing.   Ps. 146[8] begins thus : יְהוָה ׀ פֹּקֵחַ עִוְרִים; the
difficulty, however, is not at the commencement,
where the pointer appears, but after the second
word, where עֵינֵי has been inadvertently omitted in
transcription, in consequence of its resemblance to
the succeeding word : we must thus render the first
part of the sentence, 'Jehovah opens [the eyes of]
the blind.'   Similarly, though the next verse (v.[9])
of the same Psalm begins with the words יְהוָה ׀ שֹׁמֵר
אֶת־גֵּרִים, the pointer should really be inserted later,
before אֶת־, whose occurrence there is anomalous,

particularly when we consider its absence from other
accusatives which follow. In Ex. 26², and again in
v.⁸, the note-line, though inserted at the beginning,
should have been placed further on, to show pre-
cisely where a remarkable dislocation is made be-
tween the construct וְרֹחַב and its genitive הַיְרִיעָה הָאֶחָת,
through the abnormal interjection of אַרְבַּע בָּאַמָּה. In
Ex. 29²⁷, similarly, the line is prematurely inserted
before 'the breast of the wave-offering,' instead of
after this, where we ought to find the wrongly de-
ferred relative clause 'which is waved.' In Ps. 19⁵,
we read בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ ׀ יָצָא קַוָּם ; the line is really designed
to call attention to the last of these words, before
which it would have been more conveniently placed,
and instead of which we should read (as shown by
the Septuagint rendering, ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν) קוֹלָם
('their voice'). In Job 24, the line appears in no
fewer than eight verses (vv.⁵· ¹²· ¹³· ¹⁴· ¹⁷· ¹⁸· ²⁰· ²⁴), all
with the sign near the beginning, though the diffi-
culties are found later on. In Ps. 66⁶, the line near
the beginning prepares us for textual difficulties
towards the end of the verse, where, for יַעֲבְרוּ, we
should read עָבָרְנוּ, and for נִשְׂמְחָה put נִשָּׁמְרֵנוּ, so that
the correct rendering runs thus : ' He turned sea
into dry land ; through the flood we passed on foot ;
there were we preserved by him.' In Ps. 94²³, the
pointer near the beginning prepares us for the
strange repetition of יַצְמִיתֵם near the end. In Ps.
81¹¹, the sign prepares us for the later appearance
of the unusual form הַמַּעַלְךָ in which *both* the article
and a pronominal suffix are attached to a participle.
In Ps. 109²¹, the early insertion of the line leads us

to conclude that there has been an omission of חֶסֶר,
which the imperative עֲשֵׂה seems to require as its
fitting object; similarly, in v.[25], the pointer at the
beginning forewarns us that לָהֶם appears instead of
לְעָם הֵם. Isa. 54[2] exhibits the pointer at the begin-
ning of the verse, but the difficulty is really in the
middle, where, for יַפּוּ, we must restore הַפּוּ as the
correct reading (following the Septuagint and other
Versions). In Neh. 3[34] [4[2] in English], though the
pointer follows the first וַיֹּאמֶר, at the beginning of
the verse, it really calls attention to the second,
which forms a needless repetition. In Gen. 48[7], the
line anticipatively prepares us for the omission, later,
of 'Aram' after 'from Padan,' as attested by the
Septuagint, Samaritan, and Syriac. In Neh. 13[23],
the pointer after the opening word forewarns us of
the omission, at a later stage, of the relative 'who.'
In Ps. 20[6], the line after the opening word really
points onwards to נְרֹגֵּל, for which we must read
נָגִיל ('we shall exult'), as required by the parallelism.
In Ps. 80[2], the line near the beginning really calls
attention to the omission, later (in the middle of the
verse, after the words 'thou that leadest Joseph
like a flock'), of another imperative such as 'hear!'
In Zech. 1[6], the line after the initial word points to
the substitution, at a later stage, of הִשִּׂיגוּ for חָשְׁבוּ
('they restrained').

    See also Lev. 11[42], Jer. 11[19] 30[18], Zech. 8[17].

Note. — Comparatively rare are cases in which
peculiarities at the *end* of a verse are marked by
the line placed there; but see Ps. 5[7] 10[3] 40[16] 72[19],

1 Chron. 29[11], 2 Chron. 12[6], Jer. 11[5] 23[6] 33[2]; 2 Kings 3[16] etc.

(5) Special consideration is claimed for instances— which are now, however, comparatively rare — of the *double* note-line, or, to speak more correctly, the *pair* of note-lines enclosing the noteworthy form between them.* Possibly, this repetition of the line (after as well as before the form noted) may really exhibit the original mode in which peculiarities were marked. If this be so, then the single line—usually the first,† but sometimes ‡ the second—has come to be regarded as sufficient, and the other has been dropped, as superfluous, especially when *single* words are noted as remarkable.

> Compare the full marking as found in Ezek. 33[11] חַי־אָנִי ׀ נְאֻם ׀ אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה, with the simpler noting in Ezek. 34[8] חַי־אָנִי נְאֻם ׀ אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה; compare also Ps. 40[17] יָשִׂישׂוּ ׀ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ ׀ בְּךָ, with יָשִׂישׂוּ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ ׀ בְּךָ in Ps. 70[5]. Compare also 1 Sam. 18[10] with 19[9].

This double note-line now appears in only a few passages in certain Books of the Old Testament, chiefly Numbers, Joshua, Samuel, Kings, Psalms, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel; and the purpose of its insertion was evidently to indicate that the word or expression enclosed is either superfluous, or has been substituted for another which should be restored, or has been misplaced in the sentence.

---

* This collocation must not be confounded with the more frequent occurrence of *two single and separate* note-lines, calling attention to *two different* peculiarities in the same verse, as found in Ex. 32[1], Deut. 7[26], Josh. 1[15], 2 Sam. 19[7], Ps. 39[13] 40[6] 66[7] etc. etc. See the fuller list on p. 3. See also p. 8.

† See above, p. 22.   ‡ See below, p. 30.

Thus, in the expression לַחֲצִי ׀ שֵׁבֶט ׀ מְנַשֶּׁה ('to the half-tribe of Manasseh'), Num. 32[33], the pair of lines encloses a word unusual in this Book for designating 'tribe,' * for which מַטֶּה is the proper form in such a connection: see Num. 34[13, 14, 15]. In 1 Sam. 24[10], a superfluous word ('to-day'), already used earlier in the verse, is enclosed within a pair of lines, thus, נְתָנְךָ יְהֹוָה ׀ הַיּוֹם ׀ בְּיָדִי. In Prov. 6[3] אֵפוֹא ׀ is marked as probably a transcriptional slip for אָנָּא. In Esth. 9[27] עֲלֵיהֶם ׀ is marked as written for עַל־נַפְשָׁם, which is correctly given in v.[31]. In Isa. 66[20], the enclosed expression ׀ מִכָּל־הַגּוֹיִם ׀ is marked as awkwardly placed in the sentence, which would run more smoothly if the clause were transposed to some other point. In 1 Kings 21[2] לֵאמֹר ׀ has probably been marked as superfluous.

See other illustrations of the double line in Num. 4[26] 31[30] (cf. v.[47]), 2 Sam. 24[13], Ezra 6[9], Ps. 55[20, 24] 84[4] 141[4], 2 Kings 18[14], 1 Chron. 21[15], Jer. 4[19] 29[32] 35[15] 44[26] 51[37], Josh. 8[33] 19[51] 22[22], Ezek. 47[12] 48[21].

Passages in which only the *first* of the two lines now appear are Jer. 1[10], where the two words 'this day' seem marked as superfluous; Ps. 92[10], where the words 'Jehovah, for behold thine enemies' form an unnecessary repetition; Ps. 93[3], where 'Jehovah' and the two following words are redundant.

(6) Though the single note-line, as has already been shown, normally precedes the peculiarity thus marked, and should follow only when this happens to be the first

* See the author's *Studies in Hebrew Synonyms*, p. 123.

word in a verse, or member of a verse,* yet there are many cases in which it *follows*—sometimes even at a distance— a peculiar word, or combination of words,† which is *not* the first in its own sentence or clause [1]. This post-inserted line may in some rare instances be (*a*) merely the later survivor of an original *pair* of note-lines [2], but (*b*) more frequently the abnormal insertion is evidently due to the action of a later scribe, who inadvertently inserted the single line at the wrong point [3].

1. In Prov. 30[19], the line *follows* the form הַנֶּ֫שֶׁר ('the eagle'), which it marks as unique in having the article, while all other similar nouns are anarthrous. In Isa. 18[2], the pointer follows לְכוּ ('go ye'), but should rather be placed in front, to show the omission of לֵאמֹר there. Num. 15[30] shows the line following תַּעֲשֶׂה, which should rather be תַּעֲשֹׁק ('oppresses'). In Num. 8[19], the line following נְתֻנִים ('given') marks the word as really superfluous; similarly, in 32[33], the pointer after לָהֶם notes it as needless. In Isa. 52[1], the line should be placed earlier in the sentence, to note there a reading which does not, in its present form, exhibit proper parallelism between the first and the second parts. In Ps. 69[14], the line is now placed at a point where no change seems to be required; but emendations are necessary, both before and after. In Ps. 91[7], the pointer follows, but should rather precede, מִצִּדְּךָ, for

---

* See p. 22.

† The union of two words by Maqqeph is so close that the pointer, if postponed, must follow the second, even though the *first* is meant to be signalised: see פְּתַח־בָּר in Ps. 72[16].

which obviously we must read מִיָּדְךָ. In Ps. 125³,
the line appears after, instead of before, the second
occurrence of הַצַּדִּיקִים, which is really superfluous.
Prov. 1²⁷ shows the line following instead of pre-
ceding the faulty reading כְּשֹׁאָוה, which is corrected
in the Qerî as כְּשׁוֹאָה. In 2 Chron. 20²², the note-
line is inserted after the remarkable reading in
נָתַן יְהוָֹה ׀ מְאָרְבִים ('Jehovah placed men in ambush ');
for 'Jehovah,' some substitute 'Judah' (יְהוּדָה). It
is instructive to compare Lev. 7¹⁶, where the line is
(normally) *prefixed* to אוֹ (which should be אִם), with
v.²¹, where it *follows* the same reading. In Ps. 22²⁷,
the note-line follows the suspected reading עֲנָוִים, for
which רְעֵבִים ('hungry') would be a suitable sub-
stitute. In Mal. 3¹, the pointer should precede
rather than follow הָאָדוֹן, which is marked as an
unusual Divine name. In Ps. 5⁷, the line follows
יְתָעֵב, which is thus noted as the only instance, in
the whole Psalm, of the 3rd person being employed
in relation to God; everywhere else, 'thou' occurs.
In Judg. 20²⁵, the line should not be behind בִּנְיָמִן, but
in front, where בְּנֵי has inadvertently been dropped,
through its similarity to what follows. In Ps. 9¹⁴,
the pointer should not follow, but precede יְהֹוָה, so
as to call attention to the unusual form חָנְנֵנִי at the
beginning of the verse. In 2 Sam. 24¹³, in the
expression שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים ׀ רָעָב ׀ בְּאַרְצֶךָ, the pair of note-
lines should *not* enclose ' famine,' as the remarkable
term, but ' seven,' which puts its own clause out
of harmony with the other two correlative clauses
following, both of which present the number 'three';
the numbers are correctly stated in the parallel account

found in 1 Chron. 21¹². In Jer. 27¹⁸, where we read
לְבִלְתִּי בֹּאוּ הַכֵּלִים ׀ הַנּוֹתָרִים, the line should rather be
next בֹּאוּ, which it really was intended to mark as a
strikingly irregular construction. Similarly, in Jer.
31³⁹, where the opening words are וְכָל־הָעֵמֶק הַפְּגָרִים ׀
וְהַדֶּשֶׁן, the pointer should rather be close to the
irregular form ' valley,' which is in the construct
state, and thus should not have the article prefixed.
In 1 Sam. 9²⁴, the line should be placed earlier in
the sentence, beside וְהֶעָלֶיהָ, which really must be read
וְהָאַלְיָה ('and the fat tail'), instead of coming later (thus
וַיָּשֶׂם ׀ לִפְנֵי שָׁאוּל), where it is out of place. In Ps. 65¹⁴
כָּרִים must be restored as הָרִים (' mountains '), but the
note-line should have been placed before, instead of
after the contested reading. In 2 Chron. 35²⁵ וַיֹּאמְרוּ
should be וַיֹּאבְלוּ ('and they mourned'), but the pointer
ought to be placed close to the disputed reading in-
stead of coming later.

Many other instances will easily be detected by an
observant reader. But reference may further be made
to Ex. 16²⁹, Deut. 6²² 7¹ 12¹⁵, Josh. 22³², 1 Sam. 14³⁶,
2 Kings 11¹⁵, Ps. 84¹², Prov. 3²⁸, Eccles. 6², Isa. 23¹⁷.

2. That a pointer following the noteworthy reading
may sometimes really be the remaining *second* of an
enclosing pair of lines, seems conclusively proved by
comparing Ezek. 34⁸ with 33¹¹, and Ps. 70⁵ with 40¹⁷,
as already exhibited.* In 2 Kings 2⁴, the line after
' Elisha,' which marks it as superfluous, is probably
but the latter of two enclosing lines.

3. Ortenberg † pertinently reminds us of similar

* See p. 28.
† Stade's *Zeitschrift für alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1887, pp. 301-2.

misplacements, and even omissions, by later copyists, of the significant signs—viz. the asterisk and the obelus—introduced by Origen, in his *Hexapla*, into the text of his copy of the Septuagint, to mark differences between this and the Hebrew text. Such unfortunate transpositions have lessened the value of the *Syro-Hexaplar* as a witness for these ancient texts. A single page of this translation presents abundant illustrations of these misplacements by transcribers.

In 2 Chron. 35^{21}, the double note-line enclosing לֵאמֹר is certainly misplaced; no difficulty is apparent there, but several difficulties occur later. In Judg. 14^{15}, the pointer should be placed later, beside הַשְּׁבִיעִי 'the seventh,' which should be הָרְבִיעִי 'the fourth,' as proved by the Septuagint ($\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\hat{\eta}$ $\dot{\eta}\mu\dot{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$ $\tau\hat{\eta}$ $\tau\epsilon\tau$-$\dot{\alpha}\rho\tau\eta$). In Ps. 57^4, the line appears too soon, and should rather precede חֵרֵף, which has most probably been substituted for מֵחֶרֶב ('from the sword').

Other misplacements are found in Gen. 7^{23} 30^{20}, Ex. 7^{17} 13^{18}, Num. 3^{38}, Josh. 5^4 20^9, Judg. 6^2 10^4 18^{10}, 1 Sam. 11^7, 2 Sam. $19^{1, 38}$, 2 Chron. 26^{15}, Cant. 4^8 etc.

Regarding *repeated* insertions of the line in the same erse, see the remarks already made on pp. 3, 7 ff.

CLASSIFICATION OF CASES.

8. Conditions for Insertion of the Line.

Instances showing the line may be grouped thus—

(1) Passages are marked in which *an unusual form of the Divine name* occurs.

In the Book of Malachi, the Divine name generally employed is יְהוָה (1[1, 2, 4, 7] etc.), or יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת (1[4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13] etc.); but when הָאָדוֹן appears in 3[1], the singularity is noted by the line placed after it.

In the Book of Exodus, the Divine name employed at the beginning is simply אֱלֹהִים, and afterwards יְהוָה, or the double designation יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים. But, in Ex. 15[26], attention is called to the compound name יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ, so common in Deuteronomy, though strange here; moreover, in Ex. 23[17] and 34[23], the line notes the remarkable combination הָאָדוֹן ׀ יְהוָה.

In Genesis, Divine names commonly found are אֵל שַׁדַּי, אֵל, יְהוָה, אֱלֹהִים. But, in Gen. 24[7], where Abraham is represented as employing the expression יְהוָה ׀ אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם, the line has been inserted to show that this is a somewhat unusual combination. Further, the trusted servant of Abraham is repre-

sented, in 24[12], as employing a peculiar designation,
viz. יְהוָֹה ׀ אֱלֹהֵי אֲדֹנִי אַבְרָהָם, which is duly marked by
the note-line. (The sign is *not* repeated, however,
when the designation recurs in vv.[27, 42, 48].*)

In Deuteronomy, the Divine name usually em-
ployed is 'Jehovah our God,' 'Jehovah your God,' or
'Jehovah thy God' (see 1[6, 10, 19, 20, 21] etc.); but in
3[20], where the expression יְהוָֹה ׀ לַאֲחֵיכֶם occurs, the
line notes distinctly that אֱלֹהֵיכֶם is *not* there.

Josh. 22[22] is specially remarkable for the *twofold*
occurrence of the unusual expression אֵל ׀ אֱלֹהִים ׀ יְהוָֹה,
in which a *pair* of pointers appears each time.

In the Book of Judges, the ordinary designation,
יְהוָֹה, is of course left unmarked; but in 4[6] 6[8] and 11[23],
where יְהוָֹה ׀ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל is employed, this fuller name
is noted by the line. (The sign, however, is not
inserted in 5[3] or 11[21].)

In 1 Chron. 13[6], the line is inserted to mark the
expression אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים ׀ יְהוָֹה as quite peculiar.

In 2 Chron. 30[19], הָאֱלֹהִים ׀ יְהוָֹה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתָיו is noted
by the line as unusual.

In Isa. 37, various Divine names are employed,
such as 'Jehovah thy God' (v.[4] twice), 'Jehovah'
(vv.[6, 14] twice, [15, 17] twice, [18, 20, 22, 33, 34, 36]), 'thy God'
(v.[10]), 'Jehovah of Hosts' (vv.[16, 32]), 'the God of
Israel' (v.[16]), 'Jehovah, the God of Israel' (v.[21]), 'the
Holy One of Israel' (v.[23]); all of these, however,
are unmarked, as not uncommon. But when אֲדֹנִי
appears in v.[24], it is marked as unique, by the juxta-
position of the line. In Isa. 40[28], again, the rare
occurrence of the name אֱלֹהֵי עוֹלָם is noted by the

* See later, p. 106 ff.

post-inserted line. In Isa. 42^5, the pointer in the combination הָאֵל ׀ יְהֹוָה notes this as remarkable.

In Jeremiah, יְהֹוָה is the name generally employed, sometimes also יְהֹוָה צְבָאוֹת is found ($9^{6.\ 16}$ 11^{17} etc.); but, in 4^{10} and 7^{20}, where the combination אֲדֹנָי יֱהֹוִה occurs, this is marked by a line in front, calling attention to the peculiarity. In the same book, the expression נְאֻם יְהֹוָה frequently occurs (see 22^{24} $23^{4.\ 7.}$ $^{11.\ 23.\ 28.\ 29}$ $27^{8.\ 15.\ 22}$ $29^{11.\ 14.\ 19}$), and is accordingly left unmarked; but when we reach 30^8, the fuller expression נְאֻם ׀ יְהֹוָה צְבָאוֹת is marked as noteworthy.

In Lam. 1^{15} $2^{1.\ 5.\ 7}$, the line notes the unexpected occurrence of אֲדֹנָי instead of יְהֹוָה elsewhere.

In Ps. 44, אֱלֹהִים is used five times (vv.$^{2.\ 5.\ 9.\ 21.\ 22}$), but אֲדֹנָי only once, in v.^{24}; this unique occurrence is noted by the prefixed line. In Ps. 50, אֱלֹהִים is generally found, but v.^{1} presents the peculiar compound אֵל ׀ אֱלֹהִים יְהֹוָה, which naturally has received the line to mark its singularity. In Ps. 55^{20}, the unique occurrence of אֵל is marked by a pair of pointers.* In Ps. 57^{10}, the line prefixed to אֲדֹנָי calls attention to this as the sole occurrence of the name in the whole poem. In Ps. 68^{19}, the line placed before יָהּ אֱלֹהִים obviously notes the combination as remarkable; in v.^{21}, the line after הָאֵל has been inserted for a similar reason. Ps. 72^{18} presents the remarkably full expression יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, which is rightly noted as uncommon. Throughout Ps. 89, the Divine name commonly employed is simply יְהֹוָה; but in v.^{9} the pointer is first inserted in the lengthened expression יְהֹוָה ׀ אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת, and then before the contracted

* See p. 28.

form יָהּ; moreover, in v.[50], where a further change is made to אֲדֹנָי, the prefixed line calls attention to the fact. In Ps. 118, יְהֹוָה is the Divine name generally employed; but when, in v.[27], אֵל is prefixed to it, the combination is marked by the line.

