

# THE SONG OF SONGS

TRANSLATED BY  
M. G. EASTON

## The Translator's Preface

The volume now offered to students of the Bible completes the Keil and Delitzsch series of Commentaries on the Old Testament. Like those which have preceded, it is intended exclusively for theological students and scholars, with whom it cannot but gain a welcome reception, as a most important contribution to the right interpretation of those difficult portions of the sacred canon, whether the reader may agree with the conclusions of the learned author or not.

At the end of the original volume there are added three dissertations by Wetzstein. But as the commentary is in itself complete without those, they have been omitted with Dr. Delitzsch's concurrence. I content myself by merely indicating here their import. In the first of them, Wetzstein aims at showing that the words פֶּלֶחַ הָרְמוֹן, Son. 4: 3; 6: 7, signify the slice (*Spalt, Ritz*) of a pomegranate = the inner surface of a sliced pomegranate. In the second, he argues that the *Dudaim* plant, Son. 7:13, is not the *mandragora vernalis* of botanists, but the *mandr. autumnalis*, which begins to bud and blossom, as is the case with most of the Palestinian flora, about the time of the first winter rains in the month of November. The passage, הֵדָּהּ ... רִיחַ, he accordingly translates: "Already the mandragora apples give forth their fragrance," i.e., are already ripe; because it is only the ripe apples that are fragrant. In the third dissertation, on Ecc. 12: 5, he seeks to establish the translation of וַיִּסְתַּבֵּל ... הַחֲגִב by "And the almond tree flourisheth, and the locusts creep forth, and the wretched life is brought to dissolution." The first two of these clauses, he holds, denote the season of the year [the beginning of the meteorological spring. The seven days from 25th February to 3rd March are called the *eijam el-'agaiz*, i.e., the (seven death-) days for old people], in which that which is said in the third (the death of the old man) takes place.

I cannot send forth this volume without expressing the deep obligation I am under to Dr. Delitzsch for his kindness in forwarding to me various important corrections and additions which I have incorporated in the translation, and for valuable suggestions with reference to it. This English edition may, from these circumstances, be almost regarded as a second edition of the original. I have done my best to verify the references, and to present a faithful rendering of the

original, and in such a form as to allow the author to express himself in his own way, without violating the idiomatic structure of the language.

## Abbreviations

The abbreviations and technical forms common to such critical works as this have been retained. These require no explanation. The colon (:) has been used, as in the original, to introduce a translation or a quotation. In the text criticisms, the following abbreviations have been used: —

F. = *Cod. Francofurtensis* of 1294, described by Delitzsch in his Preface to Baer's edition of the *Psalter* of 1861 and 1874.

H. = *Cod. Heidenheimii*, a MS.

J. = *Cod. Jamanensis*, which was brought from South Arabia by Jacob Sappir, and passed into Baer's possession. Vid., Delitzsch's Preface to Baer's edition of *Isaiah*, 1872.

P. = *Cod. Petropolitanus* of the year 1010, now in St. Petersburg. Vid., Pinner's *Prospectus*, pp. 81-88.

D. = A parchment MS of the Song placed at Delitzsch's disposal by Baer.

E<sup>1</sup>, E<sup>2</sup>, E<sup>3</sup>, E<sup>4</sup> = The four Erfurt Manuscripts.

## Introduction to the Song of Songs

The *Song* is the most obscure book of the Old Testament. Whatever principle of interpretation one may adopt, there always remains a number of inexplicable passages, and just such as, if we understood them, would help to solve the mystery. And yet the interpretation of a book presupposes from the beginning that the interpreter has mastered the idea of the whole. It has thus become an ungrateful task; for however successful the interpreter may be in the separate parts, yet he will be thanked for his work only when the conception as a whole which he has decided upon is approved of.

It is a love-poem. But why such a *minne* -song in the canon? This question gave rise in the first century, in the Jewish schools, to doubts as to the canonicity of the book. Yet they firmly maintained it; for they presupposed that it was a spiritual and not a secular love-poem. They interpreted it allegorically. The Targum paraphrases it as a picture of the history of Israel from the Exodus to the coming of the Messiah. The bride is the congregation of Israel; and her breasts, to quote one example, are interpreted of the Messiah in His lowliness

and the Messiah in His glory. But “Solomon” is an anthropomorphic representation of Jahve Himself. And all the instances of the occurrence of the name, with one exception, are therefore regarded as an indirect allegorical designation of the God of peace (vid., Norzi under 1: 1). And because of its apparently erotic, but in truth mysterious contents, it was a Jewish saying, as Origen and Jerome mention, that the Song should not be studied by any one till he was thirty years of age (*nisi quis aetatem sacerdotalis ministerii, id est, tricesimum annum impleverit*). Because, according to the traditional Targ. interpretation, it begins with the departure out of Egypt, it forms a part of the liturgy for the eighth day of the Passover. The five Megilloths are arranged in the calendar according to their liturgical use. <sup>11</sup>

In the church this synagogal allegorizing received a new turn. They saw represented in the Song the mutual love of Christ and His church, and it thus became a mine of sacred mysticism in which men have dug to the present day. Thus Origen explains it in twelve volumes. Bernhard of Clairvaux died (1153) after he had delivered eighty-six sermons on it, and had only reached the end of the second chapter; <sup>12</sup> and his disciple Gilbert Porretanus carried forward the interpretation in forty-eight sermons only to 5:10, when he died. Perluigi de Palestrina gained by his twenty-nine motettes on the Song (1584) the honoured name of *Principe della Musica*. In modern times this allegorico-mystical interpretation is represented in the department of exegesis (Hengst.), sermon (F. W. Krummacher), and poetry (Gustav Jahn), as well as of music (Neukomm’s duet: *Er und sie*), and even of painting (Ludw. von Maydell).

If the Song is to be understood allegorically, then Shulamith is the personification of the congregation of Israel, and mediately of the church. All other interpretations fall below this. Hug (1813) understands by the “beloved” the kingdom of the ten tribes longing after a reunion with the house of David; and Heinr. Aug. Hahn (1852), the Japhetic heathendom. Ludw. Noack (1869) has even changed and modified the readings of the Heb. text, that he might find therein the ballads of a *Tirhâka* romance, i.e., a series of pictures of the events occurring between Samaria and her Aethiopian lover *Tirhâka*, of the years (B.C.) 702, 691, and 690. These are the aberrations of individuals. Only one other interpretation recommends itself. Solomon’s *chairisma* and aim was the Chokma. The Peshito places over the Song the superscription חכמה חכמה. Is Shulamith, then, the personification of wisdom, like Dante’s Beatrice? Rosenmüller (1830) is the most recent representative of this view; we ought then to have in Dante’s *Convito* the key to the allegorical interpretation. He there sings sweet songs of love of his mistress Philosophy. But there is nothing in the description here to show that Shulamith is Wisdom. The one

expression, “Thou shalt teach me” (Son. 8: 2), warns us against attempting to put Wisdom in the place of the church, as a reversal of the facts of the case.