Ezekiel mostly uses יְהֹוָה (1[3. 28] 3[16. 22] 4[13] etc.) and אֲדֹנָי יְהֹוִה (2[4] 3[11] 5[5] 6[3] [twice] etc.) ; but at the first introduction of the compound אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in 9[3], the change is noted by the line prefixed; the mark, however, is not repeated later (10[19. 20]).

(2) The line is frequently inserted *between two adjacent words in which the initial letter of the second is the same as the final letter of the first.* Still more frequently is the insertion made *when the same letter is repeated three times in succession.* Distinct assurance is thus given that this consecutive repetition of the same letter is not the result of mere inadvertence.

In Deut. 1[7], attention is called to פְּנוּ ׀ וּסְעוּ 'turn ye and march' (contrast קוּמוּ סְּעוּ in 2[24]). In Ex. 20[4] and the parallel Deut. 5[8], presenting part of the fourth commandment, we are invited to mark the striking collocation of the same letter thrice in succession, in the expression בַּשָּׁמַיִם ׀ מִמַּעַל 'in the heavens above'; similarly in 1 Sam. 20[21], we find הַחִצִּים ׀ מִמְּךָ 'the arrows [are] from thee'; in Isa. 6[2] occurs the expression עֹמְדִים ׀ מִמַּעַל 'standing above.' In Ps. 68[36] we are called to note נוֹרָא אֱלֹהִים ׀ מִמִּקְדָּשֶׁיךָ; in 143[5] occurs מִקֶּדֶם ׀ זָכַרְתִּי יָמִים 'I remember days of old'; in 3[8] יְהֹוָה ׀ הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי is similarly marked. Again, in Judg. 13[7] attention is called to יַיִן ׀ אַל-תִּשְׁתִּי 'drink not wine' (but the same expression is left

‏וְהִתְבּוֹנֵן ׀ נִפְלְאוֹת אֵל‎ unmarked in v.[5] *); in Job 37[14] to ‏נִפְלְאוֹת אֵל‎
in 1 Chron. 22[3] to ‏וּבַרְזֶל ׀ לָרֹב‎, and similarly in v.[5]
to ‏לְהַגְדִּיל ׀ לְמַעְלָה‎; in Lev. 27[16] to ‏וְאִם ׀ מִשְּׂדֵה אֲחֻזָּתוֹ‎
(where the ‏מ‎ is no doubt superfluous; see p. 45).†

See also Ex. 17[7], Deut. 13[6], Ps. 68[21] 86[9] 128[3],
Ezek. 16[14], 2 Chron. 15[3] 20[1] 34[12], Job 27[13].

Cases in which the line is omitted are Num. 23[22],
Deut. 4[39] 15[6], Isa. 45[8].

(3) Conversely, the line is sometimes inserted between
two words, the first of which does *not* end, as might
have been expected, with the same letter as that with
which the second begins; or the second of which does
not begin with the same letter as that with which the
first concludes.

> Thus, in Deut. 9[7] we find ‏יָצָאתָ ׀ מֵאֶרֶץ‎ 'thou didst
> go out from the land,' where the line has been
> inserted to assure us that the form before it is not
> the plural ‏יְצָאתֶם‎, as the plurals following might lead
> us to expect; and in Ezek. 16[52] occurs the reading
> ‏גַּם־אַתְּ ׀ שְׂאִי‎ 'do thou also bear,' with the line inserted
> to assure us that the form succeeding it is the im-
> perative, and *not* the future ‏תִּשְׂאִי‎.

* See subsequent remarks, p. 109 f.

† It must here be conceded that the line might appropriately be
regarded as a 'separator' in such instances as have now been cited.
The sign in these cases may certainly be viewed as pointing out the
necessity for distinctly enunciating the termination of the word pre-
ceding it, and the commencement of the word following, so as to
avoid the natural tendency to run both words together, owing to the
identity of the adjacent letters. But, as will gradually be shown, the
total number of such instances, in which the designation 'Paseq'
would be suitable, forms but a small proportion of the whole in which
the line appears.

(4) The line is regularly inserted *between two words identical in form*. In this case also, the sign assures us that this consecutive repetition of the same word, or words, either (*a*) is *not* an inadvertent error committed by a transcriber, or (*b*) *is* a needless repetition which should be corrected.

Observe יוֹם ׀ יוֹם 'daily' in Gen. 39[10], Ex. 16[5], Ps. 61[9] 68[20], Prov. 8[31. 34], and frequently elsewhere. In Ex. 34[6] we find יְהֹוָה ׀ יְהֹוָה; in Num. 5[22] and Neh. 8[6] אָמֵן ׀ אָמֵן 'Amen, Amen!' (Ps. 41[14] אָמֵן ׀ וְאָמֵן); in Lev. 13[45] טָמֵא ׀ טָמֵא 'Unclean, unclean!' in Zech. 4[7] הֵן ׀ הֵן; in Isa. 26[3] 57[19] שָׁלוֹם ׀ שָׁלוֹם 'Peace, peace'; in Ps. 35[21] 40[16] 70[4] הֶאָח ׀ הֶאָח 'Aha, Aha!' Specially noteworthy is the triple repetition קָדוֹשׁ ׀ קָדוֹשׁ קָדוֹשׁ 'Holy, holy, holy!' in Isa. 6[3]. The pointer similarly calls attention to the actual repetition of a name in direct address, as 'Abraham, Abraham!' in Gen. 22[11]; 'Jacob, Jacob!' in Gen. 46[2]; 'Samuel, Samuel!' in 1 Sam. 3[10]. Very striking is the marked repetition סָבִיב ׀ סָבִיב 'all round about' in Ezek. 40[5. 14. 16. 17. 25. 29. 33. 36. 43], and in 41[5. 6. 7. 8. 10. 11. 12. 16. 17. 19] 42[15. 20]. Consider also עָרוּ ׀ עָרוּ 'Rase, rase!' in Ps. 137[7]; הַב ׀ הַב 'Give, give!' in Prov. 30[15]; הַלּוֹט ׀ הַלּוֹט 'the veil that veils' in Isa. 25[7]; אָבִי ׀ אָבִי 'My father, my father!' in 2 Kings 2[12] and 13[14]; and רֹאשִׁי ׀ רֹאשִׁי 'My head, my head!' in 2 Kings 4[19]. See also Jer. 4[19] 15[12].

Obs. 1. The line is placed before—or at least near —a repeated word or words, even when a *different* form has been introduced between the identical terms. Examples occur in Ps. 57[2] חָנֵּנִי אֱלֹהִים ׀ חָנֵּנִי

'Have mercy on me, O God, have mercy on me';
Ps. 75² 'הוֹדִינוּ לְךָ ׀ אֱלֹהִים הוֹדִינוּ' We give thanks unto
thee, O God, we give thanks'; Ps. 76⁸ אַתָּה ׀ נוֹרָא
אַתָּה ;Ps. 77¹⁷ רָאוּךָ מַיִם ׀ אֱלֹהִים רָאוּךָ מַיִם 'The waters
saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee'; Ps. 115¹ לֹא
לָנוּ ׀ יְהֹוָה לֹא לָנוּ 'Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us';
Ps. 92¹⁰ 'כִּי הִנֵּה אֹיְבֶיךָ ׀ יְהֹוָה כִּי הִנֵּה אֹיְבֶיךָ יֹאבֵדוּ For lo
thine enemies, O Lord, for lo thine enemies shall
perish'; Ps. 93³ 'נָשְׂאוּ נְהָרוֹת ׀ יְהֹוָה נָשְׂאוּ נְהָרוֹת קוֹלָם The
rivers have lifted up, O Lord, the rivers have lifted
up their voice'; Ps. 94³ עַד־מָתַי רְשָׁעִים ׀ יְהֹוָה עַד־מָתַי
רְשָׁעִים יַעֲלֹזוּ 'How long shall the wicked, O Lord, how
long shall the wicked exult?' See also Prov. 31⁴
אַל לַמְלָכִים ׀ לְמוֹאֵל אַל לַמְלָכִים.

No line, however, is inserted in Cant. 1¹⁵ 'Behold,
thou art fair, my love; behold, thou art fair.'

Obs. 2.—As וַהֲדָרְךָ 'and thy majesty,' at the end
of Ps. 45⁴, is immediately repeated at the beginning
of v.⁵, the line cannot, of course, be inserted *between*
the forms,* but it is placed after the second.

Obs. 3.—Exceptional cases in which immediate
repetition of the same word or expression is *not*
certified by the presence of the line, are Ex. 3⁴
'Moses, Moses'; 2 Kings 9⁴ 'the young man, the
young man'; Isa. 38¹⁹ 'the living, the living';
Jer. 2¹³ 'cisterns, cisterns'; Jer. 7⁴ 'The temple of
the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the
Lord'; Ps. 93¹ 'he is clothed, he is clothed'; Ezek.
21¹⁵ 'a sword, a sword'; 21³², 'Overturn, overturn,
overturn'; Zech. 2¹⁰ 'Ho, ho!' Jer. 22²⁹ 'Earth,
earth, earth.' See also Jer. 15³ 46²⁰, Ps. 115¹². ¹⁴.

* See the rule on p. 39.

Obs. 4.—The line is commonly absent from cases in which immediate repetition of the same form idiomatically indicates either (*a*) *distribution*, as in Ex. 36⁴ אִישׁ אִישׁ 'each man,' Gen. 32¹⁷ עֵדֶר עֵדֶר לְבַדּוֹ 'each flock by itself,' 2 Chron. 13¹¹ 'every morning and every evening,' Deut. 14²² 'each year'; or (*b*) *intensity*, as in the common expression Gen. 7¹⁹, Num. 14⁷ מְאֹד מְאֹד 'very very'; Deut. 16²⁰ צֶדֶק צֶדֶק 'nothing but justice'; Deut. 2²⁷ 'only by the road'; Deut. 28⁴³ (two instances), Josh. 4². ⁴.

The line, however, appears in 2 Kings 3¹⁶ גֵּבִים ׀ גֵּבִים 'ditches, ditches,' *i.e.* full of ditches.

Obs. 5.—The line is very rarely placed *before* the repeated words, as in Ps. 96¹³ 'for he comes, for he comes.' But when Maqqeph joins them, the pointer, of course, cannot but precede, as in Isa. 18⁷ קַו־קָו ׀ גּוֹי.

(5) The note-line is sometimes—not frequently—inserted between * adjacent words which are *similar* in form, to assure the reader that both are genuine elements in the text. Such pairs of words may either (*a*) belong to the same root, or (*b*) bear only an outward resemblance, their origin being wholly different.

(*a*) Illustrations of cognate forms in combination, marked by the line, are הַגֵּר ׀ הַגָּר 'the sojourner that sojourns,' Lev. 19³⁴ and 20²; בְּנֵיהֶם ׀ וּבְנֵי בְנֵיהֶם 'their children and the children of their children,' 2 Kings 17⁴¹; יָמִימָה ׀ מִיָּמִים in Judg. 11⁴⁰ 21¹⁹, 1 Sam. 2¹⁹ and elsewhere; similarly יָמִים ׀ לַיָּמִים in 2 Sam. 14²⁶; מִיָּמִים ׀ לְיָמִים in 2 Chron. 21¹⁹; מִיּוֹם ׀ לְיוֹם in Esth. 3⁷;

---

* Rarely *before*, as in 1 Kings 18⁴⁵, Jer. 25³; or *after*, as in Deut. 2⁷, Judg. 18¹⁰, Prov. 8¹³.

בְּיוֹם ו יוֹם in 2 Chron. 30²¹; בְּפַעַם ו בִּפְעַם in Judg. 20³¹; לְכָה ו נֵלְכָה in Josh. 8³³, Ezek. 47¹² 48²¹; מִזֶּה ו וּמִזֶּה in מֵעִיר ו לָעִיר in Deut. 5⁴; פָּנִים ו בִּפְנֵי in 1 Sam. 9¹⁰; in 2 Chron. 30¹⁰. Excellent double illustrations are הַשֹּׁמֵעַ ו יִשְׁמַע in Isa. 21², and הַבּוֹנֵד ו בּוֹנֵד וְהַשּׁוֹדֵד ו שׁוֹדֵד וְהֶחָדֵל ו יֶחְדָּל in Ezek. 3²⁷.

See also 1 Sam. 3¹⁰ 7¹⁴ 20²⁵ 27¹, 2 Sam. 24³, 1 Kings 20²⁵ (twice).

Unmarked pairs of cognates are שָׁנָה בְשָׁנָה in 2 Chron. 24⁵ and לְיוֹם בְּיוֹם in v.¹¹; see also Deut. 15²⁰, 1 Chron. 12²².

(*b*) Instances of adjacent words, similar in form or sound, but different in their origin and meaning, and thus marked by the line, are הוֹי ו גּוֹי in Isa. 1⁴; וַאֲנִי ו עָנִי in Ps. 40¹⁸ and 70⁶; לְעֵת ו צֵאת in 2 Sam. 11¹; נֶּ ו נֵעוֹל in Gen. 39⁸; followed by נָעֹל ו וַיְמָאֵן ו וַיֹּאמֶר in Cant. 4¹²; אִם־תָּעִירוּ ו וְאִם־תְּעוֹרְרוּ in Cant. 2⁷ and again in 3⁵; similarly מַה־תָּעִירוּ ו וּמַה־תְּעֹרְרוּ in 8⁴. See also Deut. 1²⁸, Ps. 18⁸ 38¹³, Jer. 6¹¹ etc.

Note.—In *familiar combinations* such as that of the emphasising infinitive with its cognate finite verb, *the omission of the line is the rule*, as the mark seemed unnecessary; thus Ex. 3⁷ רָאֹה רָאִיתִי; Lev. 27¹⁹ גָּאֹל יִגְאַל, etc.

In some cases, however, the scribe has inserted the line, when he deemed this needful, as in Gen. 17¹³ הִמּוֹל ו יִמּוֹל; Isa. 24³ הִבּוֹק ו תִּבּוֹק הָאָרֶץ וְהִבּוֹז ו תִּבּוֹז. See also Num. 15³¹. In 1 Sam. 27¹, the line *follows* the form.

The want of uniformity in such cases clearly proves that the insertion or omission of the sign

was frequently determined by the taste or opinion
of the scribe.* At some points its insertion might
seem expedient, or even necessary ; in other places,
where it did not seem required, it was omitted.
Thus, Deut. 7^{26} presents a double illustration of the
emphasising combination of the absolute infinitive
with its finite verb, the construction being noted in
both instances by the line שַׁקֵּץ ׀ תְּשַׁקְּצֶנּוּ וְתַעֵב ׀ תְּתַעֲבֶנּוּ;
yet the line is *not* inserted in similar cases previously
occurring in this book, such as 4^{26} (two instances)
6^{17}, and even in the same chapter (viz. in Deut.
$7^{2.\ 18}$).

(*c*) With cases of adjacent similars marked by
the line may fitly be classed the few instances of
alliteration which are likewise noted by the pointer,
as in Ps. 127^1 שָׁוְא ׀ שָׁקַד שֹׁמֵר; 137^3 שְׁאֵלוּנוּ שׁוֹבֵינוּ ׀ שָׁם.

(6) The pointer sometimes calls attention to 'conflate
readings' of the same word, in which the second form is
usually to be preferred.

> Illustrations are גֵּאָה וְגָאוֹן in Prov. 8^{13} (where the
> pointer follows the forms); יָשִׂישׂוּ ׀ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ in Ps. 40^{17}
> (repeated in 70^5), Ex. 38^9, 1 Sam. 4^{18}, Ps. 10^{14}, Jer.
> 6^{11}. But there is no line with the conflates in Job
> 20^{17}, Jer. 10^{25}.
>
> See also the remarks at p. 51.

(7) The line may also be placed with the first or the
second of two similar *expressions* in immediate proximity.
These, as in cases just indicated, are sometimes really
'conflates,' but other instances are intentional repeti-

* See subsequent remarks on this subject, at p. 112 ff.

tions, slightly varied in the second form, for the sake of rhetorical effect.

> Examples are הַלְלוּיָהּ ׀ הַלְלוּ אֶת־יְהֹוָה in Ps. 148[1], and
> הַלְלוּיָהּ ׀ הַלְלוּ־אֵל in Ps. 150[1]. In Job 13[13, 14], the latter
> verse begins in almost the same form as that in
> which the former ends, thus עָלַי מָה ׃ עַל־מָה; hence the
> notifying line is placed after the second expression.[*]
> Ezek. 3[5, 6] runs thus : ' Not unto a people deep of
> lip and heavy of tongue art thou sent, [but] unto the
> house of Israel. Not unto many peoples, deep of
> lip and heavy of tongue, whose words thou canst
> not understand.' The line at the beginning of v.[6]
> calls attention to the similarity between the words
> there and those at the opening of v.[5].

> See also Hos. 9[7].

(8) The pointer frequently marks *superfluities*, which may be regarded in different ways.

A. As regards their *form*, superfluities may consist of a single letter, or a single word, or several words. It is advisable to consider these classes separately.

(*a*) We shall first consider some cases of *single letters intruded* into the text.

> In Prov. 3[28], the line post-fixed [†] to the form לְרֵעֶיךָ,
> as well as the marginal Qerî,[‡] calls attention to the
> letter י as an intrusion,—for the *singular* (' to thy
> friend '), not the plural, is the correct reading. In
> Josh. 19[11], the pointer prefixed to לְיָמָּה (' to sea-
> ward ') marks the ל as superfluous. In Ps. 10[2], the
> line after יִתָּפְשׂוּ marks the plural form, as well as
> חָשָׁבוּ at the close, as irregular; the omission of the

concluding וֹ in both cases would restore these words
to harmony with the context, which exhibits the
nouns and verbs in the *singular*. In 2 Chron. 23¹⁰,
the line has been inserted to show that the con-
junction before וְאִישׁ is needless. Similarly, the line
inserted in the opening words of Ps. 43¹, viz. שָׁפְטֵנִי
אֱלֹהִים ׀ וְרִיבָה רִיבִי, marks the וֹ as a superfluous addi-
tion. In like manner, the presence of the con-
junction in the expression יִקְרָאֵנִי ׀ וְאֶעֱנֵהוּ Ps. 91¹⁵, is
noted as an enfeebling superfluity. A double illustra-
tion is presented in 1 Chron. 21¹², where לְ before
לְמִשֶּׁנֶת, and וֹ in וְדָבָר are both marked as disturbing
additions. In וְאִם ׀ מִשְּׂדֵה אֲחֻזָּתוֹ Lev. 27¹⁶, the line
obviously marks the following מ as a misleading
dittogram from the word preceding.

For cases in which the Article is marked as
superfluous, see p. 65.

(*b*) We shall next consider cases in which a *single word*
is marked as a foreign element.

The negative in the expression בְּטֶרֶם ׀ לֹא יָבוֹא
('before it comes'), Zeph. 2², is rightly marked as
needless and disturbing; in Esth. 8¹¹, similarly, the
line prefixed to אֲשֶׁר properly indicates that this is
superfluous; while, in 2 Sam. 7²⁴, the second לְךָ is
justly noted as an unnecessary repetition. In 1 Sam.
12²¹ כִּי is marked as a disturbing element which
should be removed; * the same word is similarly
marked as needless in Ex. 12¹⁵˒¹⁹, 1 Sam. 20⁹ 25³⁴,
2 Sam. 12¹⁸ (first occurrence) 14¹⁷, Jer. 4²², Ps. 96⁵,
1 Chron. 21¹⁸. In the unique phrase וְכֹל ׀ יוֹם הַמָּחֳרָת

* The word is not represented in any of the Ancient Versions.

in Num. 11³², the second word is rightly indicated as unnecessary (see the correct phrase in Ex. 32⁶, Num. 17⁶·²³, Jonah 4⁷ etc., where יוֹם does not appear); in Jer. 40⁷, the second הִפְקִיד is noted as superfluous; similarly, in Josh. 19⁴⁷, the first אוֹתָהּ is pointed out as needless. In Zech. 1¹⁷ עוֹד occurs no less than four times; at the beginning, where it is marked by the line, it certainly seems superfluous, yet it may really belong to the end of the preceding verse, as testified by the Septuagint. In Num. 10³², it is enough that וְהָיָה should be used at the beginning of the verse; its second occurrence is thus properly marked as superfluous; the pointer is also placed with the same form, to mark it as unnecessary, in Isa. 4³ 7¹⁸ 11¹¹.* Other instances of superfluous words, marked as such by the pointer, are אֲנַחְנוּ in Gen. 42¹³; לְבְנוּ in Gen. 47²⁹; פֶּתַח (with the double line †) in Num. 4²⁶ (see the correct expression in Ex. 35¹⁷ 39⁴⁰); אֲנִי in Ex. 6⁵; נְתֻנִים in Num. 8¹⁹; לָהֶם in Num. 32³³; אֵלַי in Isa. 31⁴; אֲשֶׁר in Eccles. 8¹⁴; לְךָ in 1 Chron. 17²²; לֵאמֹר in Gen. 42²² and 2 Sam. 2¹; שָׁאוּל in 1 Sam. 29³ and 2 Sam. 3⁸; בֹּל in Lev. 4⁷.