But if one understands the church to be meant, there yet remains much that is inexplicable. Who are the sixty queens and the eighty concubines (Son. 6: 8)? And why are the heroes just sixty (Son. 3: 7)? The synagogal and church interpretation, in spite of two thousand years’ labour, has yet brought to light no sure results, but only numberless absurdities, especially where the Song describes the lovers according to their members from head to foot and from foot to head. But notwithstanding all this, it is certain that the “great mystery” (Eph. 5:32) mirrors itself in the Song. In this respect it resembles the love of Joseph and Zuleikha, often sung by the Arabian poets, which is regarded by the mystics<sup>3</sup> as a figure of the love of God towards the soul longing for union with Him. Shulamith is a historic personage; not the daughter of Pharaoh, as has been often maintained since the days of Theodore of Mopsuestia (died 429) and Abulfaraj (died 1286), but a country maiden of humble rank, who, by her beauty and by the purity of her soul, filled Solomon with a love for her which drew him away from the wantonness of polygamy, and made for him the primitive idea of marriage, as it is described in Gen. 3:23ff., a self-experienced reality. This experience he here sings, idealizing it after the manner of a poet; i.e., removing the husk of that which is accidental, he goes back to its kernel and its essential nature. We have before us six dramatic figures, each in two divisions, which represent from within the growth of this delightful relation to its conclusion. This sunny glimpse of paradisaical love which Solomon experienced, again became darkened by the insatiableness of passion; but the Song of Songs has perpetuated it, and whilst all other songs of Solomon have disappeared, the providence of God has preserved this one, the crown of them all. It is a protest against polygamy, although only in the measure one might expect from the Mosaic standpoint. For the *Tôra* recognises, indeed, in its primitive history monogamy as the original form (Mat. 19: 4-6); but in its legislation, giving up the attempt to abolish polygamy, it is satisfied with its limitation (Deu. 17:17).

The Song celebrates paradisaical, but yet only natural love (*minne*). It stands, however, in the canon of the church, because Solomon is a type of Him of whom it can be said, “a greater than Solomon is here” (Mat. 12:12). Referred to Him the antitype, the earthly contents receive a heavenly import and glorification. We see therein the mystery of the love of Christ and His church shadowed forth, not, however, allegorically, but typically. The allegory has to coincide throughout with that which is represented; but the type is always only a type *subtractis subtrahendis*, and is exceedingly surpassed by the antitype. In this sense Jul. Sturm (1854) has paraphrased the Song under the title of “*Zwei Rosen*” (two roses) (the typical and the antitypical). When my monograph on the Song appeared (1851), a notice of it in Colani’s *Revue de Theologie* (1852)

began with the frivolous remark: “*Ce n’est pas la première rêverie de ce genre sur le livre en question; plutôt à Dieu que ce fût la dernière;*” and Hitzig (1855) judged that “such a work might properly have remained unprinted; it represents nothing but a perverse inconsiderate literature which has no conception of scientific judgment and industry.” But this work (long since out of print and now rare) was the fruit of many years of study. The commentary here given is based on it, but does not put it out of date. It broke with the allegorizing interpretation, the untenableness of which appears against his will in Hengstenberg’s commentary (1853); it broke also with the theory which regards the poem as a history of Solomon’s unsuccessful seductive efforts to gain the Shulamite’s affections, a theory which Hitzig (1855) tries to exempt from the necessity of doing violence to the text by arbitrarily increasing the number of speakers and actors in the plot. I certainly succeeded in finding the right key to the interpretation of this work. Zöckler has recognised my book<sup>f4</sup> as presenting “the only correct interpretation of its design and contents.” Kingsbury, author of the notes on the Son in *The Speaker’s Commentary*, has expressed the same judgment. Poets such as Stadelmann (*Das Hohelied, ein dramatisches Gedicht* = *The Song of Songs: a dramatic poem*, 1870) and J. Koch, late pastor of St. Mary’s in Parchim (died 1873), have recognised in their beautiful German paraphrases my interpretation as natural and in conformity with the text; and for twenty years I have constantly more and more seen that the solution suggested by me is the right and only satisfactory one.

Shulamith is not Pharaoh’s daughter. The range of her thoughts is not that of a king’s daughter, but of a rustic maiden; she is a stranger among the daughters of Jerusalem, not because she comes from a foreign land, but because she is from the country; she is dark-complexioned, not from the sun of her more southern home, but from the open sunshine to which she has been exposed as the keeper of a vineyard; in body and soul she is born to be a princess, but in reality she is but the daughter of a humble family in a remote part of Galilee; hence the child-like simplicity and the rural character of her thoughts, her joy in the open fields, and her longing after the quiet life of her village home. Solomon appears here in loving fellowship with a woman such as he had not found among a thousand (Ecc. 7:28); and although in social rank far beneath him, he raises her to an equality with himself. That which attached her to him is not her personal beauty alone, but her beauty animated and heightened by nobility of soul. She is a pattern of simple devotedness, naive simplicity, unaffected modesty, moral purity, and frank prudence, — a lily of the field, more beautifully adorned than he could claim to be in all his glory. We cannot understand the Song of Songs unless we perceive that it presents before us not only Shulamith’s external attractions, but also all the virtues which make her the idea of all that is gentlest and noblest in woman. Her words and her silence, her

doing and suffering, her enjoyment and self-denial, her conduct as betrothed, as a bride, and as a wife, her behaviour towards her mother, her younger sister, and her brothers, — all this gives the impression of a beautiful soul in a body formed as it were from the dust of flowers. Solomon raises this child to the rank of queen, and becomes beside this queen as a child. The simple one teaches the wise man simplicity; the humble draws the king down to her level; the pure accustoms the impetuous to self-restraint. Following her, he willingly exchanges the bustle and the outward splendour of court life for rural simplicity, wanders gladly over mountain and meadow if he has only her; with her he is content to live in a lowly cottage. The erotic external side of the poem has thus an ethical background. We have here no “song of loves” (Eze. 33:32) having reference to sensual gratification. The rabbinical proverb is right when it utters its threat against him who would treat this Song, or even a single verse of it, as a piece of secular literature. <sup>15</sup>

The Song transfigures natural but holy love. Whatever in the sphere of the divinely-ordered marriage relation makes love the happiest, firmest bond uniting two souls together, is presented to us here in living pictures. “The Song,” says Herder, “is written as if in Paradise. Adam’s song: Thou art my second self! Thou art mine own! echoes in it in speech and interchanging song from end to end.” The place of the book in the canon does not need any further justification; that its reception was favoured also by the supposition that it represented the intercourse between Jahve and the congregation of Israel, may be conjectured indeed, but is not established. The supposition, however, would have been false; for the book is not an allegory, and Solomon is by no means an *Allegorumenon* of God. But the congregation is truly a bride (Jer. 2: 2; Isa. 62: 5), and Solomon a type of the Prince of peace (Isa. 9: 5; Luk. 11:31), and marriage a mystery, viz., as a pattern of the loving relation of God and His Christ to the church (Eph. 5:32). The Song has consequently not only a historico-ethical, but also a typico-mystical meaning. But one must be on his guard against introducing again the allegorical interpretation as Soltz (1850) has done, under the misleading title of the typical interpretation. The typical interpretation proceeds on the idea that the type and the antitype do not exactly coincide; the mystical, that the heavenly stamps itself in the earthly, but is yet at the same time immeasurably different from it. Besides, the historico-ethical interpretation is to be regarded as the proper business of the interpreter. But because Solomon is a type (*vaticinium reale*) of the spiritual David in his glory, and earthly love a shadow of the heavenly, and the Song a part of sacred history and of canonical Scripture, we will not omit here and there to indicate that the love subsisting between Christ and His church shadows itself forth in it.

But the prevailing view which Jacob (1771) established, and which has predominated since Umbreit (1820) and Ewald (1826), is different from ours.