(c) We shall next give instances in which *two or more words together* are marked as superfluous. Such unnecessary insertions are especially frequent in Jeremiah.

In Gen. 16³, according to some editors,‡ אֵשֶׁת אַבְרָם ('the wife of Abram') is preceded by the line, to show that the expression is really a needless

---

* The form, however, is not indicated as superfluous in Isa. 7²¹·²²·²³ etc., though it really *is* needless in these passages. See, further, pp. 51 and 105 ff.

† See pp. 4 and 28.   ‡ See pp. 3 and 105.

repetition of an explanation already given in v.[1].
In Lev. 14[6] וְאֵת ׀ הַצִּפֹּר הַחַיָּה is noted as unnecessary,
seeing that 'the living bird' has already been men-
tioned at the beginning of the verse; and similarly,
in v.[28], the words אֲשֶׁר עַל־כַּפּוֹ are marked as an un-
necessary repetition from the preceding verse. In
Gen. 30[32], the pointer marks the beginning of a
needless insertion, viz. נָקֹד וְטָלוּא וְכָל־שֶׂה, which only
disturbs the flow of the sentence. In Job 32[6], the
line marks 'Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite'
as an unnecessary expression, repeated from v.[2].
In 1 Chron. 2[3], the explanation that Er was 'the
firstborn of Judah,' is marked as really needless (but
not marked in the parallel passage, Gen. 38[7]). In
1 Sam. 10[18], the pointer similarly shows that the
words 'to the children of Israel' may be omitted.
Jer. 38[4] contains two excellent illustrations: both
הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה and בָּעִיר הַזֹּאת are marked as superfluous;
moreover, in v.[20] בְּקוֹל יְהֹוָה is indicated as a redund-
ant insertion. Similarly, in Zech. 3[8] הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל is
pointed out as a superfluity, after the expression has
been already employed in v.[1]; in 2 Sam. 1[6] הַמַּנִּיר לוֹ
is noted as a repetition from the preceding verse;
in Jer. 32[8] אֲשֶׁר ׀ בְּאֶרֶץ בִּנְיָמִן is marked as an unneces-
sary explanation regarding Anathoth; and in Jer.
1[10] הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה is likewise indicated as superfluous. See
also Ps. 92[10] (three words needlessly repeated), 93[3]
(two words unnecessarily repeated); 2 Chron. 18[3]
(unnecessary explanation that Ahab was 'the King
of Israel'), and v.[7] (where the words 'to Jeho-
shaphat' might be omitted: see also 1 Kings 22[8]).
See likewise Josh. 22[32], Jer. 32[36, 43].

A notable illustration under this head, marked by the line, is the familiar formula כֹּה ׀ אָמַר יְהֹוָה, which appears with special frequency in Isaiah: thus 37[6] 45[14] (cf. end of v.[13]) 49[8] (cf. v.[7]) and [25] 50[1] 65[8] (cf. v.[7]) and [13] 66[12]: see also 2 Kings 3[17] 7[1]. Even more frequently is the insertion noted in Jeremiah: see 2[5] 9[22] (cf. v.[21]) 10[2] (cf. v.[1]) 17[5] 19[11] 22[3. 6. 30] (cf. vv.[1] and [2]) 24[8] (cf. v.[5]) 26[2] 29[16] 30[18] 31[6. 14. 15. 34. 36] 33[10] 44[30] etc. etc. In Ezekiel, the similar formula כֹּה־אָמַר ׀ אֲדֹנָי יְהֹוָה is similarly marked: see 5[7] (cf. v.[5]) 13[18. 20] 14[4. 6] 17[3] 20[39] 24[6] 28[2] 29[3] 34[2] 36[6] 37[9] 39[17]. Examination of these passages clearly shows that the additions are superfluous, and interrupt the even flow of the discourse, so that they may, on the warrant of the pointer, be safely omitted without affecting the sense or dignity of the passages in which they now appear.

B. When we further consider the *origin and character* of the superfluities, these may be conveniently arranged in different classes.

(*a*) Some are readily recognisable as natural but *inadvertent repetitions* of what is already in the text.

Thus, in Ps. 86[9], the conjunction before the second of the two verbs יָבֹאוּ ׀ וְיִשְׁתַּחֲווּ seems to be marked as a needless repetition of the last letter in the first; in 1 Sam. 24[10] הַיּוֹם is rightly enclosed within a pair of note-lines to show that it is unnecessary, after 'this day' has previously been given at the beginning of the verse; in Ps. 96[13] כִּי בָא is marked as needlessly repeated; in Josh. 19[47], it is certainly enough that אוֹתָהּ should be used once, so that the

line is rightly placed with the first, to mark it as superfluous. See also 1 Kings $3^{12, 26}$.

(b) Other additions must be regarded as *intentional insertions*.* These, again, form various categories: thus—

1. Explanatory words or clauses were designedly added to the text by a copyist who did not consider the original reading sufficiently clear.

> In Gen. 27^1, it is related of Isaac that 'he called for Esau, his elder son'; the last two words in the Hebrew text (בְּנוֹ הַגָּדֹל) are properly noted as superfluous. In Gen. 47^{29}, where it is recorded of Jacob that 'he called for his son, for Joseph,' לִבְנוֹ is rightly marked as unnecessary. 1 Sam. 29^3 makes mention of 'David, the servant of Saul the king of Israel,' but 'Saul' is marked as an unnecessary explanation. In Gen. 37^{22}, 'Reuben' is marked as needlessly repeated from the previous verse; in Josh. 22^{32}, the line indicates that there is no necessity for repeating, from the preceding verse, the explanation that Phinehas was 'the son of Eleazar the priest'; in Isa. 45^1 לְכוֹרֶשׁ is marked as an explanatory addition to the preceding word, 'to his anointed.'† See another excellent illustration in Gen. 19^{14}, where mention is made of Lot's sons-in-law; also 2 Chron. 18^3 23^{14}.

* J. Olshausen (*Lehrbuch*, § 43), indeed, followed by Ortenberg (in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, vii. 301) and Prätorius (in *Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, liii. 683) held that the *main* purpose of 'Paseq' is to indicate interpolations. It will be admitted, however, that this opinion was rather hastily formed.

† In these last two instances, the pointer *follows* the insertion: see p. 30 ff.

4

2. Closely akin to these explanatory superadditions are *synonymous words* or expressions inserted by later coypists.

Illustrations are found in Ex. 38[9], where we find the expression לְפְאַת ׀ נֶגֶב תֵּימָנָה ('for the region of the South, southward') marked at the proper point by the line,—though a similarly full expression in v.[13] (לִפְאַת קֵדְמָה מִזְרָחָה 'for the region toward the East, eastward') is *not* marked by the sign; in 1 Sam. 5[4], where וּשְׁתֵּי ׀ כַּפּוֹת יָדָיו occurs; in Ps. 71[18], where we find עַד־זִקְנָה ׀ וְשֵׂיבָה 'to old age and hoary age'; in Job 21[28], where attention is called to the expression אַיֵּה אֹהֶל ׀ מִשְׁכְּנוֹת רְשָׁעִים; in Isa. 5[19], presenting יְמַהֵר ׀ יָחִישָׁה ('let him hasten, speed'); in Ps. 40[17] and 70[5], where we find the expression יָשִׂישׂוּ ׀ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ ('let them rejoice, and let them be glad'). See also 2 Kings 11[15], 2 Chron. 23[14] ('the captains of hundreds, officers of the host'), Num. 4[26], 2 Kings 19[4] ('the king of Assyria, his master'), Ex. 7[19].

3. Another class of superfluities, marked by the line, is formed by *pleonasms* which have originated with the transcribers. These redundancies are easily recognised.

In Gen. 42[22], Reuben is represented as having thus addressed his brethren regarding their ill treatment of Joseph, 'Did I not say unto you [saying], Sin not against the youth?' The line before לֵאמֹר here rightly marks it as superfluous. Further, in 1 Kings 19[7] and Isa. 11[11] שֵׁנִית ('again,' 'a second time') is rightly marked as superfluous after a verb which is in itself sufficient to indicate repetition. Similarly, in Gen. 21[14], after the statement that 'Abraham arose early,' it is really unnecessary (cf. 2 Sam. 15[2],

Zeph. 3[7], Gen. 19[2], Jer. 7[13] 35[14] 44[4] etc. etc.) to add בַּבֹּקֶר ('in the morning'); hence the line prefixed to this word. (The sign, however, is not found in Job 1[5], Ex. 8[16] 9[13] etc.)

A common pleonasm, frequently marked as such, is the familiar וַיְהִי ('and it came to pass') in historical narratives: see Ezek. 8[1] 20[1], Jer. 41[1], Neh. 4[1, 10] (though the line is *not* inserted in vv.[6, 9]), Judg. 19[1], 2 Sam. 1[2] etc.

Similarly, in prophetic passages, the connecting formula וְהָיָה ('and it shall come to pass') is frequently marked by the pointer, to show that it may safely be omitted without injury to grammar or sense: see Isa. 2[2] 7[18] (but the line is omitted in vv.[21, 22, 23]) 10[20, 27] 11[11] 23[17], Ezek. 38[10, 18] etc.

Here perhaps may be placed Jer. 28[3] and Num. 11[20], in which 'two years' and 'a month,' respectively, are followed by 'days.'

See also Ex. 6[5], Lev. 10[3], Num. 10[32], 1 Sam. 28[12], 2 Sam. 3[21], 1 Kings 1[32], Jer. 32[36, 43] 38[20] 52[3], Amos 1[2].

4. *Conflate readings* present another class of superfluities. Here the correct reading—or what is supposed to be more correct—usually follows, but sometimes precedes the faulty form; and the pointer is at hand to warn the reader of difficulty in the text.

Examples occur in 1 Sam. 9[10], where the former of the two words לְכָה ׀ נֵלְכָה may safely be omitted as a corruption of the second; in 1 Sam. 4[18], where, instead of the first two forms in the troublesome expression בְּעַד ׀ יַד הַשַּׁעַר, we must simply put בְּיַד as the correct reading; in Ex. 22[24], where we read

אִם־כֶּסֶף ׀ תַּלְוֶה אֶת־עַמִּי אֶת־הֶעָנִי (' If thou lendest money [to my people] to the distressed '), presenting the closing expression as the more correct form of what immediately precedes.*

To this category also belongs Deut. 17[8], which runs thus in the English Version : ' If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke [being], matters of controversy within thy gates, then thou shalt . . . come unto the priests the Levites, and unto the judge . . . and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment.' An attentive reader of even this translation will perceive the difficulty that, while one could expect the controversy to be waged between one *person* and another, we find it represented as lying between one *thing* and another. Yet this is a fair rendering of the troublesome clause in the Massoretic text, which is the following :—

בֵּין־דָּם ׀ לְדָם בֵּין־דִּין לְדִין וּבֵין נֶגַע לָנֶגַע דִּבְרֵי רִיבוֹת

To obtain the correct reading and rendering, let it be observed that the first and second clauses are similar in form, and that the first significantly has the pointer within it; yet neither side presents the correct reading, which, however, may be very simply obtained through careful examination of both, as they are conflate forms. The truth is that all the leading forms here are *active participles*, and signify *persons;* moreover, as the first two sets of expressions are equally traceable to one and the same

---

* It will be observed that the pointer has been inserted too early in this sentence : see p. 33.

genuine reading, this will be obtained only after discarding both of the former and substituting the latter. The restored text then runs thus—

בֵּין־דָּן לְדָן וּבֵין נֶגַע לְנֶגַע דִּבְרֵי רִיבֹת

which may be rendered, ' between one contender and another, and between one smiter and another, stating [their] causes.'

On the other hand, the *second* is the incorrect form —therefore to be discarded—in the following com-binations : 2 Sam. 14[19] אִם־אִשׁ (marked by the note-line succeeding); Ps. 144[1] לְדָוִד ׀ בָּרוּךְ.

See also Ex. 30[34], Judg. 6[2], 1 Sam. 27[1], Ps. 10[9].

5. Other instances, however, of a more striking char-acter occasionally occur. We sometimes find a sudden transition to another subject, after the discourse has been smoothly flowing on, so that it becomes difficult to per-ceive why the interruption was made. The line may mark the turning-point to the new topic.

> In Josh. 13[21], the latter portion of the verse, com-mencing with the words ' and the princes of Midian,' shows slight internal connection with what precedes: the line appears where the addition begins.

> Jer. 12[1-4] contains an address to the Lord by the prophet, who reverently requests an answer to the ever-recurring problem regarding the prosperity of the wicked ; but before the case has been even briefly stated, the discourse is abruptly broken off, and we are face to face with an address to the prophet which can hardly be regarded as a reply from the Lord. The sudden transition, at the beginning of v.[5], is marked by the line.

The fragmentary character of Jer. 29[16], as well
as its want of proper connection with the preceding
verse, seems to be indicated by the line at the
beginning.

See also Gen. 37[2], Ps. 40[6] 42[5], Zech. 3[9] 6[15] 9[11] 13[9].

(9) The note-line often indicates where *omissions* have
been made in the course of transcription.* For the sake
of convenience, these omissions may be simply classified.

(*a*) Omission of a *single letter* is not uncommon.

In Jer. 7[9], the line in the expression הֲגָנֹב ׀ רָצֹחַ calls
attention to the omission of the conjunction ו before
the second word : see the succeeding infinitives, to
all of which the conjunction is prefixed. In Num.
4[19], the opening words וְזֹאת ׀ עֲשׂוּ are marked to show
the inadvertent omission of ת from the beginning of
the verb (which should be the future תַּעֲשׂוּ) ; the dis-
appearance was most natural after the occurrence of
the same letter at the end of the demonstrative pro-
noun preceding.   In the expression עַל־כֵּן ׀ קָרָא שְׁמָהּ
Judg. 15[19], the note-line similarly indicates the omis-
sion of נ (quite naturally after the same letter pre-
ceding) from the verb-form, which should therefore
be נִקְרָא ; the restored text will then be rendered,
'therefore its name was called.' In Gen. 35[5], the
unique construct form חִתַּת ('fear'), to which the line
is prefixed, is obviously a mutilated reading which

---

* A glimpse of this important principle was obtained by Dr. Wickes,
who says in a footnote on p. 129 of his *Treatise on Prose Accents*,
'Attention may be drawn to Judg. 16[2], 1 Sam. 16[7], and 2 Chron. 21[19],
where Legarmeh seems to indicate defective grammatical construc-
tion, as Paseq in 2 Kings 25[4].'

has arisen through the omission of the initial מ from
מִחִתַּת. In Ps. 74[18], the line after חֵרֵף indicates the
omission, from the end of this form, of the pronoun-
affix of the second person; as shown by the succeed-
ing parallel member, we must read חֵרֶפְךָ, and render
'hath reproached thee.' In Ps. 78[6], the line following
יֵדְעוּ shows the omission there of the pronoun-affix ם,
which is required to complete the sense ('that they
might know [them]'). In Isa. 63[1], the line in the
expression מִי־זֶה ׀ בָּא calls attention to the omission
of the article, which naturally took place after the
preceding ה.* In Ps. 119[69], the line after לֵב indicates
that it stands for לִבִּי, so that the expression may be
rendered 'with my whole heart,' as has been done
by the Septuagint translator.

(*b*) Omission of *single words* is somewhat common.

In Ps. 33[12] (the only verse in this Psalm which
contains the pointer), attention is obviously called to
the omission of אֲשֶׁר, the relative. In Ps. 45[13], the
line appears at a point where a verb must be supplied:
'the daughter of Tyre [shall come] with a gift.' In
Deut. 3[20], from between the words יְהֹוָה ׀ לַאֲחֵיכֶם, as
shown by the presence of the line, there has taken
place the omission of אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, which would most
naturally be neglected on account of its similarity
to the word following. In Josh. 6[24], the line before
הַכֶּסֶף marks the omission there of כְּלִי, which appears
in the clause following. In Gen. 1[30], the *noun* רֶמֶשׂ
has very naturally been omitted (where the line is
inserted) before the *participle* רוֹמֵשׂ now remaining in

* For fuller illustrations of the omission of the article, see p. 64.

the text: cf. v.[26] and 8[17]. In Jer. 7[14], the line calls attention to the omission of הַזֶּה after לַבַּיִת; the full expression has previously been given in v.[11]. From the expression וְאֹתָהּ ׀ נָתַן לָכֶם in Lev. 10[17], the subject יְהוָֹה has strangely been omitted at the point marked by the inserted line. In the titles of Ps. 69 and 72, the line points to the omission of 'a psalm,' which must be supplied to render the heading more intelligible. In Ps. 80[2], which consists of three parallel lines, the pointer—which is inserted too soon— indicates the omission of an imperative (perhaps another 'hear') after the imperfect middle clause, 'thou that leadest Joseph like a flock.' In Eccles. 2[12], the pointer prepares us for the omission of a verb ('can do'), which must obviously be supplied to make sense; in 4[8] also, a like omission of a verb is marked. In Cant. 5[2], the line prepares us for the subsequent omission of the participle 'saying'; a similar omission is indicated in Isa. 18[2] by the line inserted at a later point. In Ezek. 3[13], the pointer indicates that we must supply 'I heard,' so as to complete the sense. In Jer. 50[34], the line after the opening word וְאֻלָם points to the natural omission, before it, of the similar form וְאֻלָם 'nevertheless,' which must be restored to bring out the contrast between this verse and that which precedes. In Ps. 88[14], the pointer indicates the omission, where it stands, of לַיְלָה ('in the night'), which must be replaced in order to form the contrast with 'and in the morning' which follows. In Isa. 49[5], the pointer obviously marks the probable omission of 'thus' from the opening words, 'And now saith the Lord.' In 2 Sam.

14^{32}, the sign marks the probable omission, where it stands, of מַלְאָךְ (' a messenger '), which would naturally be dropped from between the now adjoining words אֵלָיו ׀ לֵאמֹר, which have so many letters in common. In Ps. 109^{21}, the line at the opening of the verse forewarns us that חֶסֶד has been omitted between עֲשֵׂה אִתִּי (as shown in the Septuagint). In Deut. 11^2, the pointer marks the omission of ' I speak,' as supplied in most Versions; and in 2 Sam. 24^{16}, it notes the need of a preposition in the statement that 'the angel stretched forth his hand [over] Jerusalem.' In Jer. 19^4 the line marks the omission of the subject, which may be either 'my people,' or 'the children of Israel.' In 2 Kings 7^1, the presence of the line in the expression כָּעֵת ׀ מָחָר notes the inadvertent omission of the resemblant verb-form תִּפָּכֵר, which must be replaced in order to complete the announcement of the prophet thus: 'About this time to-morrow [there shall be sold] a measure of fine flour for a shekel. . . .'

(c) The omission of *two or more words* is not very common; but instances do occur, and are sometimes marked.

In Gen. 3^{22}, the *second* line (at וְעַתָּה ׀ פֶּן) evidently prepares us for the anacolouthon following; after 'Now therefore, lest . . .' we should certainly expect the expression of such a practical conclusion as 'let us drive him forth,' but this is left to be inferred from the context. In Ex. 13^{17}, the line marks a similarly incomplete sentence. Gen. 37^2 opens with the words, 'These are the generations of Jacob,' a formula which leads us to expect a detailed list of

his descendants, as in 10¹ 11¹⁰· ²⁷ 25¹²· ¹⁹; but as this
is not given, the line is inserted to mark the blank.
In 2 Kings 25⁴, the second line warns the reader of
omissions, which can be supplied from the parallel
account in Jer. 39⁴. In Zech. 6¹⁵, the line seems to
be a premonition of the anacolouthon at the end of
the verse.