According to them, the Song celebrates the victory of the chaste passion of conjugal love. The beloved of Shulamith is a shepherd, and Solomon acts toward her a part like that of Don Juan with Anna, or of Faust with Gretchen. Therefore, of course, his authorship is excluded, although Anton (1773), the second oldest representative of this so-called shepherd hypothesis, supposes that Solomon at a later period of his life recognised his folly, and now here magnanimously praises the fidelity of Shulamith, who had spurned his enticements away from her; and a Jewish interpreter, B. Holländer (1871), following Hezel (1780), supposes that Solomon represents himself as an enticer, only to exhibit the idea of female virtue as triumphing over the greatest seduction. Similarly also Godet (1867),<sup>16</sup> who, resting on Ewald, sees here a very complicated mystery presented by Solomon himself, and pointing far beyond him: Solomon, the earthly Messiah; Shulamith, the true Israel; the shepherd, Jahve, and as Jahve who is about to come, the heavenly Solomon; the little sisters, heathenism — it is the old allegory, able for everything, only with changed names and a different division of the parts which here comes in again by the back-door of the seduction-history.<sup>17</sup>

Thus this seduction-history has not put an end to the over-ingenious allegorizing. In one point, however, at least, it has aided in the understanding of the Song. Herder saw in the Song a collection of Solomonic songs of love, which he translated (1778), as the oldest and the most beautiful, from the Orient. But Goethe, who in the *Westöst. Divan* (1819) praises the Song as the most divine of all love-songs, recognised, after the appearance of Umbreit's Comm., the unity also of the "inexplicably mysterious."

We are not conscious of any prejudice which makes it impossible for us to do justice to the interpretation to which Umbreit and Ewald gave currency. It abundantly accounts for the reception of the book into the canon, for so interpreted it has a moral motive and aim. And the personality of Solomon has certainly not merely a bright side, which is typical, but also a dark side, which is pregnant with dark issues for his kingdom; it may perhaps be possible that in the Song the latter, and not the former, is brought to view. Then, indeed, the inscription would rest on an error; for that in this case also the Solomonic authorship could be maintained, is an idea which, in the traditional-apologetical interest, mounts up to a faith in the impossible. But the truth goes beyond the tradition; the inscription would then indicate a traditional interpretation which, as is evident from the book itself, does not correspond with its original meaning and aim. "It is clear to every unprejudiced mind," says Gustav Baur,<sup>18</sup> "that in Son. 2:10-15; 4: 8-15, a different person speaks from the royal wooer; for

**(1)** Solomon only says, 'my friend' [Son. 1:15, etc.]; while, on the other hand, the shepherd heaps up flattering words of warmest love;



(2) Solomon praises only the personal beauty of the woman; the shepherd, the sweet voice, the enchanting look, the warm love, the incorruptible chastity of his beloved; — in short, the former reveals the eye and the sensuousness of the king; the latter, the heart of a man who is animated by the divine flame of true love.” We only ask, meanwhile, whether words such as Son. 4:13 are less sensuous than Son. 4: 5, and whether the image of the twin gazelles is not more suitable in the mouth of the shepherd than the comparison of the attractions of Shulamith with the exotic plants of Solomon’s garden? “In three passages,” says Godet, “lies open the slender thread which Ewald’s penetrating eye discovered under the flowers and leaves which adorn the poem: ‘The kings has brought me into his palace’ (Son. 1: 4); ‘I knew not how my heart has brought me to the chariots of a princely people’ (Son. 6:12); ‘I was a wall, and have found peace before his eyes’ (Son. 8:10).” The same critic also finds in several passages an apparent contrariety between Solomon and the shepherd. “Observe,” says he, “e.g., Son. 1:12, 13, where the shepherd — whom Shulamith calls her spikenard, and compares to a bunch of flowers on her breast — is placed over against the king, who sits on his divan; or Son. 7: 9f. where, suddenly interrupting the king, she diverts the words which he speaks concerning herself to her beloved; or Son. 8: 7, where, leaning on the arm of her beloved, she expresses her disregard for riches, with which Solomon had sought to purchase her love.” But spikenard is not the figure of the shepherd, not at all the figure of a man; and she who is praised as a “prince’s daughter” (Son. 7: 2) cannot say (Son. 6:12) that, enticed by curiosity to see the royal train, she was taken prisoner, and now finds herself, against her will, among the daughters of Jerusalem; and he whom she addresses (Son. 8:12) can be no other than he with whom she now finds herself in her parents’ home. The course of the exposition will show that the shepherd who is distinguished from Solomon is nothing else than a shadow cast by the person of Solomon.