See also Ps. 40⁶ 66⁷, Hos. 7¹⁶, Zech. 3⁹ 9¹¹.

(10) The pointer is sometimes employed for directing
attention to single *words with some peculiarity*, or irregu-
larity. Such a term may be (*a*) a proper name; (*b*) a rare,
or unique, or poetic word; (*c*) an unusual grammatical
form; or (*d*) a word of unusual or doubtful meaning.

(*a*) We shall first cite instances in which the line marks
a peculiarity in the *form of a proper name*.

This is noted in Hag. 1¹², where the contracted
form שְׁלְתִּיאֵל is for the first time found instead of the
full form שְׁאַלְתִּיאֵל in 1¹ and 2²³. (The short form
also appears later, in 2², but is there left unmarked:
see p. 107.) Similarly, in Ex. 4¹⁸, attention is called
by the line to the variant form יֶתֶר, instead of יִתְרוֹ
(Moses' father-in-law), as given in 3¹. In Ps. 81⁶,
the mark is prefixed to the unusual form בִּיהוֹסֵף in-
stead of בְּיוֹסֵף (' in Joseph '). In Prov. 25¹, the pointer
marks the *short* form חִזְקִיָּה of the name of the king
of Judah, Hezekiah, instead of the usual חִזְקִיָּהוּ (as
in 2 Kings 18⁹ etc.); on the other hand, the *longer*
form יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ is also specially noted by the line prefixed
in 1 Chron. 4⁴¹.* Similarly, in Amos 1¹, the line

* See further remarks at p. 114.

before עֻזִּיָּה has been placed there for the purpose of calling attention to the short form of the name of the king of Judah found here, instead of the fuller form עֻזִּיָּהוּ as in Isa. 1¹ and elsewhere.

Specially noteworthy is the insertion of the line to mark the *unique occurrence of a proper name*, particularly a *foreign* name. Thus, in 1 Sam. 26⁶, attention is called to Ahimelech the Hittite, whose name does not appear elsewhere; the unique occurrence also, in Jer. 40⁸, of עֵיפַי (Qerî), a man's name, and in v.¹⁴ of בַּעֲלִים, a king of the Ammonites, is noted by the line; in Prov. 30¹ אָגוּר is marked for the same reason. The name of a mountain called אֲמָנָה is marked in Cant. 4⁸ as occurring there only. Foreign names specially marked as such, by the line, are נִסְרֹךְ and others following in Isa. 37³⁸ and 2 Kings 19³⁷; the name of *each* of Haman's ten sons has the sign prefixed in Esth. 9⁷·⁸·⁹; the mark is likewise placed before 'Persia and Media' in Esth. 1³·¹⁴·¹⁸, and before 'India' in Esth. 8⁹; in Ezek. 47¹⁶ 'Berothah, Sibraim,' are marked, by the prefixed line, as elsewhere unknown.

See also Jer. 25²⁵.

(b) Rare or unique occurrence of certain appellatives is frequently marked by the line.

Thus, יְקוּם in Gen. 7²³ is noted as uncommon; in Josh. 13³ and Judg. 3³, attention is called to the peculiar designation סַרְנֵי פְלִשְׁתִּים ('lords of the Philistines'); in Cant. 4¹⁴ כַּרְכֹּם ('saffron'?) is marked as unique, and several words similarly in Esth. 1⁶. For the same reason we find the sign with גַּלְמִי in Ps.

139[16], with קְמָשׁוֹנִים in Prov. 24[31], with סַד in Job 13[27], with עֲלוּקָה in Prov. 30[15].

See also Josh. 20[9], 2 Chron. 26[15].

(*c*) The pointer is often associated with *unusual grammatical forms*.

Examples appear in Gen. 1[29], where, instead of the Qal participle זֹרֵעַ, we should certainly expect the Hiphil participle מַזְרִיעַ, as in vv.[11, 12]; in Ps. 9[14], where חׇנְנֵי is found instead of the usual חׇנֵּנִי; in Prov. 9[7], where יֹסֵר unexpectedly occurs instead of the more correct Piel participle מְיַסֵּר; in Isa. 4[4], where רׇחַץ is marked as less likely than יִרְחַץ to be the proper form; in Gen. 15[1], Esth. 3[1], where the form אַחַר is pointed out as less common than אַחֲרֵי; in Ex. 8[5], where the singular form לְמׇתַי is noted as less correct than the simple מׇתַי; in Josh. 3[4], where the adjectival form רׇחוֹק is indicated as less likely than the noun-form רֹחַק to be correct; in Ruth 1[13], where the unexpected form לׇהֵן is noted as actually found instead of the correct (masculine) לׇהֶם; in Num. 11[15] and Deut. 5[24], showing the abnormal אַתְּ, for which אַתׇּה should be substituted; in Ps. 41[3], with יְשַׁמְּרֵהוּ, instead of which יִשְׁמְרֵנּוּ should rather be expected; in Hag. 2[12], where the Aramaising form הֵן (' if ') occurs, instead of the more classical אִם, which actually appears in the next verse. In Deut. 14[28], attention is called to the long form מִקְצֵה (' at the end of '), with the same meaning as the short form מִקֵּץ in 15[1].

See also Lev. 13[55], Ps. 62[4, 11] 65[10] 76[6] 77[18], Jer. 2[24], Job 16[12], Esth. 1[5], Deut. 28[57].

(*d*) The line marks *words bearing an unusual meaning or application* in the following passages : —

In Gen. 13[16] אֲשֶׁר must either be held to signify
'so that,' or is superfluous; in Gen. 2[5] שִׂיחַ bears
the singular sense of 'bush' or 'shrub'; in Prov.
24[16] שֶׁבַע signifies 'seven times,' but this meaning
would more commonly be conveyed by the fuller
expression שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים; in Deut. 7[12] עֵקֶב is marked
as bearing the exceptional sense of 'if,' though
generally signifying 'because'; in Ezek. 5[1] חֶרֶב,
though usually meaning 'a sword,' is noted as bear-
ing the unusual sense of 'a knife'; in 2 Chron. 5[1],
'the holy things of David' is with good reason
marked as a singular expression; in Gen. 23[17] וַיָּקָם
has received the line at its side to mark the strange
use of the verb, though the form is really a corruption
of וַיִּקֶן 'and it was purchased'; in Prov. 8[21], the
pointer beside יֵשׁ calls attention to the special mean-
ing that must be attached to this term, which is
commonly affirmed to be 'substance,' *i.e.* wealth;
in Num. 4[9] בֶּגֶד has received the line to mark its
unique application to denote a covering for the ark,
as elsewhere it means an article of wearing apparel.
In like manner, attention is called by the line in
2 Kings 20[5] to the unexpected designation of King
Hezekiah, in the Divine message, as נְגִיד עַמִּי 'prince
of my people'; and in 1 Kings 11[34], where King
Solomon is called נָשִׂיא 'prince.'

See also 2 Kings 4[13], Ps. 69[16], Prov. 6[9], Neh. 2[6].

(*e*) The line sometimes also marks *words of doubtful
meaning*; in such cases, however, the forms may really
prove to be questionable readings.

Thus, in 1 Chron. 15[27] מְכֻרְבָּל, marked by the sign,
is generally supposed to mean 'clothed'; but it may

be an obscured form of a familiar term. Again, in
1 Chron. 8³⁸ בִּכְרוּ is generally regarded as the name
of a person ('Bocheru'); but the line preceding in-
dicates a doubt whether it should not rather be read
בְּכֹרוֹ 'his firstborn,' and thus be viewed as explicative
of the person previously named. In Prov. 30⁸, the
line prefixed to the second of the first three words
evidently means that this may otherwise be pointed
וְדֹבֵר or וְדַבֵּר, and thus translated 'and one who
speaks,' or 'and utterance,' either of which render-
ings would be as suitable as that indicated by the
Massoretes.

See also Isa. 49²¹, 1 Chron. 12⁴⁰.

(*f*) The pointer may call attention to *unique forms*
(ἅπαξ λεγόμενα), whose genuineness or signification is
thereby questioned.

Ps. 68¹⁷ opens with the expression לָמָּה ׀ תְּרַצְּדוּן
הָרִים, in which the line is prefixed to the verb-form
in order to show that this is absolutely unparalleled
by any other from the same 'root,'—if root there
be; the meaning of the word is quite uncertain,
though Gesenius renders it 'observe insidiously.'
Frequently, however, it is read תִּרְקְדוּן ('leap,' or
'skip'), but a more simple and suitable emendation
is תִּרְעֲדוּ ('tremble' for fear).

Ps. 72¹⁶, which somewhat interrupts the even flow
of the poem, begins with the words יְהִי פִסַּת־בַּר ׀ בָּאָרֶץ,
showing the pointer-line post-fixed * to a compound
expression difficult to explain, especially because the
supposed noun פִּסָּה occurs nowhere else in Scripture,

* See p. 30, footnote.

and no satisfactory meaning has yet been attached
to the form, though it has variously been alleged to
signify ' abundance,' or ' a handful.'

In Ps. 89[9], which begins a direct address to the
Almighty, there first appears a pointer that may
merely be an anticipation of the second; this is
placed beside a unique form. After the question,
' Who is like unto thee ? ' there follows the remark-
able expression חֲסִין יָהּ, the first word of which
occurs nowhere else, and is really difficult to explain,
though some commentators render the words by ' a
strong one [is] Jah.'

In Ps. 55[16], the opening word, marked by the line,
is ישימות, which some expositors read as יְשִׁימוֹת and
explain as ' desolations'; but the Qerî is יַשִּׁיא מָוֶת
' let death deceive [them],' while a bolder rendering
would be יַשִּׁיגֵם מָוֶת ' let death overtake them.'

Deut. 27[9] contains the expression הַסְכֵּת וּשְׁמַע,
showing the pointer beside the opening word, which
occurs here only. Perhaps this is merely an aural
error of transcription for הִשְׁקֵט which appears else-
where (Isa. 7[4] etc.) in similar circumstances, bearing
the meaning ('be quiet') that should most probably
be attached to the form here.

The opening words of Ps. 55[23] are usually rendered,
' Cast upon the Lord thy burden.' But the Hebrew
term יְהָבְךָ, forming the object in this brief sentence,
appears nowhere else in Scripture, and is of wholly
uncertain origin, so that its meaning can only be con-
jectured. The early scribe who here inserted the line
has thereby recorded his perplexity with this word,
which some later interpreters have supposed to mean

'grief.' The form still awaits a satisfactory explanation. In 1 Kings 19⁸, attention is called by the line to the unique form אֲכִילָה (with the article prefixed), for which אֹכֶל 'food,' would rather have been expected.

See also Gen. 38²⁴, Josh. 20⁹, Judg. 6², Job 19³, Jer. 11¹⁶, Ezek. 17⁹.

(11) The pointer is frequently employed to mark peculiar or *abnormal constructions in grammar*. Such divergences are various, but they may be conveniently classified.

(*a*) Irregularities in the *use of the article* are sometimes noted by the line.

(α) The *absence* of the article may be marked at points where it should normally appear.

Thus, in 2 Kings 20¹³, attention is called to the construction in אֶת ו שֶׁמֶן הַטּוֹב ; in Ps. 146⁶, we are invited to consider עָשָׂה ו שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ, all the more because the article *is* used before the object immediately following (viz. 'the sea'); in Isa. 63¹, we are called to note מִי זֶה ו בָּא, where the omission of the article from the last term may be regarded as an instance of haplography, due to the influence of the preceding demonstrative (see similar instances in Job 38² 42³); in Deut. 31³, the sign distinctly notes the article as absent in the expression הוּא ו עֹבֵר לְפָנֶיךָ; while its presence, on the other hand, is marked with equal distinctness in vv.⁶,⁸, where we find the expression הוּא ו הַהֹלֵךְ לְפָנֶיךָ; in Lev. 11²⁷ וְכֹל ו הֹלֵךְ is all the more noteworthy because similar expressions in the preceding verses, and following in the same verse, *have* the article; in 2 Sam. 20³, the line calls attention to

the double omission of the article from the two con-
secutive defined nouns in the expression 'the ten
women, the concubines.' Highly instructive is the
expression הָאִישׁ ׀ לְבֻשׁ הַבַּדִּים ('the man clothed with
the linen garments') found in Ezek. 9^{11} and 10^2, with
which must be compared הָאִישׁ הַלָּבֻשׁ הַבַּדִּים, the fuller
construction previously given in 9^3. The absence of
the article is similarly noted in שְׁלֹשָׁה ׀ קְנֵי מְנוֹרָה ('three
branches of the lampstand') Ex. 25^{32} and 37^{18}; and
in the unvarying expression אֶת ׀ אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד ('the tent
of tryst') in Ex. 31^7 etc. The line prefixed to the
defective expression בַּלַּיְלָה הוּא in Gen. 32^{23} marks it
as notable, and invites comparison with the full con-
struction בַּלַּיְלָה הַהוּא given in the verse immediately
preceding.

(β) At other times, the pointer calls attention to the
abnormal presence of the article.

Thus, in 2 Kings 25^4 and Zech. 1^8, the sign has
been placed before הַלַּיְלָה, which properly signifies
'to-night' (or 'this night'), but must in both pas-
sages—as the context shows—be rendered 'by night,'
i.e. לַיְלָה. In Jer. 38^6, the irregular attachment of the
article to a construct noun is noted in the expression
הַבּוֹר ׀ מַלְכִּיָּהוּ 'the cistern-prison of Malchiah,' and
a like irregularity is marked in Ezek. 21^{27}, where we
find הַקֶּסֶם יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם 'the divination of Jerusalem.' In
Isa. 63^{11}, the line is prefixed to הַמַּעֲלֵם 'he who
brought them up,' a Hiphil participle to which a
pronominal suffix as well as the article is attached;
the same accumulation is again marked, anticipat-
ively, in Ps. 81^{11}, where we find the form הַמַּעַלְךָ 'he

5

who brought thee up.' The line likewise calls attention, in Num. 7[7.8], to the definite forms of expression וְאֵת ׀ אַרְבַּע הָעֲגָלֹת and אֵת ׀ שְׁתֵּי הָעֲגָלֹת ('the two waggons,' 'and the four waggons'), instead of which the context rather leads us to expect indefinite expressions, *without* the article and the accusatival sign ('two waggons,' 'and four waggons'); and again, in Num. 35[14], to אֵת ׀ שְׁלֹשׁ הֶעָרִים, instead of which we certainly rather expect an indefinite expression (viz. 'three cities'). In Prov. 30[19], the presence of the article in הַנֶּשֶׁר 'the eagle,' is marked as abnormal when the form is compared with like nouns, in succeeding clauses, *without* the article; similarly, in Ps. 65[14], הַצֹּאן is noted as not in accordance with the corresponding noun, which wants the article, in the second parallel member of the verse.

See other instances in 1 Sam. 11[7], Ps. 104[25] 106[48] (latter half, two cases) 129[8], Jer. 31[39] 48[27].

(*b*) The pointer sometimes marks *unusual constructions of nouns*. Such instances may advantageously be classified. Thus—

(*a*) Attention is called to cases in which a noun is found in the *absolute state*, when the construct might rather have been expected.

In Neh. 2[12] we find אֲנָשִׁים ׀ מְעַט 'a few men,' instead of אַנְשֵׁי מְעַט, or אֲנָשִׁים מְעַטִּים; and in 1 Sam. 10[3] we find שְׁלֹשָׁה גְדָיִים 'three kids,' though the construct form שְׁלֹשֶׁת occurs in the next clause.

(*β*) On the other hand, uncommon uses of the *construct state* may be noted by the line.

Instances are שֹׁכְבֵי קֶבֶר 'lying [in] the grave,' Ps.
88⁶; עֹבְרֵי ׀ בְּעֵמֶק הַבָּכָא 'those passing through the
valley of Baca,' Ps. 84⁷; חֲמִשָּׁה חַלֻּקֵי אֲבָנִים 'five smooth
stones,' 1 Sam. 17¹⁰. See also Zech. 8¹⁷, Ps. 127²,
1 Kings 2³¹ ('blood shed causelessly').

(γ) Circumlocutions for expressing the genitival idea by
means of לְ, may be indicated by the line.

Examples are קֶרֶן ׀ לְעַמּוֹ 'the horn of his people,'
Ps. 148¹⁴; כֹּהֲנִים ׀ לַיהוָֹה 'priests of Jehovah,' 2 Chron.
26¹⁷; שַׁבָּת ׀ לַיהוָֹה 'the sabbath of Jehovah,' Deut. 5¹⁴.

(δ) Abnormal *insertion of a word between a construct
noun and its genitive* may be noted by the pointer.

Cases are מְקוֹם־שָׁם קֶבֶר 'a place of burial there,'
Ezek. 39¹¹; and the *second* clause in Ex. 26²˙⁸, which
must be rendered 'and the breadth of the second
curtain [was] four cubits.'

(ε) The line may mark a noun placed absolutely and
without inflection at the beginning of its own clause,
sometimes for the sake of emphasis.

Examples are כֶּסֶף in Ex. 21³²; אֹרֶךְ in Ezek. 40⁴⁷;
תְּשֻׁאוֹת in Isa. 22²; שָׁמַיִם in Ps. 89³.

(ζ) Singular for plural.

Thus בֵּית instead of בָּתֵּי 'in the houses of,' 2 Kings
17²⁹.

(η) A suffixed noun, instead of the absolute form followed
by a 'dative.'

In Ps. 115⁷ 'their hands' is noted as an irregular
construction for 'hands [are] to them,' as in vv.⁵˙⁶

(But the sign is not repeated at the similarly irregular
form following ['their feet'].)

(*c*) The line sometimes calls attention to *abnormal
arrangement of attributives*, which should succeed their
principals instead of being placed in front.

> Illustrations are זֶה ׀ מֹשֶׁה 'this Moses,' Ex. 32[1. 23];
> זֶה ׀ לַחְמֵנוּ 'this bread of ours,' Josh. 9[12]; זֶה ׀ אֱלֹהִים
> 'this God,' Ps. 48[15].   See also 1 Chron. 26[26].

(*d*) The *omission of the relative sign* אֲשֶׁר is sometimes
marked by the line.

> Instances are הָעָם ׀ בָּחַר 'the people [whom] he
> chose,' Ps. 33[12]; בְּיוֹם ׀ הִצִּיל 'on the day [when] he
> delivered,' Ps. 18[1]; אַשְׁרֵי ׀ תִּבְחַר 'blessed [is he whom]
> thou dost choose,' Ps. 65[5].   See also Ps. 74[2].

(*e*) The line may mark *want of agreement* between subject
and predicate.

> In Ps. 55[22], attention is called to the plural pre-
> dicate חָלְקוּ, whose subject ('his mouth') is singular,*
> and in Ps. 66[4] similarly to the formal incongruity
> in כָּל־הָאָרֶץ ׀ יִשְׁתַּחֲווּ לְךָ 'all the earth shall worship
> thee.'

(*f*) The line frequently calls attention to *noteworthy
constructions of verbs*.   Such cases may conveniently be
classified thus—

(*a*) The sign often marks an *unusual regimen of a verb*
in relation to its object, especially when the completion of
its essential idea is effected by means of a preposition not
ordinarily thus employed.

---

* But perhaps the genuine reading is חָלָק (adj.) 'smooth.'

In Ps. 18[1], we are called to observe the construction דִּבֶּר ׀ לַיהֹוָה, as the preposition commonly employed is אֶל; in v.[7], note is made of the simple accusative in the expression אֶקְרָא ׀ יְהֹוָה, instead of the indirect government by means of אֶל; and in v.[51], the exceptional construction עֹשֶׂה חֶסֶד ׀ לִמְשִׁיחוֹ (instead of the normal connection by means of the preposition עִם) is similarly marked. In Ps. 31[15], attention is called to the unusual construction עָלֶיךָ בָטַחְתִּי ' upon thee did I trust'; the preposition אֶל appears in v.[7], but the connection of the verb with its object is normally affected by means of בְּ. In Ps. 137[6], note is made of the abnormal regimen in the expression תִּדְבַּק לְשׁוֹנִי ׀ לְחִכִּי ' let my tongue cleave to my palate,' where the preposition בְּ would rather have been expected; and of the construction זְכֹר יְהֹוָה ׀ לִבְנֵי אֱדוֹם 'remember, O Lord, the children of Edom,' in v.[7], where the direct accusative could have been used instead. Other instances, in which a preposition is abnormally introduced, particularly between a verb and its object, are in 1 Sam. 1[11] תִּרְאֶה ׀ בָעֳנִי אֲמָתֶךָ 'thou wilt behold the distress of thine handmaid'; in Ps. 146[7] עֹשֶׂה מִשְׁפָּט ׀ לַעֲשׁוּקִים 'executing judgment for oppressed ones'; and in v.[9] יְהֹוָה ׀ שֹׁמֵר אֶת־גֵּרִים 'the Lord preserveth strangers.' See also Josh. 1[15], Ps. 40[10], 138[2], Eccles. 6[2], Jer. 46[28], Ezek. 18[20].

On the other hand, the *absence* of a connecting preposition, between a verb and its object, may be marked by the line, as in Deut. 3[27] ('go up [to] the top of Pisgah'), Ezek. 11[13] ('and I cried [with] a loud voice'; compare 1 Sam. 28[12], Neh. 9[4] etc., where בְּ is used). See also Ps. 2[12], 18[7].

imperfect, even in narrating what is past (see Gen.
37¹⁸, Ex. 1¹⁹, Jer. 1⁵ *twice*).

(*h*) The pointer frequently marks an abrupt *change of
construction* during the course of a sentence.

> In Mal. 2¹¹, after the feminine has been employed,
> in the first part of the verse, in describing the wicked-
> ness of apostate Judah, a sudden change to the
> masculine is marked in the latter half, commencing
> כִּי ׀ חִלֵּל יְהוּדָה. In Ps. 10², after beginning has been
> made with the singular, there comes a transition to
> the plural, in the forms יִתְפְּשׂוּ and חָשְׁבוּ: the line has
> been inserted into the text to note the change.
> Similarly, in Ps. 32⁹, after the singular has been
> used in the preceding verses, note is made, by the
> pointer, of transition to the plural in the expression·
> אַל־תִּהְיוּ. In Gen. 14², after the preposition אֵת has
> been prefixed to the names of the first *two* kings, it
> is omitted—and the inserted line calls attention to
> the fact—before the names of the remainder. In
> the middle of Ex. 12¹⁵, the line gives forewarning of
> a sudden change in construction: 'for, every one
> that eateth leaven,—that soul shall be cut off': a
> similar example appears in v.¹⁹. Lev. 11²⁷ presents
> a more lengthy illustration: 'And everything that
> goeth . . .—whosoever toucheth their carcase shall
> be unclean.' The line in Ex. 34¹⁵ marks striking
> changes of construction,—first, from the second
> person singular 'thou,' next to the third person
> plural 'they,' and then to the indefinite third person
> singular 'one.' The pointer at the beginning of
> Deut. 4⁵ marks a rapid and remarkable transition
> from the second person singular to the second person

plural : רְאֵה ׀ לִמַּדְתִּי אֶתְכֶם ' See [thou], I have taught
you.' Change from the second person to the third
is expressly noted by the pointer at the opening of
Ps. 135⁹ 'He sent signs and wonders into the
midst of thee, O Egypt, upon Pharaoh and·all his
servants.' In Ex. 35²², the line inserted in the ex-
pression בֹּל ׀ נְדִיב לֵב notes the sudden occurrence of
the singular form (instead of נְדִיבֵי) in the midst of
plurals. In Jer. 46¹⁶, change from the singular of
the imperative to the plural of the cohortative is pre-
sented in the expression קוּמָה ׀ וְנָשֻׁבָה (but probably
the first of these forms should be נָקוּמָה).

See also Gen. 37²⁰, Lev. 10⁶, Ps. 5⁷, Jer. 13¹⁰ 30¹⁵.

(*i*) The insertion of the line may be prompted by a
desire for a more suitable arrangement of verses.

> In Ps. 96¹³, the first two words at the beginning,
> viz. 'before the Lord,' cut off by the line which
> follows, certainly find a more fitting position at the
> end of the preceding verse. (But the line may
> likewise call attention to the remarkable repetition
> immediately following, viz. 'for he comes, for he
> comes.' *) See also Zech. 1¹⁷.

(12) The note-line is frequently inserted to point out the
order of words as remarkable at least, if not questionable.
The cases in which a peculiar arrangement of the members
in a sentence is thus noted may naturally be disposed in
two different classes.

(*a*) Certain words may purposely be placed in unusual
positions for the sake of emphasis.

* See p. 48.

Thus, in Neh. 2^2, the subject is marked by the line as intentionally placed before its predicate, for emphasis : ' Why is *thy face* sad, seeing that thou art not ill ? ' In Job 14^{19}, the object is noted by the sign as purposely put first, to give it special prominence : '[Even] *stones* the waters wear away.' Lev. 11^{26}, which treats of unclean animals that were not to be eaten, distinguishes them as ' not cleaving the *hoof*, and not chewing the *cud*': these objects are placed in the beginning of their respective clauses, and have the line inserted beside them to certify that the words are thereby intentionally emphasised. Similarly, the line in 2 Kings 5^{11} seems to have been inserted where it now appears, to assure us that the unusual arrangement of the members in the sentence was made for the purpose of producing special emphasis : ' Surely he will come out to *me!*'

(*b*) More numerous are instances in which the line marks *inadvertent displacement, by an early transcriber, of words* from their natural order in the sentence.

In Ruth 4^{11}, the sign calls attention to the order in which Jacob's two wives are mentioned, viz. ' Rachel and Leah ' (not ' Leah and Rachel '); and in the same book, 1^2, the names of Naomi's sons are similarly marked as given in the order, ' Mahlon and Chilion,' whereas, in 4^9, the order is ' Chilion and Mahlon.' In 2 Sam. 3^{18}, we are called by the presence of the pointer to observe the unusual order of the words 'David my servant,' because the normal arrangement (see $7^{5.\ 8.\ 26}$ $14^{19.\ 20}$ etc.) is ' my servant David'; and in the same book, 4^9, the order of the

names of those who murdered Ishbosheth is specially
noted as 'Rechab and Baanah,' because, in v.[2], men-
tion had first been made of Baanah, then of Rechab.
Similarly, in Jer. 14[16], the prefixed line calls attention
to the order of the words, 'the famine and the
sword,' inasmuch as vv.[12, 13, 15] had previously pre-
sented these in reverse order. In Judg. 21[22] אֵלֵינוּ is
properly marked as placed rather late in the sentence,
for it should immediately follow יָבֹאוּ; and in Ps.
49[11] כִּי should not begin but come second in the
sentence, so that this may be read, 'He seeth that
wise men die.' In Ps. 28[1] 'my rock' should not
be separated from יְהֹוָה by אֶקְרָא, but should come
between these words, where the line appears. Josh.
19[51] shows בְּגוֹרָל ('by lot') with a double note-line *
as placed rather late within its own proposition,
where it should occupy a position nearer the verb.
In Ex. 29[27], the line, though inserted prematurely,†
points to the fact that the relative clause אֲשֶׁר הוּנַף
comes too late; it should immediately follow its
antecedent, 'the breast of the wave-offering.' In
Ps. 18[50] יְהֹוָה is marked as appearing rather late
within its own proposition (see the parallel in 2 Sam.
22[50], where it rightly comes earlier); for the same
reason אֱלֹהָי in Ps. 86[8], יְהֹוָה in Ps. 108[4], רֵעֵהוּ in Ps.
101[5], and נַפְשִׁי in Ps. 142[8] have the line prefixed to
them. The line in Ps. 119[156], after רַבִּים, shows that
this word, as the predicate, should stand first in the
verse; and the sign in Isa. 10[14] indicates that יָדִי
('my hand') should be placed earlier, immediately
after its verb. In 1 Sam. 14[47] סָבִיב is noted as

appearing too early; similarly, in Isa. 4^5 יוֹמָם is marked as introduced too soon, and thus disturbing the close connection between 'cloud and smoke.' In Ezek. 26^{15}, and again in 38^{14}, the interrogative הֲלֹא is pointed out as awkwardly suspended at the beginning of its own clause, while its verb, which should follow as soon as possible after, is not introduced till near the end of the sentence. Isa. 66^{20} presents an excellent illustration of perplexity caused through transposition of words and clauses; the introduction of the lines is obviously intended to assist in reducing the whole to better order.

See also Gen. 17^{14}, Lev. 20^5, Num. 9^{10} 31^{30} (cf. the proper order in v.^{47}), Jer. 42^6, Ezek. 24^{17}, Mic. 5^4, Ps. 3^1 $24^{7.9}$ 39^{13} 69^7 116^1, I Chron. 2^{25} (cf. the normal order in 9^5), Neh. 8^{17}, 2 Sam. 6^2.

(13) The line frequently points to a strange expression or *startling statement*, calculated to raise doubt as to its accuracy.* This sense of difficulty apparently led to the insertion of the line, which may accordingly be regarded, in such cases, as essentially a query introduced by an observant scribe.

In Judg. 1^7, we find the sign at the remarkable statement that 'seventy kings' (שִׁבְעִים ׀ מְלָכִים), with their thumbs and their great toes cut off, gathered their meat under his table; the number seems incredible,—even though we should take the 'kings' to be but petty chiefs,—and we should probably read

---

* For the present, we have to consider mainly the question of *fact*. At a later stage (p. 78), attention will be turned to the removal of such difficulties by means of textual emendations.

'seven.' In Josh. 5⁶, the mark is placed at the
statement, 'For forty years (כִּי ׀ אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה) the
children of Israel walked in the wilderness'; obvi-
ously, the number is merely approximate, and the
correct reading probably is כְּאַרְבָּעִים ('nearly forty').
A querying line is similarly placed after the state-
ment, in 1 Chron. 29²³, that 'Solomon sat on the
throne of Jehovah' (כִּסֵּא יְהֹוָה). In Judg. 20²³, the
mark is placed at the beginning, where we read that
'all' the men of Israel rose up out of their place to
set themselves in battle-array; this statement is
somewhat surprising in view of what is immediately
added, that 'the ambush of Israel' simultaneously
arose from their place, for attack. Similarly, in
Lev. 4⁷, after it had been ordained that the officiating
priest is to put 'some of the bullock's blood' (vv.⁵· ⁷)
on the horns of the altar of incense, it is added that
he should pour out 'all the blood' at the foot of the
altar of burnt-offering: by the insertion of the line,
attention is reasonably directed to כֹּל as a strange
reading. In 1 Sam. 18¹⁰, we read that 'an evil spirit
of God' (׀ רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים ׀ רָעָה) fell upon Saul; the insertion
of the double note-line is of course substantially a
query by the scribe. In Ex. 18¹², where we read
that Jethro brought a burnt-offering and sacrifices, it
is added that Aaron came, 'and all the elders of
Israel,' to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law be-
fore God; but an observant transcriber has inserted
the interrogatory line at 'all.' In Jer. 7¹⁶ the line
obviously calls attention to what is certainly a
remarkable prohibition; the prophet is actually
forbidden by the Lord to intercede on behalf of

the people. Similarly, when a like utterance is repeated later, in 11^{14}, the line is inserted at the equally remarkable reason given for forbidding intercession, 'because I will not hear in the time that they cry.'

See also Deut. 28^{68}, 1 Sam. 14^{36} 22^{18}, 2 Sam. 13^{29}, 1 Kings 10^{10}, Jer. 12^{14}.

(14) The insertion of the line was frequently prompted by a spirit of reverence in the scribe, who thereby noted *anthropopathic expressions*, or any phrase that might seem to detract from the Divine dignity. The sign may therefore be regarded, in some instances, as meant to remind the reader that such expressions must not be interpreted literally.

Thus, in Ps. 13^2, the line has been inserted in the earnest but not strictly proper question of the distressed writer addressed to the Lord, 'How long wilt thou withdraw * thy face from me?' Similarly, in Ps. 27^9, which begins, 'Withdraw not thy face from me,' the expression is marked as anthropopathic; in Deut. 16^{11}, containing the words, 'Thou shalt rejoice before the face of the Lord thy God,' and again in v.^{16}, which contains the command, 'Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the face of the Lord thy God, the words signifying 'face' are noted by the line; the mark is also found in the command, Deut. 14^{23}, 'Thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God . . . the tithe of thy corn . . .' Notably also the line appears, Deut. 23^{15}, in the reason assigned for the command to the Israelites

* See the author's *Studies in Hebrew Synonyms*, p. 71.

that they should keep the camp clean, viz. that the Lord ' walketh ' * in the midst of it.

Again, in Num. 10[35], at the words, 'Arise, O Lord,' the line appears to suggest that such language is almost too familiar. Specially remarkable is Ps. 44[24], containing the intensely earnest cry, 'Awake ! why sleepest thou, O Lord ?' and showing the line beside *both* verbs, to mark the feeling in the mind of the inserting scribe that such language was not strictly admissible. Similarly, in Isa. 37[17], the line calls attention to the impassioned utterance of Hezekiah in his prayer for heavenly help, ' Incline thine ear, O Lord, and hear; open thine eyes and see.' † Exception is further taken, through the insertion of the line, to the description in Ps. 78[65], that ' the Lord awaked as one that had been asleep '; and in I Kings 19[4] to the words of the wearied and weak Elijah, 'It is enough now, O Lord ; take away my life,' as unbecoming and hardly reverent even in the mouth of an honoured prophet.

See also Ex. 34[6], Num. 6[25, 26].

(15) Specially frequent is the insertion of the line by later transcribers to mark difficulties caused by a predecessor's *substitution of a questionable reading*. For the original word, he had inadvertently written another resembling it in form or sound, but differing in sense.

The principle on which the later scribes introduced

* This anthropopathism, however, is not marked in Gen. 3[8], where the Lord is described as 'walking in the garden.' See subsequent remarks on this subject, p. 112.

† Only some editions exhibit the line in Ps. 86[1], at the words, ' Incline thine ear, O Lord.'

the sign was simple. No attempt was made on their
part to amend the passage; they practically left it as
it was. But if a single word was found intractable, it
was marked as lying under doubt. Reverence for the
sacred text would doubtless suggest this conservative
course.

These suspected readings vary much in character.
Some difficulties can be solved very simply : the restora-
tion of a single letter may suffice to give the reading we
require. In other cases, more than one letter must be
altered ere a satisfactory solution is obtained. More
complicated instances involve the correction of several
words. Yet all such emendatious, even when conjectural,
must be strictly regulated by sound principles, derived
by induction, after careful observation and experience of
similar changes proved to have taken place elsewhere in
the Hebrew Scriptures. But after all there will remain
some passages unsolved,—perhaps insolvable.*

Simple illustrations will now be given of instances in
which the correction is easy. Let it be observed, how-
ever, that the following emendations are effected without
much regard to the testimony of the Septuagint or other
ancient Versions, inasmuch as many of the difficulties
noted by the line had already crept into the Hebrew text
before these translations were made.†

Gen. 29¹³, according to the Massoretic text, in-
forms us that when Laban heard the ' tidings ' (שֵׁמַע)
of Jacob, his sister's son, who had just arrived from

* See p. 90.   † See p. 20.

Canaan, that he ran to greet him. The line after
שְׁמַע, however, indicates the doubt of the scribe
regarding this reading; and his suspicion is con-
firmed by the Septuagint, in which ὄνομα points to
שֵׁם as the correct term, so that the expression
originally was 'the name of Jacob.'

Lev. 16¹³ forms part of the directions regarding
the mode in which Aaron was to enter the holy place
on the Great Day of Atonement: 'he shall put the
incense upon the fire [in the censer] before the Lord,
that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-
seat.' For the first time in this chapter, the pointer-
line appears in front of the expression 'the cloud of
incense,' for which the phrase occurring in the
Hebrew received text is עֲנַן הַקְּטֹרֶת. But why is the
line here at all? Because the intelligent scribe who
inserted it felt confident that עֲנַן is inappropriate, and
that the true reading rather is something similar,
viz. עָשָׁן 'smoke.'

The Massoretic text in Ps. 84¹² represents Jehovah
as a 'sun (שֶׁמֶשׁ) and shield,' but the combination of
figures is somewhat incongruous. This has been
perceived by the scribe who inserted the line after
'sun,' which he felt to be a textual difficulty. The
ingenious suggestion of Houbigant, that we should
read שֹׁמֵר ('preserver,' or 'guard'), forms the best
solution of the difficulty. If both predicates be taken
as participles, the resultant rendering becomes, 'The
Lord is a protector and preserver.'

The line at the beginning of Josh. 6¹⁹, in the
expression וְכֹל ׀ כֶּסֶף 'and all silver,' was evidently
introduced by a scribe who thought that the first

word should rather be וּכְלֵי, as in the context immediately following; the opening words should therefore be, 'and vessels of silver.' *

˙ Deut. 12¹⁵ gives directions regulating the slaughter of animals which were to be used merely as human food, and not offered in sacrifice, away from the central altar. 'Thou mayest slay, and eat flesh.' The corresponding Hebrew, actually found in the Massoretic text, is תִּזְבַּח ׀ וְאָכַלְתָּ בָשָׂר; but it will be observed that a scribe has with good reason inserted the note-line after the first verb, which should rather be תִּטְבַּח, inasmuch as זָבַח properly signifies to slay animals *for sacrifice* (see Ex. 3¹⁸ 5³·⁸·¹⁷ etc.), whereas טָבַח signifies to slaughter animals for use merely as human food (see Gen. 43¹⁶, Ex. 21³⁷, 1 Sam. 25¹¹ etc.).

Ezra 4² records that the aliens who had been settled in the land of Israel, after the mass of the Hebrews had been carried to Babylon, came to Zerubbabel after the Return from the Captivity and desired to share in the worship of Israel's God. 'Like you,' they said, 'we seek your God, and to him have we been doing sacrifice.' In the Massoretic text, the Hebrew corresponding to the last clause is וְלֹא ׀ אֲנַחְנוּ זֹבְחִים, but the marginal note rightly calls us to read וְלוֹ instead of the first word. It will further be observed, however, that an early scribe had already noted the textual difficulty, and inserted the usual signal-line.†

* Reference has already been made to this passage in another connection: see p. 21.

† On the coincidence of the Qerî with the note-line, see p. 13.

6

In Ps. 54, containing 9 verses, the pointer appears only in v.[5], and there at the form זָרִים ('strangers'), which has obviously been regarded by the observant scribe as too mild a term to suit the context; the similarly sounded צָרִים ('adversaries') must be restored, as more appropriate.

In Gen. 18[21], Jehovah is represented as saying concerning the wickedness of the people in Sodom, ' I will go down, that I may see whether they have done wholly (עָשֹׂוּ ׀ כָּלָה) according to the cry of it, that is come unto me.' It will be perceived that the pointer has been inserted before 'wholly,' which certainly demands a somewhat unusual construction in its favour, if it be the genuine reading. But it is more probable, as has already been suggested, that the correct reading is כֻּלָּם ('all of them'); and this may have been the view of the scribe who introduced the sign.

In Gen. 19[9] (the first place in this chapter, containing 38 verses, where the line appears,—the only other instance being v.[14], where another textual difficulty is noted), the mark is placed before גֶּשׁ־הָלְאָה, the short and sharp command addressed to Lot by the wicked Sodomites who assailed him at his own door. It has long been perceived that these two words, taken in their usual meaning, 'Come thither,' present a contradiction: the insertion of the pointer here records the difficulty felt by the scribe. Instead of imposing on גֶּשׁ a meaning directly opposed to what it bears elsewhere, and then rendering the two words by 'Be off!' (as in the Septuagint ἀπόστα

ἐκεῖ), it certainly suits the context better to amend
הֲלְאָה into הֲלֹם, and then render the expression 'Come
here !'

In Jer. 44⁹ (the first point at which the line appears in this chapter), the mark is prefixed to the
expression מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה ('the kings of Judah,' *plural*);
but in the next clause we find נָשָׁיו ('his wives,' *
the pronominal suffix being *singular*). The difference between these two expressions, in number,
might well lead us to conclude that an early scribe
had inadvertently added י to the Hebrew term for
'king,' through the influence of the initial letter in
the next word 'Judah.' With the observant scribe
who inserted the line, we may safely assume that
the correct reading is מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה ('the king of
Judah').

In Ruth 2²¹, the opening words גַּם ׀ כִּי אָמַר, given
as reported to Naomi by her daughter-in-law, and
describing what Boaz had done, are noted by the
Hebrew scribe as doubtful, for the usual meaning of
the first two words, combined, is 'Even if'; the
construction is certainly unusual. But by changing
the first word into אַף we obtain an excellent and
appropriate statement, 'He actually said!' (See
Neh. 9¹⁸, Gen. 3¹.)

In Ps. 22, the line does not appear till v.¹⁶, where
it is significantly prefixed to כֹּחִי ('my strength').
The suspicions of the scribe who placed it there have
been confirmed by the judgment of J. Olshausen,
Ewald, and others. These have pointed out that
parallelism requires us to restore the form to חִכִּי

* Not 'their wives,' as given in the English Versions.

('my palate'), so that the first part of the verse may run thus—

> 'My palate is dried like a potsherd,
> And my tongue cleaveth to my jaws.' *

In Hos. 9¹, after the opening words, 'Rejoice not, O Israel,' the pointer fitly introduces an expression which, as it stands in the Massoretic text, does not accord with ordinary constructions in Hebrew grammar. The words אֶל־גִּיל כָּעַמִּים have been rendered 'for joy, like [other] peoples,' but the whole result is unsatisfactory. Guidance to a better reading, however, is afforded by the Septuagint † μηδὲ εὐφραίνου, which at once gives us וְאַל־תָּגֵל, forming a satisfactory parallel to the beginning of the verse. The following context further seems to warrant the emendation of כָּעַמִּים into כְּעַמִּי, so that we may render the verse, thus far, as follows :—

> 'Rejoice not, O Israel,
> Nor exult like my people.'

In Ps. 104⁸, which forms one of several verses declaring Jehovah's absolute mastery over the waters of the mighty deep, one is certainly startled on finding the statement, 'they go down to the place which thou didst found (יְסַדְתָּ) for them.' Hence the old scribe appropriately placed the pointer before the suspected term. A little consideration leads us to think that instead of the verb laid under suspicion,

---

* For other emendations necessary in this verse, see *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Psalms.*

† See also the Syriac and Vulgate.

we should read one of similar sound, viz. יָעַדְתָּ ('thou hast appointed').

Ex. 16²⁹ records Moses' reproof of the Israelites who transgressed the Divine command, and went out to seek for manna though none was to be found. One of the injunctions impressed anew on the wayward and unbelieving ones runs thus: 'Sit ye each one where he is.' The received Hebrew text is שְׁבוּ ׀ אִישׁ תַּחְתָּיו; but the scribe who inserted the pointer evidently thought, with good reason, that the verb actually in the text should rather be שִׁבְתוּ 'Rest ye'; and certainly the dominant idea in the whole episode is the Divine command to *rest* on the seventh day.

Ps. 109²⁸ presents an excellent instance in which the pointer precisely locates a textual difficulty that can easily be solved by observing the laws of parallelism. A strict translation of the whole verse, as given by the Massoretes, is the following :—

> ' Let *them* curse,
> But *thou* shalt bless ;
> They arose and were ashamed,
> But thy servant shall rejoice.'

That the harmony of the whole is obviously broken by the third line, was perceived by the old transcriber who introduced the pointer thus, קָמוּ ׀ וַיֵּבֹשׁוּ. By a very simple emendation we obtain the true reading, viz. קָמַי יֵבֹשׁוּ, which in English becomes—

' Those who rise against me shall be ashamed.'

When this change is made in the third line, the

demands of parallelism are satisfied, and the whole
verse runs smoothly.

2 Chron. 2⁹ relates, in part, Solomon's proposals
to the King of Tyre, with the view of obtaining
workmen and material for building the Temple in
Jerusalem. Among other things, the Jewish monarch
promises to give to the foreign artisans what is de-
scribed in the Massoretic text as חִטִּים ׀ מַכּוֹת ; this
expression, however, as we see from the insertion of
the pointer, has naturally been regarded as unintel-
ligible. It cannot fairly, on grammatical grounds,
be rendered 'beaten wheat,' as in the English Ver-
sion; nor is the difficulty much lessened by proposing
to read חִטֵּי מַכּוֹת. But guidance is given in the
parallel passage, 1 Kings 5²⁵, where the reading is
חִטִּים מַכֹּלֶת, in which the second word is doubtless
contracted from מַאֲכֹלֶת, so that the expression may
be rendered 'wheat [as] food.' This satisfies the
requirements of the passage.

Deut. 28²⁵, according to the Massoretic text, may
be rendered thus: 'The Lord shall deliver thee [to
be] smitten before thine enemies; by one way shalt
thou go out against him, but in seven ways shalt
thou flee before him.' When we observe that the
pointer has been inserted before נִגָּף ('smitten'), and
when we further remember that the dominant idea
here is the craven *flight* of the Hebrews before their
enemies, we conclude that the intelligent scribe who
inserted the line thought the true reading was a
similar form, viz. נִדָּף ('driven away'), which should
unhesitatingly be restored.

Ps. 37¹⁴ opens with a strange expression, rightly

marked with the pointer, חֶרֶב ׀ פָּתְחוּ רְשָׁעִים, which is
commonly translated, 'The wicked have drawn the
sword.' But this is a forced rendering of the verb,
which really means 'opened.' The proper verb to
use in such a connection—if 'drawn' be the true
reading—is שָׁלְפוּ (see Num. 22²³·³¹, Josh. 5¹³, Judg.
8¹⁰ 20²·¹⁵·¹⁷·⁴⁶ etc.); but as it is hardly probable that
this form has been exchanged for that which now
appears in the Massoretic text, it is likely that we
should read חָרְדוּ, which bears a suitable meaning
('sharpened'), and might naturally be displaced by
the received reading, which it resembles in sound
and form.

Ps. 78²¹ immediately follows a brief description of
Israel's discontent and unbelief in the wilderness,
when the people did not trust the power and good-
ness of the Lord as ample guarantees that they would
lack no good thing. 'Therefore Jehovah heard, and
burst forth in wrath.' But the Massoretic text ex-
hibits the pointer before the first verb ('heard'),
which certainly may seem rather tame an expression
for indicating the result, in the Divine mind, of the
people's sin. This term שָׁמַע, therefore, has been
marked as a suspected reading. But what can be
suggested as more appropriate? The simplest solu-
tion appears to be that we must read זָעַם, which, from
its similarity in sound, would very naturally be set
aside, as somewhat uncommon, in favour of a more
familiar word. After making restoration of the more
appropriate term, the opening of the verse runs more
smoothly, thus, 'Therefore the Lord was righteously
indignant, and broke forth in wrath.'

In a subsequent portion of the same Psalm, the continued discontent and unbelief of the people are portrayed. Then at v.[31] we read of the result: 'The anger of God ascended upon them.' But the Massoretic text exhibits the verb found here with the line prefixed, showing doubt in the mind of the scribe whether עָלָה was the genuine reading. Possibly the correct form is עָשַׁן 'smoked,' as in Ps. 74[1], Deut. 29[19], Ps. 80[5] etc.

In Prov. 16[10], the line properly marks the first word as a questionable reading. Simply rendered, the verse would run thus: 'Divination [is] upon the lips of a king; in judgment, his mouth will not transgress.' Elsewhere, קֶסֶם always signifies divination practised by sorcerers or false prophets, and of course it is utterly condemned. No good end can therefore be served by forcibly attributing to the term the sense of a 'Divine sentence' (Auth. Version) or 'oracle' (Targ.), which it cannot legitimately bear. Most probably we must amend the form, and read קֹשֶׁט 'truth.' It further appears necessary to change the unsuitable verb-form יִמְעַל, in the second part of the verse, into יִמְעַד ('waver'). The verse will then run more smoothly thus: '[If] truth [be] upon the lips of a king, his mouth shall not waver in [pronouncing] judgment.'

Jer. 29[32] records the sentence pronounced by the Lord upon the false prophet Shemaiah, who had misled the people. According to the received text, it is declared that 'he shall not have a man dwelling (or "sitting") among this people.' But a scribe, by enclosing יוֹשֵׁב within a pair of note-lines, has

indicated his hesitation in accepting this as the correct reading; and certainly the word wants force. Probably the true reading is שָׂב 'aged,' and the Divine judgment, therefore, was that no member of Shemaiah's family should live to mature years; the curse thus accords with that which was uttered long before on the sons of Eli for their sins (1 Sam. 2³¹, ³²).

Prov. 10²⁶, according to the received text, runs thus: 'As vinegar to the teeth, and as smoke to the eyes, so is the sluggard to those who send him.' But a glance at the Hebrew shows that a note-line preceding לַשִּׁנָּיִם ('to the teeth') calls attention to the form as questionable. Most probably the observant scribe deemed that a similar form, לַלָּשׁוֹן ('to the tongue'), was more appropriate, and more likely to be correct.

Isa. 61³ exhibits the note-line at the beginning of the verse, where an undoubted difficulty is felt. In this passage, the Messiah lucidly sets forth the joyful work to which the Lord has appointed him — 'to bring good tidings to the lowly, to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to captives, and release to prisoners; to proclaim the year of the Lord's good pleasure, and the year of vengeance of our God, to comfort all mourners.' But next (v.³) comes the expression לָשׂוּם ׀ לַאֲבֵלֵי צִיּוֹן, which, most naturally rendered 'to place [or 'set'] for the mourners of Zion,' is neither complete in itself, nor presents an idea appropriate to the context. Of several emendations which have been proposed, the simplest and most suitable seems to be that instead of לָשׂוּם we should read לְשַׂמֵּחַ, and thus

obtain the rendering 'to gladden the mourners of Zion.'

See also Ex. $7^{17, 20}$, Num. 11^{31}, Judg. 18^7, I Sam. 6^{18} 30^{24}, I Kings 1^{25} 6^{29}, Job 27^{13}, Ps. $15^{3, 4}$ 22^{30} $109^{20, 25}$ $131^{1, 2}$, Jer. 4^{13} 26^{15} 44^{14}, Zech. 10^6.

(16) Other passages marked by the line present difficulties which have not yet been solved, and may remain insolvable. The pointer may thus be regarded as inviting solutions. Some specimens of such passages will now be given. These, let it be observed, chiefly occur in the poetic portions of Scripture, though some are likewise found in prose writings, more especially the Books of Samuel.

In Ex. 17^{15}, forming part of the account given of Amalek's discomfiture at Rephidim, we read that Moses built a memorial altar, and named it 'Jehovah Nissi.' The Hebrew is יְהֹוָה ׀ נִסִּי, showing the line as practically a point of interrogation inserted by a transcriber who felt in doubt. The next verse likewise awaits explanation.

In Deut. 8^{15}, the second pointer, in particular, calls attention to an obscure expression abruptly introduced in the description of the 'great and dreadful wilderness.' The difficulty is not solved but merely lessened in ordinary Versions, which render נָחָשׁ ׀ שָׂרָף וְעַקְרָב by '[wherein were] fiery serpents and scorpions.'

I Sam. 12^{21} forms part of Samuel's exhortation to erring Israel that had madly determined to have a visible king. The insertion of the line marks the

point at which some words have been inadvertently omitted by an early transcriber. The blank is usually filled up thus: 'And turn ye not aside, for [then should ye go] after vanity.'

1 Sam. 14[36] introduces an episode in the history of Saul, who is here represented, according to the reading in the Massoretic text, as proposing to his followers, 'Let us go down after the Philistines by night, and plunder among them till the morning light, and we shall not leave a man among them.' An observant scribe long ago felt the difficulty of conceiving how the nocturnal *plundering* among the enemy should precede, and even be a means of killing every one; he accordingly inserted the pointer at the troublesome expression וְנִבְּזָה בָהֶם, which has not yet been satisfactorily amended.

2 Sam. 20[8] mainly gives details of Joab's preparations for assassinating Amasa; the brief clauses describing the arrangement of his robe and his concealment of his weapon have fallen into some confusion, and a few words still present problems which even the most skilled interpreters cannot satisfactorily solve.* The pointer has been inserted where the greatest difficulties begin.

Ps. 71[21], brief as it is, very properly contains the pointer to mark the extreme difficulty felt by interpreters in attempting to make suitable sense of the whole. The Authorised Version runs thus—

> 'Thou shalt increase my greatness,
> And comfort me on every side.'

* See the Commentaries of Wellhausen, Driver, H. P. Smith, Klostermann, Budde, and others.

The Revisers have given a slightly different render-
ing—

> ' Increase thou my greatness,
>   And turn again and comfort me.'

But we still await a satisfactory solution of the
problems associated with the four Hebrew words
forming this verse.

Isa. 23[13] has the line fittingly inserted at the
beginning to mark a *series* of difficulties—textual,
grammatical, and exegetical—running through this
somewhat lengthy verse, the Revisers' rendering of
which is the following :—

> ' Behold, the land of the Chaldæans ;
>   This people is no more ;
>   The Assyrian hath appointed it for the beasts of
>   the wilderness ;
>   They set up their towers,
>   They overthrew the palaces thereof ;
>   He made it a ruin.'

The general obscurity still remaining is only too
palpable ; and the large number of alternative
renderings placed in the margin only prove more
conclusively that the best of modern Hebraists
together felt unable to understand this verse, and
to make it intelligible to others.

The extreme difficulty felt in determining the
true text and thus ascertaining the exact meaning
of Ps. 73[20] may be perceived from the varied render-
ings of competent modern authorities ; but the old
scribe who long ago inserted the pointer had already
thereby signified that he was baffled in his endeavour

to make good sense of the verse, particularly the latter half. The Authorised Version (which is not much changed by the Revisers) substantially runs thus—

> 'As a dream when [one] awaketh,
>
> [So], O Lord, when [thou dost] awake,
>
> Thou shalt despise their image.'

The Septuagint rendering may be represented thus—

> 'As the dream of one awakening, O Lord,
>
> In thy city thou shalt scorn their image.'

Delitzsch gives the following rendering :—

> ' Like a dream, as soon as one awaketh,
>
> O Lord, when thou art aroused,
>
> Thou dost rid thyself of their shadow.'

The textual difficulties, however, still await solution.

At the middle of Isa. 33^{14}, the pointer appears in the expression מִי יָגוּר, which is repeated in the next clause. The difficulty perceived and noted by the old transcriber still remains ; for even after violating the normal construction of the verb, there is but small accord between the context and the resultant rendering—

> ' Who among us can dwell with devouring fire ?
>
> Who among us can dwell with eternal burnings?'

Ps. 132^{17} exhibits the pointer inserted to indicate the transcriber's inability to understand the verse, read in the light of the usual meaning attached to the several words—

> ' There will I cause a horn to sprout for David,
>
> I have prepared a lamp for mine anointed.'

There is apparent incongruity among the ideas presented in the first line especially.

Prov. 21^{20} has justly received the line to mark the incomprehensibility of the verse in its present state. Fairly rendered, the whole assumes the following form in English:—

'[There is] desirable treasure and oil in the abode of a wise man,

But a prating fool [of] a man will swallow it up.'

It is not wonderful that even the most competent expositors have confessed their inability to understand this verse.

Prov. 24^{14}, also marked by the line, is likewise difficult to understand. After an exhortation in the preceding verse to eat honey and the honeycomb, because they are good and sweet, this verse continues—

'So, know wisdom for thyself;

If thou hast found [it], then there *is* an end, And thy hope will not be cut off.'

Such a text might well baffle the ablest exegetes.

Zech. 3^9, with the line at the beginning, also belongs to this class. The whole verse, as it stands, shows little internal connection with the preceding and succeeding context; and even when viewed alone, little coherence is exhibited between its several clauses. A fair translation of the whole might run thus—

'For, behold the stone which I have put before Joshua;

Upon one stone, seven eyes.

Behold, I engrave its graving, saith the Lord of
hosts,

But I will take away the iniquity of that land in
one day.'

The mention of a ' stone ' is quite unexpected ; but,
apart from this, the later mention of ' one stone ' leads
us to expect some reference to another ; yet there is
no mention of a second.   Moreover, the removal of
' the iniquity of that land ' is an idea not essentially
connected with any other in the context.

Ps. 9 is obviously an acrostic poem, whose con-
secutive verses were arranged in the order of the
Hebrew alphabet.   The received text, however, is
incomplete.   A signal break appears at v.[7], where
beginning should be made with the letter ד ; but this
no longer appears as the initial of a verse.   At this
point, instead, we find הָאוֹיֵב, which is followed by
the significant pointer.   The variety of renderings
suggested shows the perplexity of even the most
competent interpreters to make good sense of the
verse.*   The following may be taken as a fair
rendering :—

' The enemy,—desolations are finished for ever,

And cities hast thou destroyed.

Their remembrance has perished.'

It is hard to discover unity of thought underlying
the different clauses exhibiting such sudden transi-
tion from one subject to another.

The line at the beginning of Nah. 1[12] calls atten-

* See, among others, the Authorised English Version and its
marginal rendering, the Revised English Version, the renderings of
Grätz, Ewald, Hupfeld, Baethgen, etc.

tion to the series of difficulties which follow. The variety of renderings proposed by different translators reveals their perplexity. The Authorised English Version presents the following : ' Thus saith the Lord, Though [they be] quiet, and likewise many, yet thus shall they be cut down, when he shall pass through. Though I have afflicted thee, I will afflict thee no more.' In the margin, however, is given an alternative rendering of the obscure words succeeding the introductory formula : ' If [they would have been] at peace, so [should they have been] many, and so should they have been shorn, and he should have passed away.' The Revisers, in the text, thus render the verse, after the initial formula : ' Though they be in full strength, and likewise many, even so shall they be cut down, and he shall pass away. Though I have afflicted thee, I will afflict thee no more.' And for the last sentence, they propose in the margin, as an alternative rendering, ' So will I afflict thee, that I shall afflict thee no more.' The rendering of the Septuagint translator abundantly proves that he also was unable to present an acceptable representation of the Hebrew text. His version may fairly be put as follows : ' Thus saith the Lord who rules over many waters, Even thus shall they be separated, and the report of thee shall not be heard any more.' A verse so difficult to be understood might well receive the significant line.

In 2 Kings 4[13], the opening words of Elisha to the Shunammite woman, when seeking to give her some reward, have been marked with the line as cer-

tainly peculiar,—so peculiar, indeed, as to constitute
the sign a query whether the reading be correct:
' Behold, thou hast feared for us all this fear ' (הִנֵּה
חָרַדְתְּ ׀ אֶת־כָּל־הַחֲרָדָה הַזֹּאת). The verb with its cognate
noun found in this passage always elsewhere in-
dicates trembling fear for one's self (see 1 Sam. 13^7
16^4, Ezek. 26^{16} 32^{10}, Gen. 27^{33}, 1 Kings 1^{49} etc.), but
not anxious concern for another's safety or comfort,
which is the sense required by the context. No
solution has yet been found for the difficulty marked
by the ancient scribe.

See also 1 Kings 9^{19} 20^{30}, Ps. 55^{20} 77^3 113^4,
Jer. 11^{16} 12^5 31^{39}, Zech. 9^{11}.

III.

APPLICATION OF RESULTS.

9. THE LINE AS AN INDICATOR OF DIFFICULTIES IN THE TEXT.

FACTS already adduced now warrant the formulation of an important principle for criticism of the Massoretic text. This principle may be enunciated thus—

The note-line frequently indicates, more or less precisely, the spot where textual difficulties exist.

By marking suspected passages, the early transcribers have lightened our labour. It now remains for us to advance the work they began, by pursuing proper methods in the emendation of the text.

These early editors, indeed, did not note every difficulty they perceived.* Moreover, some marks have been misplaced,† while others have wholly disappeared.‡ Further, even of those which remain, we must put out of account, for our present purpose, instances in which the note-line merely indicates the repetition of a letter or a word.§ But even after making all these deductions, there remain

* See below, p. 106 f.   † See p. 33.   ‡ See p. 105.   § See p. 37 f.

passages in which the mark demands our best attention, as locating a textual difficulty awaiting solution.

Many illustrations have already been given incidentally.* The following are additional instances, in which reasonable restoration seems possible :—

> In Ex. 14¹⁰, the line before נֹסֵעַ indicates a doubt as to its genuineness; the term certainly seems too mild in its meaning ('moving,' or 'marching') to be applicable to the Egyptians who were pursuing the Israelites. Probably the true reading is נִשְׁאָה 'rushing,' a comparatively rare word, similar in sound to that in the received text, which might naturally be substituted by a coypist.

> In Ps. 17¹, attention is called to the strangeness of the object mentioned in the petition שִׁמְעָה יְהוָֹה ׀ צֶדֶק, a simple rendering of which would be, 'Hear, O Jehovah, righteousness.' To 'hear righteousness,' however, is inconceivable; and failure has ever followed attempts to explain away the difficulty inseparably associated with the inappropriate object.† But when we consider the nature of the other objects in the succeeding parallel clauses, viz. 'Attend unto my cry, give ear unto my prayer,' it is easy to see that the object in the first line, which now concerns us, must be something similar (viz. a *cry* that claims to be heard), and in form will probably resemble רִנָּתִי and תְּפִלָּתִי, the objects in the second and third lines.

---

* See p. 78 ff.

† The Septuagint is εἰσάκουσον, κύριε, τῆς δικαιοσύνης μου (= צִדְקִי); the English Version is 'Hear the right, O Lord'; Baethgen's German rendering is 'Höre, O Jahve, eine gerechte Sache.'

The reading צַעֲקָתִי 'my cry for help,' must at once commend itself as the original of which we are in search.

In Ps. 69¹⁴, for the noun תְפִלָּתִי, preceding the line, we must restore the verb-form אֶתְפַּלְּלִתִי; and after the pointer, for עֵת רָצוֹן read the similar forms אַתָּ רְצֵנִי, so that the first half of the verse may be rendered thus:—'As soon as I pray unto thee, Lord, do thou graciously receive me.'

In Ps. 95, containing 11 verses, the line occurs only once, viz. in v.¹⁰, at a point in a statement which, strictly rendered, proves a rather startling utterance. The Lord is represented as speaking thus: 'Forty years did I loathe (אָקוּט) the generation, and I said, They are a people erring in heart, seeing that they do not know my ways.' One cannot think, however, of *God* as 'loathing' his chosen people, and still less continuing to do this for forty years. But by reading the marked word as a passive (אָקוּט), and adding the demonstrative 'that' (הַהוּא) after the repointed בַּדּוֹר, as testified by the Septuagint, the Latin,* and other Versions, we obtain a reasonable rendering, 'Forty years was I loathed by that generation.'

In Job 36²⁸, which treats of God's beneficent arrangements in distilling rain from heaven, an observant scribe has recorded his suspicion regarding that part of the text which represents 'man,' אָדָם as the object on which the rain is poured. It is surely safe to conclude that the correct reading is the similar form אֲדָמָה 'ground,' for which the

* Generationi illi ; τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ.

other would easily be substituted. With good
reason also it has been already suggested that for
the succeeding word, רָב, we should read וּרְבִיבִים
'rain-drops.'

Num. 15³⁰, as it stands in the Massoretic text,
may be rendered thus : ' But the soul that acts with
a high hand, whether a native or a stranger,—he
reproaches the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off
from the midst of his people.' It is to be observed,
however, that an intelligent transcriber has marked
the first verb תַּעֲשֶׂה 'acts,' as a questionable reading;
and certainly this word is disappointingly vague.
But if we change this term into the similar though
less common תַּעֲשֹׁק ' oppresses,' which might very
naturally be discarded by an earlier scribe in favour
of the more familiar word, we obtain a better render-
ing. After this change, the first half of the verse
runs thus : ' But the soul that oppresses with a
high hand either a native or a stranger,—he re-
proaches the Lord.'

At first sight, Deut. 9²¹ reads so smoothly that
one might fancy there is nothing to amend. Moses
is represented as reminding the Israelites of the way
in which he acted after they had made the idol-
calf: ' The calf I took, and burned it in the fire,
and beat it in pieces, pounding it small, to dust;
and I cast the dust of it into the brook that de-
scended out of the mountain.' But the appearance
of the line in the expression וָאֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ ׀ בָּאֵשׁ ' and I
burned it in the fire,' is an incentive to examine the
passage more carefully. It then turns out that אֹתוֹ
is not likely to be the pronominal accusative ' it,'

but rather עֵצוֹ, 'the wood of it,'—for what Moses burned in the fire could not be a solid mass of gold, or even the gold plating which encased the calf,*— *i.e.* the inner portion of the idol, entirely made of wood, which alone could be 'burned.' But this result leads us to venture on another emendation further on, — to change עֲפָרוֹ 'its dust' into אֶפְרוֹ 'its ashes,' the proper designation of unconsumed residuum of wood, after fire has done its work.†

In Ps. 1⁵, the line is found prefixed to the statement that 'the wicked shall not arise [or, stand up] in the judgment.' A little reflection shows that the verb יָקֻמוּ has been reasonably suspected by the scribe who inserted the mark; the idea which it conveys does not commend itself as appropriate, in view of the context. It would appear that we must replace the suspected form by the Niphal יִנָּקוּ, and thus obtain the declaration that 'the wicked shall not be acquitted in the judgment.'

10. UNACCOUNTABLE INSERTIONS OF THE LINE.

Though most of the instances in which the line appears in the text of the Old Testament have now been arranged under suitable categories, there yet remain certain passages in which its presence still awaits a satisfactory explanation. It may be that the insertion is due to mere inadvertency. As there are proved cases of omis-

---

* The metal would be *melted* in the fire.

† Similar substitution of these resemblant Hebrew forms has likewise taken place in Num. 19¹⁷, 2 Kings 23⁴.

sion,* so there may presumably be cases of insertion for which no satisfactory ground can be discovered. Good and sufficient reasons have been given for the insertion in the vast majority of passages where it occurs : that no good reason can be conceived for its presence in a small residuum of cases need excite no surprise. The following appear to be some of these instances :—

Deut. 7[6] 'Thee hath the Lord thy God chosen to be to him a special people.' It is difficult to see why the line has been inserted at 'chosen.'

Deut. 17[6] 'At the mouth of two witnesses, or three witnesses, shall one who is to die be put to death.' No reason appears for the presence of the line before the expression 'two witnesses.'

Deut. 19[15] 'At the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall a matter be established.' Here also it is not easy to perceive why the line is inserted before 'two witnesses.'

Josh. 10[5] 'And there assembled together and went up the five kings of the Amorites,—the king of Jerusalem, the king of Hebron,' etc. There is no apparent reason for the presence of the pointer at 'the five kings,' inasmuch as these are all distinctly specified, and there is no unusual construction requiring to be noted.

Josh. 12[1] 'Now these are the kings of the country whom the children of Israel slew. . . .' The presence of the pointer at the opening of this chapter, in a verse containing no remarkable construction or statement, remains to be explained.

* See pp. 3, 28, 105 f., 111 f.

Josh. 23^{10} 'One man of you shall pursue a thousand; for the Lord your God,—*he* fighteth for you.' Why the line appears before 'the Lord your God' is not obvious.

Josh. 23^{14} 'There hath not failed one thing of all the good things which the Lord your God hath spoken concerning you.' Neither at the expression 'of all the good things,' nor anywhere else in this verse, does there seem any reason for the presence of the pointer.

Judg. 10^6 'And the children of Israel again did evil in the eyes of the Lord. . . .' The line appears *twice* in this verse, first at the beginning, and then in the middle ; but at neither point is there anything remarkable that seems really to require the insertion of the pointer.

Similar instances, irreducible to any of the categories previously formed,* will occasionally present themselves to an observant reader. After patient consideration, however, some reason, more or less probable, can generally be discovered for the insertion of the line, and the action of the notating scribe will thus be amply justified. The sum-total of intractable cases will then be found comparatively small.

11. WANT OF UNIFORMITY IN THE USE OF THE LINE.

After so many details have been given regarding the insertion of the note-line, it becomes necessary to make some

* See p. 34 ff.

remarks regarding its *non*-insertion.   Consideration of so
many different classes of instances in which it *does* appear
naturally prepares us to expect it again under similar
conditions. Nevertheless, such expectations are frequently
disappointed: the line does *not* appear at many points
where we might reasonably look for it.*   The general
rule which we had framed fails to apply, and numerous
exceptions come into view.

Some observations, then, must now be made regarding
the *non-appearance of the sign* where it might be expected.
The following are the results of careful examination :—

(1) In the same passage of the Hebrew Scriptures,
different manuscripts and printed editions vary as regards
the insertion of the pointer ; some copies have it, while it
does not appear in others.   The most probable explana-
tion of this variation seems to be that the line was
originally present at all those points where it now occurs
in one copy or another, but that later scribes either in-
advertently omitted the sign, or intentionally refrained
from inserting a mark which they deemed unnecessary.

In Ps. 1¹, many printed editions show אֲשֶׁר ׀ לֹו,
but the line is absent from others ; in Ps. 1², certain
editions have כִּי ׀ אִם, but others want the line ; in
Ps. 100³, some copies exhibit the reading וְלֹא ׀ אֲנַחְנוּ,
while in others there is no intervening line ; in Ps.
6⁷·¹¹, the line is inserted after the first word, in some

* In his treatise on the Prose Accents, Wickes remarks, perhaps
too strongly (p. 127), that 'the *failure* of the sign is more con-
spicuous than its presence.'

editions, but absent in others; in Gen. 16³, many editions present the reading שָׂרַי ׀ אֵשֶׁת אַבְרָם, while others have no line. The same remark applies to אִישׁ ׀ אֵשׁ in Prov. 6²⁷, and to לְמִי אוֹי ׀ לְמִי אֲבוֹי in Prov. 23²⁹; אֵלַי ׀ אֵלִי in Ps. 22²; אֱלֹהִים ׀ צְבָאוֹת in Ps. 59⁶. Most instructive, however, are the editorial notes in ordinary printed Bibles at 2 Chron. 16⁸ 21¹⁸, ¹⁹ and 30¹⁹, informing us that the line usually appearing there is not found in some copies.

(2) Of two parallel texts, one may have the line, while it is absent from the other.

Notably, in Ps. 18, the line is frequently inserted, whereas *it is not found anywhere throughout the parallel passage*, 2 Sam. 22. In Ps. 14⁵, the line is placed beside שָׁם, but not given in Ps. 53⁶. In Ps. 105³, the line is found, but not in the parallel verse, 1 Chron. 16¹⁰; in Ps. 96⁵, the sign appears, but not in the parallel, 1 Chron. 16²⁶; in 1 Kings 12², the line notes textual difficulties,* but it does not appear in the parallel account, 2 Chron. 10².

(3) Usage varies in relation to the *repetition of the line at successive occurrences of the same remarkable reading* in a passage. Thus—

(*a*) Some editors habitually repeated the line at *every recurrence* of the *same* case, throughout a whole passage, or at successive occurrences of *different* cases within the same verse.

Excellent examples of continued insertion of the line at successive occurrences of the *same word* are

* See remarks by Kittel and Klostermann in their Commentaries; also Kamphausen's notes in Kautzsch's German translation.

seen in סָבִיב ו סָבִיב Ezek. 40⁵. ¹⁴. ¹⁶. (*twice*) ¹⁷. ²⁵. ²⁹. ³⁰. ³³. ³⁶. ⁴³ 41⁵. ⁶. ⁷. ⁸. ¹⁰. ¹¹. ¹². ¹⁶. ¹⁷. ¹⁹ 42¹⁵. ²⁰ 43¹²; also in וְעַל ו גְּבוּל Ezek. 48². ³. ⁴. ⁵. ⁶. ⁷. ²². ²⁴. ²⁵. ²⁶. ²⁷, but *not* in vv.⁸. ²¹. ²⁸. In Lam. 1¹⁵ and 2¹. ⁵. ⁷, the line is placed with אֲדֹנָי for the purpose of calling attention to the occurrence of this Divine name rather than יְהוָֹה ; but there is *no* line in 3³¹. ³⁶. ⁵⁸. Similarly, the continued occurrence of the singular expression שְׁנֵיהֶם ו מְלֵאִים is noted in Num. 7¹³. ¹⁹. ²⁵. ³¹. ³⁷. ⁴³. ⁴⁹. ⁵⁵. ⁶¹. ⁷³. ⁷⁹.

The same principle of repeated insertion of the line may be applied when two or more peculiarities, of *different* character, occur in the *same* verse : in Ps. 42⁵, no less than three lines are inserted at different points. See also Ps. 10¹³. ¹⁴ 18¹ 32⁴ 42⁹ 44²⁴. But such repetition within the same verse is rare.

(*b*) Other scribes, however, contented themselves with inserting the line at the *first* case only, and left the reader mentally to supply the mark at later instances of the same, or of a different character. This is the general rule.

This practice of inserting the line only at the *first* occurrence of a peculiarity is much more common than repeated insertion. In Lam. 1¹⁵, only the *first* appearance of אֲדֹנָי instead of יְהוָֹה is marked; the second is unmarked. In Gen. 1²⁹, the line is placed before the unexpected form זֹרֵעַ only at its first appearance, not at the second. In 1 Sam. 20²¹, the line is inserted to call attention to the first occasion on which the letter מ appears thrice in succession; at the second occurrence in v.²², there is no line. In Deut. 31³, attention is called, by insertion of the line, to the first occurrence of the expression הוּא עֹבֵר,

but not to the second. In Zeph. 2², the line notes
the unnecessary insertion of the negative at its first
occurrence, but not at its second. The first occur-
rence of the short form שַׁלְתִּיאֵל in Hag. 1¹² (cf. the
full form in v.¹) is noted, but not its later occurrences
in 1¹⁴ 2². The first occurrence, in Hag. 2⁴, of the
short expression נְאֻם ו יְהוָֹה (without the addition of
צְבָאוֹת) is noted by the insertion of the line, but not
its later occurrences, in vv.¹⁴· ¹⁷· ²³. In Gen. 24¹²,
Abraham's trusty servant is represented as employ-
ing a remarkable designation of the Deity, 'Jehovah,
the God of my master Abraham'; this is noted there
on its first occurrence, by the inserted line; but
though the same expression is repeated in vv.²⁷· ⁴²· ⁴⁸,
the mark is not inserted in any of these later instances.
Isa. 36² shows the pointer beside 'Rabshakeh,' on
this its first occurrence in the narrative, but after-
wards the sign is omitted (vv.⁴· ¹¹· ¹²· ¹³· ²²). In Prov.
1⁹ the line calls attention to the rare noun לִוְיָה, at
this its first occurrence; but though it appears
again only in 4⁹, the mark is not repeated. In Neh.
4¹ (v.⁷ in English), the introductory וַיְהִי is marked as
superfluous; but though it is followed by the same
construction in vv.⁶· ⁹, where also it is unnecessary,
it is not there marked as such. Similarly, in Isa.
7¹⁸, the cognate וְהָיָה has the line showing that it
may be omitted without injuring the context; but
it is not inserted in vv.²¹· ²²· ²³, though the conditions
are similar. In Gen. 23¹⁷, the questionable reading
וַיָּקָם is marked, but not its later occurrence in v.²⁰.

See also 1 Sam. 12³, Ps. 115⁷, Isa. 33¹⁴, 1 Chron.
29²; and compare Judg. 18⁷ with vv.¹⁰· ²⁷.

But the same principle may likewise be applied when two or more noteworthy peculiarities, *differing in character*, appear in the *same* verse; it may be deemed sufficient to note only the first, on the ground that readers, after their attention has been called to one noteworthy form, should be prepared to find others that might follow. Thus, in Ps. 10⁸, the line is placed only at יֶשֵׁב, the first word requiring emendation (into יְשֵׁר), but others following might with equal reason be marked. In Ps. 22¹⁶, several alterations must be made; but only the first difficulty is marked by the line. Hos. 7¹⁶ is the only place in the chapter which shows the pointer, and this at the beginning of the verse; but other words, besides the first, require emendation. Similarly, Hos. 13² is the only verse in the chapter which has the line, and this after the opening word; yet other emendations are necessary, not only in this verse, but throughout the chapter.

(*c*) Strangely, also, the line is sometimes actually *not* found at the *first* occurrence of a peculiarity, but is inserted at a *later* instance of the same character. Such cases are, however, comparatively rare. But the following are examples :—

Examination of Judg. 11²¹˙ ²³ shows that the line calls attention only in the *second* of these verses to the unusual expression, 'Jehovah, the God of Israel.' In Lev. 13⁴⁸˙ ⁵², the rare technical terms for 'warp' and 'woof' are marked only at their second occurrence, but not at the first. In Gen. 11³˙ ⁴, it is only on the second occurrence of the rare form הָבָה, that the

noting line appears. In Neh. 2¹⁰, attention is called, by the insertion of the line, to the remarkable designation, 'Tobiah, *the servant*, the Ammonite'; yet the same expression is found earlier, in v.¹⁰, though unmarked. In Ezek. 18²⁰, the unexpected insertion of בּ between the preceding verb and its object עָו * is noted by the inserted pointer; yet the same construction appears, unmarked, in the preceding verse. In 2 Chron. 6²³· ²⁷, the line calls attention to the noteworthy expression וְאַתָּה ׀ תִּשְׁמַע; but, strangely, it does not appear at the *first* occurrence, in v.²¹; not surprising, however, considering the general usage, is its absence in the later verses, ³⁰· ³³. In Jer. 30¹⁵, the line is inserted at the recurrence of an expression ('because of the abundance of thine iniquity,' etc.) which is *not* noted in v.¹⁴.

(4) Most striking, however, is the fact that numerous instances are found, throughout the Scriptures, of single words as well as expressions so remarkable as to demand special consideration, yet these are *without* the note-line we now expect to find. This non-appearance may be accounted for variously.

(*a*) One sufficient reason for the absence of the pointer may be that these peculiar readings are possibly *irregularities which have originated since the line was introduced in olden times;* and that later transcribers, unaware of its true design and use, though generally retaining it where they found it already inserted, failed to extend its legiti-

---

* See the normal construction, with the accusative directly subordinated by the verb, in Isa. 53¹². Cf. p. 69.

mate application to more recent instances of suspected readings. Certainly, it would be an incalculable benefit if *all* doubtful readings could be indicated by a simple and convenient sign, like the pointer. A few specimens will now be given of textual difficulties, still unmarked by the line or any other sign, which, presumably, are of comparatively recent origin.

> Jer. 3[1] abruptly begins with what is really a connective or intermediary, and not an opening word, viz. לֵאמֹר ('saying'). The Massoretic reading is certainly strange, yet no editorial note marks the word. Cf. p. 54 ff.
>
> In Ps. 93[1], the second לָבֵשׁ 'he is clothed,' is not marked as a striking repetition, which surely must have originated *after* the early scribes had begun to insert the line. Cf. p. 39.
>
> In Ps. 137, though the line calls attention to singularities in vv.[1, 3, 6, 7,] (twice) [9], peculiar readings are to be found in other verses also, all unmarked.
>
> In Prov. 1, the only verses marked by the pointer are vv.[9, 22, 27], which certainly contain notable readings. But unmarked textual difficulties occur in other verses also, viz. vv.[11, 12, 17, 18] etc.*
>
> Prov. 19 exhibits note-lines only in vv.[7, 10], where, certainly, difficulties of the text occur ; but other perplexing readings appear in vv.[6, 12, 13, 18, 19] etc.
>
> Prov. 22 shows the line only in vv.[3, 29] ; but

---

* On these and other instances in the Book of Proverbs, see the recent Commentaries of Toy and Frankenberg, and *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Proverbs.* Some assistance may also be derived from Kautzsch's *Text of Proverbs* (edited by Haupt).

emendations must likewise be made in vv.[4. 5. 7. 8] etc.

In Prov. 3, the line does not appear till v.[28], where an obvious emendation is necessary; but unmarked textual difficulties likewise exist in vv.[4. 6. 10. 11. 12] etc.

Still more remarkable are Prov. 2, 13, and 14, which do not contain a single note-line, yet present points at which changes must be made; such are 2[6. 7. 8. 9] etc., 13[1. 4. 5. 6. 7] etc.; also 14[7. 9. 12. 14] etc.

Ps. 69 exhibits eight points at which the line appears, viz. in vv.[1. 3. 5. 7. 14. 16. 21. 36]. In all these cases, indeed, something noteworthy is indicated; several of the verses even contain more than one remarkable form; but other verses in the same Psalm present equally remarkable readings, requiring attention, at which, however, no mark is placed. Thus, in v.[27], for אַתָּה 'thou,' we must read the accusatival sign אֵת; and for יְסַפְּרוּ 'they relate,' we should put יִסְפּוּ 'they add.' In v.[33], for רָאוּ 'they have seen,' read יָרִיעוּ 'let them shout.'

In Ps. 71, the line is found at seven points, viz. in vv.[3. 6. 15. 18. 20. 21. 22]; but unmarked difficulties are to be found in vv.[4. 10. 13. 14] etc.

In Ps. 82, containing 8 verses, the line appears only in v.[5], near the beginning, though the main difficulty is at the end. But emendations must be made in vv.[2. 4. 7. 8], though these contain no sign.

See also 1 Sam. 13[1], 2 Sam. 15[7], Ezek. 16[6].

(*b*) Another obvious reason for irregularity in the insertion of the line is the *varying judgment of the same scribe* at different times, or the *difference of opinion between one*

scribe and another, as to the expediency of marking peculiarities in the text. Subjective standards always vary. Want of uniformity—or even positive inconsistency—in the insertion of the note-line is thus quite natural. A few illustrations will make this clear.

> We have already seen * that the repetition of a name, used in addressing the person who bears it, is regularly marked by the line in Gen. 22[11] ('Abraham, Abraham'), 46[2] ('Jacob, Jacob'), 1 Sam. 3[10] ('Samuel, Samuel'); yet the pointer is absent from a precisely parallel case in Ex. 3[4] ('Moses, Moses').
>
> Attention has already been called † to the remarkable repetition of the line in the case of the expression סָבִיב ׀ סָבִיב in Ezek. 40[5, 14, 16] etc. It might have been expected that the transcribers—earlier or later—who showed themselves so punctilious in copying the latter portion of the book would have been equally attentive in noting repetitions when these occur in the earlier chapters; yet in 21[14] חֶרֶב חֶרֶב 'a sword, a sword,' remains unmarked, and, still more notably, עַוָּה עַוָּה עַוָּה 'overturn, overturn, overturn,' in v.[32].
>
> See also Ezek. 7[6] 10[21] 11[15] 16[6, 23].
>
> Similarly, in Judg. 13[7], the line is inserted, in accordance with the general rule, † to mark the striking recurrence of the same letter consecutively in the expression אַל־תִּשְׁתִּי ׀ יַיִן 'drink not wine,' yet the sign is absent from the same expression previously occurring in v.[4].
>
> In 1 Chron. 2[3], after mention of Er, there follows the explanation that he was 'the firstborn of Judah.'

This has been fitly marked with the line, by a scribe, as really superfluous; yet the same expression remains unmarked by the transcriber of the earlier account in Gen. 18⁷.

The usual form of the name of King Hezekiah is חִזְקִיָּהוּ (see 2 Kings 18⁹ etc., Isa. 36¹ etc.); the short form חִזְקִיָּה in Prov. 25¹ is there fitly marked by the note-line prefixed, but not in 2 Kings 18¹. ¹⁰. ¹⁴. (twice) ¹⁵. ¹⁶, though the ordinary form likewise appears in vv.⁹. ¹³ of the same chapter. Similarly, in 1 Chron. 4⁴¹, the lengthened form יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ is rightly marked with the line, as rare; yet in Isa. 1¹, where also this third form appears, it is left unmarked.

Compare also Ps. 18 with 2 Sam. 22.

An eminent instance in which the note-line, though specially desirable, is wholly absent, is the Song of Deborah (Judg. 5), abounding in textual difficulties, some of which remain unsolved, in spite of earnest efforts by competent scholars.*

———————

It has now become evident that the insertion of the line to mark noteworthy readings was, at most, occasional. Careful consideration has proved that while the sign appears in many instances of remarkable or even questionable readings, others equally remarkable are without the sign. All this, however, must not be allowed to lessen

* See, among many others, the recent commentaries of Moore and Nowack on the *Book of Judges*, as well as Monographs on the Song by Bruston, Segond, and Rothstein.

regard for the line when it does appear. And even though, from various causes, we may be unable at times to discover a satisfactory reason for the presence of the mark, such instances will prove to be comparatively rare ; while, in the vast majority of passages, it will be found a most important guide in examining the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament.

NOTE.

THE principles observed in preparing the following list of passages which contain the note-line are these :—

1. No distinction has been made between 'Pāsēq' and 'Legarmeh,' as there is no difference. See p. 17.

2. Independent examination has been made of the entire Hebrew Bible : the excellent printed editions of Ginsburg, Letteris, Baer (so far as completed), and others have been used. The lists of 'Pāsēq' and 'Legarmeh' given by Ginsburg (in his magnificent *Massorah*, for which all scholars are profoundly grateful, and in his brief Monograph on the Paseks throughout the Scriptures), by Wickes (in his *Treatise on Prose Accents*, p. 127 ff.), and by Baer, have all been consulted, but likewise largely augmented.

3. In verses containing two adjacent note-lines which might possibly form a pair (see p. 28), it has not always been possible to determine whether they are thus correlated, or are independent.

4. When the line appears in some editions but not in others (see pp. 3 and 105), the fuller recension has been followed.

APPENDIX.

———◆———

LIST OF PASSAGES IN WHICH THE
NOTE-LINE APPEARS.

GENESIS.

CHAP.
1. 5, 10, 21, 27, 29, 30.
2. 5, 21, 22.
3. 14, 15, 22 (twice).
6. 16.
7. 2, 21, 23 (twice).
8. 20.
11. 4.
12. 17.
13. 10, 16.
14. 2, 15.
15. 1, 13.
17. 8, 13, 14, 20.
18. 15 (thrice), 21, 25.
19. 9, 14 (twice), 16.
21. 14, 17.
22. 11, 12, 14.
23. 6 (twice), 17.
24. 7, 12, 30.
26. 18, 28, 32.
27. 1.
28. 9.
29. 9, 13.
30. 8, 16, 20, 32.
31. 29, 33, 51.
32. 23.
35. 5.
36. 12, 43.

CHAP.
37. 2, 20, 22.
38. 24, 29.
39. 8, 10, 23.
40. 13, 19, 20 (twice).
41. 5, 22, 48.
42. 13, 21, 22.
43. 11.
45. 5.
46. 2 (twice), 15.
47. 29.
48. 7.

EXODUS.

2. 11.
3. 8.
4. 18.
6. 5.
7. 17, 19, 20.
8. 5.
9. 14.
10. 5.
11. 2, 3, 7.
12. 15, 19, 29.
13. 12, 17, 18.
14. 10, 20, 21.
15. 18, 26.
16. 5, 22, 29, 32.
17. 6, 7, 15.
18. 12.

117

EXODUS—*continued.*

LEVITICUS.

NUMBERS.

DEUTERONOMY.

JOSHUA.

CHAP.
1. 11 (twice), 15 (twice).
3. 4.
5. 4, 6, 14.
6. 5, 15, 19, 24.
7. 7.
    1, 33 (four times).
9. 10, 12.
10. 5, 11, 12, 23, 27.
11. 20.
12. 1.
13. 3 (twice), 21, 30.
14. 6.
15. 7, 18, 25, 55.
17. 4.
18. 19.
19. 11, 47, 51 (thrice).
20. 4, 6 (twice), 9.
21. 13, 32.
22. 4, 5, 7, 9, 16, 20, 22 (four times), 32.
23. 10, 12, 14.
24. 7, 13, 31.

JUDGES.

1. 7.
2. 7, 12 (twice), 15, 18, 19.
3. 3, 20.
4. 6.
6. 2, 8, 24, 31.
7. 4.
8. 12.
9. 28, 54.
10. 4. 6 (twice).
11. 17, 23, 39, 40.
12. 1 (twice).
13. 7.
14. 15, 17, 19.
15. 19.
16. 2, 3, 29, 31.
18. 2, 7, 10, 19.
19. 1, 8, 16.
20. 10, 16, 25, 28, 31, 33, 35.
21. 19, 22.

RUTH.

1. 2, 13.
2. 21.

CHAP.
3. 3, 13.
4. 11.

1 SAMUEL.

1. 11.
2. 15, 16, 19.
3. 9, 10.
4. 18 (twice).
5. 4, 9.
6. 8, 15, 18.
7. 1, 6, 10, 14.
9. 9, 10, 12, 16, 24.
10. 3, 18.
11. 7.
12. 2, 3, 21, 24.
13. 5, 8.
14. 3, 6, 12, 36, 47 (twice).
16. 5, 7.
17. 23, 25 (thrice), 28, 40.
18. 10 (thrice), 27.
19. 9.
20. 1, 9, 12, 21, 25, 41, 42.
21. 10.
22. 3, 17, 18.
24. 10 (double), 16.
25. 13 (twice), 14, 20, 25, 29, 31, 34.
26. 6, 7, 16, 19, 23.
27. 1.
28. 12, 15.
29. 3.
30. 21 (double), 22, 24.
31. 4, 7.

2 SAMUEL.

1. 2, 6, 10.
2. 1, 7, 16.
3. 8, 12, 13, 18, 21.
4. 9.
6. 2, 5, 16.
7. 12, 24, 28.
10. 14.
11. 1, 2.
12. 9, 11, 18, 23.
13. 29, 32, 36.
14. 7, 17, 19, 26, 32.
15. 20, 21, 30.
16. 8.
17. 18, 21.
19. 1, 7 (twice), 10, 36, 38.
20. 3, 8, 10.

2 SAMUEL—*continued.*

CHAP.
21. 16, 20.
23. 8, 10, 18.
24. 2, 3, 13 (twice), 16, 17 (twice).

1 KINGS.

1. 13, 25, 32, 36.
2. 3, 30, 31, 37.
3. 12, 14, 15 (twice), 26.
4. 19.
5. 4, 19, 20.
6. 27, 29.
7. 2, 23, 24, 25 (twice), 29 (twice), 38, 51.
8. 20, 25, 32, 36, 47, 53, 54, 59, 65 (twice).
9. 15, 19, 23.
10. 10, 22.
11. 14, 22, 32, 33, 34, 36.
12. 2, 16, 27, 32 (thrice), 33.
13. 1, 4, 6, 9, 11.
14. 21.
15. 5, 13, 18.
16. 2, 7 (twice).
17. 10.
18. 5, 10, 12 (twice), 23, 36, 40, 45.
19. 4, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14.
20. 6, 13, 25 (twice), 29, 30, 39.
21. 2 (twice), 15.
22. 8, 13, 38.

2 KINGS.

1. 6, 13, 17.
2. 4, 5, 12, 14, 23.
3. 16, 17.
4. 6, 13, 19.
5. 8, 11, 20, 22.
6. 32 (twice).
7. 1 (twice), 6, 9.
8. 14, 18.
9. 7.
10. 5, 6 (twice), 25.
11. 4, 11, 15, 19.
12. 22.
13. 3, 14, 16, 21.
17. 29, 36, 41 (twice).
18. 4, 12, 14 (thrice), 17.
19. 4 (twice), 6, 11, 16, 23, 35, 37.

CHAP.
20. 5, 13, 14, 17.
21. 8.
22. 12, 14, 17, 19.
23. 3, 12, 13 (twice), 19, 26.
24. 2 (twice), 3, 14, 20.
25. 4 (twice), 16, 17 (twice), 19, 25.

1 CHRONICLES.

2. 3, 25.
3. 1.
4. 41, 42.
5. 14, 26.
8. 38.
9. 20, 44.
10. 4.
11. 23.
12. 18, 20, 37, 40.
13. 6.
15. 2, 18, 27, 29.
16. 39.
17. 22, 25.
18. 8.
19. 2.
20. 1 (two), 2, 6.
21. 12 (two), 15 (two), 18.
22. 3, 5, 18.
24. 31.
26. 8, 26.
27. 1 (four), 4.
28. 10.
29. 2, 6, 11, 21, 23.

2 CHRONICLES.

1. 12.
2. 3, 9.
3. 5.
4. 2, 3, 4 (two).
5. 1.
6. 10, 16, 23, 27, 32, 37.
7. 3, 9, 22.
8. 1, 6.
9. 8, 9, 21.
10. 16 (two).
12. 6, 7, 13.
13. 5, 8, 12.
14. 6.
15. 3, 16.

2 CHRONICLES—*continued.*

CHAP.

16. 8.
17. 10.
18. 3, 7, 12.
19. 10 (two), 11.
20. 1, 7, 8, 22.
21. 3, 6, 12, 18, 19 (two).
23. 10, 14, 20.
24. 5, 20, 23, 24.
25. 16.
26. 15, 17, 21.
28. 7, 9.
30. 10, 19, 21, 25.
31. 2, 21.
32. 22, 31.
33. 8, 14.
34. 3, 9, 12, 20, 22, 25, 27.
35. 18, 21 (two), 25.
36. 23.

EZRA.

2. 1.
3. 8.
4. 2.
5. 6, 8, 15.
6. 1, 9 (three), 12.
7. 11, 17.
8. 35, 36.
9. 7, 8, 13.
10. 9, 14.

NEHEMIAH.

1. 4.
2. 1, 2, 6, 12 (two), 13, 19.
3. 14, 34.
4. 1, 10.
5. 14.
6. 17.
7. 6.
8. 3, 6, 7 (two), 17, 18.
11. 33.
13. 15 (two), 23.

ESTHER.

1. 2, 3, 5, 6 (two), 8, 14, 15, 18.
2. 12, 14, 15.
3. 1, 7, 12.
4. 7.

CHAP.

5. 1, 14.
7. 8.
8. 9, 11, 15.
9. 7 (three), 8 (three), 9 (four), 16, 27 (two).
10. 1, 3.

JOB.

1. 1, 16, 17 (two), 19.
2. 11.
3. 13, 26.
4. 5, 16, 19.
5. 5, 6, 19.
6. 10.
7. 20, 21.
9. 24.
10. 3, 17, 22.
11. 6 (two), 15.
12. 3, 4, 6.
13. 14, 27.
14. 5, 13, 19.
15. 23, 24, 28, 30.
16. 4, 9 (two), 10, 12.
18. 2.
19. 3, 12, 27, 29.
20. 20, 23, 29 (two).
21. 8, 17, 28.
24. 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 24.
26. 14.
27. 9, 13 (two).
28. 3, 4, 28.
30. 1.
31. 2, 34, 35, 40.
32. 2, 6 (two), 11.
33. 15, 23, 26, 27.
34. 10, 19, 20, 29, 33.
35. 13.
36. 16, 28.
37. 4, 6, 12 (two), 14, 21.
38. 1, 2.
39. 25.
40. 6, 9, 23.
42. 3, 8 (two).

PSALMS.

1. 1, 2, 3, 5.
2. 2, 12.
3. 1, 8.

PSALMS—*continued.*

CHAP.
4. 2.
5. 2, 3, 5 (two), 7, 9, 11.
6. 7, 11 (in some editions),
7. 6 (two), 7, 10.
8. 3.
9. 7, 14, 17, 21.
10. 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13 (two), 14 (three).
11. 1, 4.
12. 3, 5, 8.
13. 2, 3, 6.
14. 5.
15. 3, 4, 5.
16. 9, 10.
17. 1, 3, 14.
18. 1 (two), 7 (two), 8, 9, 12, 14, 16, 31, 50 (two), 51.
19. 5 (two), 7, 10, 14, 15.
20. 2, 6, 7, 8.
21. 5, 10.
22. 16, 24, 27, 28, 30.
23. 5.
24. 7, 9.
25. 5, 7.
26. 1.
27. 1 (two), 2, 3, 4, 5, 9.
28. 1, 5, 7, 9.
29. 9, 11.
30. 6, 11, 13.
31. 3 (two), 12, 14, 15, 21, 23.
32. 4 (two), 6, 8, 9.
33. 12.
35. 1, 10, 13, 21, 26.
36. 5, 7.
37. 1, 7, 14, 20, 28, 34.
38. 12, 13.
39. 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13 (two).
40. 3, 4, 6 (two), 10, 11, 15, 16, 17 (two), 18.
41. 3, 7, 8, 10, 14 (two).
42. 3, 5 (three), 6, 9 (two), 10, 11, 12.
43. 1, 2, 4, 5.
44. 2, 3, 9, 24 (two).
45. 2 (two), 5, 13.
47. 9, 10.
48. 9, 11, 12, 14, 15.
49. 11, 12, 14, 15.

CHAP.
50. 1, 6, 7, 16, 21.
51. 6, 16, 18.
52. 2, 5.
54. 5.
55. 16, 20 (two), 22, 23, 24 (two).
56. 1, 7, 8, 10.
57. 2, 4, 5, 7, 10.
58. 7.
59. 2, 8, 12, 17.
60. 2, 8, 9, 10.
61. 3, 9.
62. 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.
63. 2 (two).
64. 6.
65. 5, 6, 8, 10, 14.
66. 4, 6, 7 (two), 8.
67. 4, 5, 6.
68. 5, 7 (two), 9, 17, 19 (two), 20, 21, 24, 28, 31, 36 (two).
69. 1, 3, 5, 7, 14, 16, 21, 36.
70. 4, 5, 6.
71. 3, 6, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22.
72. 1, 4, 16, 17, 18, 19 (two).
73. 8, 10, 20, 28 (two).
74. 2 (two), 18.
75. 2, 9.
76. 6, 8.
77. 3, 4, 8, 17, 18, 19.
78. 4, 5, 6, 8, 20, 21, 31, 38, 55, 65.
79. 1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 13.
80. 2, 3.
81. 6, 11.
82. 5.
84. 3, 4 (three), 7, 12.
85. 9.
86. 8, 9 (two), 11, 12, 14.
87. 4, 5.
88. 6, 14.
89. 2, 3, 9 (two), 50 (two), 52, 53.
90. 2, 10, 17.
91. 4, 7, 15.
92. 8, 10.
93. 3, 4, 5.
94. 3, 14, 17, 23.
95. 10.
96. 5, 10, 13.
97. 7, 8, 9.
98. 1, 3, 6.
99. 4, 6.

ISAIAH—*continued.*

CHAP.
11. 11 (two).
13. 8.
15. 5.
17. 9.
18. 2, 7.
19. 16.
21. 2 (two), 8, 15.
22. 2, 13 (two), 24.
23. 1, 13, 17.
24. 3 (two).
25. 7.
26. 3.
27. 9, 13.
28. 12.
30. 25.
31. 4.
33. 14.
36. 2.
37. 2, 4 (two), 6, 11, 17, 24, 36, 38.
39. 2, 3, 6.
40. 28.
41. 22.
42. 5.
45. 1, 14.
47. 1.
48. 1.
49. 5, 8, 21, 25.
50. 1, 4, 10, 11.
52. 1.
54. 2.
56. 4.
57. 19.
58. 2.
60. 9.
61. 3, 11.
63. 1, 3, 7, 9, 11.
65. 8, 13 (two).
66. 12, 19, 20 (three).

JEREMIAH.

1. 10, 13, 15.
2. 5, 13, 24.
4. 1, 3, 10, 13, 19 (double), 22.
5. 15.
6. 1, 11, 14, 16.
7. 9, 14, 16, 20, 34.
8. 1, 2, 11.

CHAP.
9. 2, 22.
10. 2.
11. 5, 14, 16, 19.
12. 5, 14.
13. 10.
14. 13, 16.
15. 11, 12.
16. 3, 5.
17. 5, 8, 16, 24, 25 (two), 27.
18. 20.
19. 4, 11.
20. 4.
21. 7 (three).
22. 3, 6, 30.
23. 6, 19.
24. 8 (two).
25. 3, 25, 26.
26. 2, 8, 10, 15, 18.
27. 12, 18.
28. 1, 3, 11, 14.
29. 16, 18, 21, 32 (double).
30. 8, 11, 15, 18, 23.
31. 6, 14, 15, 34, 36, 39.
32. 8, 17, 35, 36, 43, 44.
33. 2, 10, 12, 16.
34. 1.
35. 5, 15 (double).
36. 23, 27, 32.
37. 7.
38. 4 (two), 6, 11, 20.
39. 4.
40. 1, 7, 8, 11 (two), 14.
41. 1, 2, 9, 10.
42. 6, 16.
44. 9, 14, 17, 25, 26 (double), 30.
45. 4.
46. 16, 28.
47. 2.
48. 20, 27.
49. 12, 28, 37 (two), 39.
50. 14, 29, 34.
51. 2, 6, 24, 37 (double), 59.
52. 3, 15, 20, 25.

LAMENTATIONS.

1. 1, 15, 16 (two).
2. 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 19.
5. 21.

ZEPHANIAH.

CHAP.
1. 1.
2. 2, 15.
3. 11, 15.

HAGGAI.

1. 12 (two).
2. 4, 12, 20.

ZECHARIAH.

1. 6, 8, 17.
3. 8, 9.
4. 7.

CHAP.
6. 15.
8. 17.
9. 11.
10. 6.
11. 12.
12. 10.
13. 2, 4, 9.
14. 2, 8, 12 (two).

MALACHI.

1. 6.
2. 5, 11, 14, 17.
3. 1, 5.

INDEX.

127