The Song is a dramatic pastoral. The ancients saw in it a *carmen bucolicum mimicum*. Laurentius Peträus, in his Heb.-Danish Paraphrase (1640), calls it *carmen bucolicum*, ἀμοιβαῖον, δραματικόν); George Wachter (1722), an “opera divided into scenic parts.” It acquires the character of a pastoral poem from this, that Shulamith is a shepherdess, that she thinks of Solomon as a shepherd, and that Solomon condescends to occupy the sphere of life and of thought of the shepherdess. It is not properly an idyll, nor yet properly a drama. Not an idyll, because the life-image which such a miniature drawn from life — such, e.g., as the Adon. of Theocritus presents to us — unfolds itself within a brief time without interruption; in the Song, on the other hand, not merely are the places and persons interchanged, but also the times. The whole, however, does not fall into little detached pictures; but there runs through this wreath of figures a love-relation, which embodies itself externally and internally before



our eyes, and attains the end of its desire, and shows itself on the summit of this end as one that is not merely sensuous, but moral. The Song is certainly not a theatrical piece: <sup>f9</sup> the separate pieces would necessarily have been longer if the poet had had in view the changes of theatrical scenery. But at all events the theatre is not a Semitic institution, but is of Indo-Persian Greek origin. Jewish poetry attempted the drama only after it began in Alexandrinism <sup>f10</sup> to emulate Greece. Grätz' (1871) polemic against the dramatists is so far justified. But yet we see, as in the Book of Job, so in the Song, the drama in process of formation from the lyric and narrative form of poetry, as it has developed among the Greeks from the lyric, and among the Indians from the epic. In the Book of Job the colloquies are all narrative. In the Song this is never the case; <sup>f11</sup> for the one expression, "answered my beloved, and said to me" (Son. 2:10), is not to be compared with, "and Job answered and said:" the former expression indicates a monologue. And in the "Daughters of Jerusalem" (Son. 1: 5, etc.) we have already something like the chorus of the Greek drama. The ancient Greek MSS bear involuntary testimony to this dramatic character of the Song. There are several of them which prefix to the separate addresses the names of the persons speaking, as ἡ νύμφη, ὁ νυμφίος. <sup>f12</sup>

And the Aethiopic translation makes five separate pieces, probably, as the *Cod. Sinait.* shows, after the example of the LXX, which appear as divisions into Acts.

The whole falls into the following six Acts: —

- (1.) The mutual affection of the lovers, Son. 1: 2-2: 7, with the conclusion, "I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem."
- (2.) The mutual seeking and finding of the lovers, Son. 2: 8-3: 5, with the conclusion, "I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem."
- (3.) The fetching of the bride, and the marriage, Son. 3: 6-5: 1, beginning with, "Who is this...?" and ending with, "Drink and be drunken, beloved."
- (4.) Love scorned, but won again, Son. 5: 2-6: 9.
- (5.) Shulamith the attractively fair but humble princess, Son. 6:10-8: 4, beginning with, "Who is this...?" and ending with, "I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem."
- (6.) The ratification of the covenant of love in Shulamith's home, Son. 8: 5-14, beginning with, "Who is this...?"

Zöckler reckons only five acts, for he comprehends 5: 2-8: 4 in one; but he himself confesses its disproportionate length; and the reasons which determine him are invalid; for the analogy of the Book of Job, which, besides, including the prologue and the epilogue, falls into seven formal parts, can prove nothing;

and the question, “Who is this?” Son. 6:10, which he interprets as a continuation of the encomium in Son. 6: 9, is rather to be regarded, like Son. 3: 8; 8: 5, as a question with reference to her who is approaching, and as introducing a new act; for the supposition that Son. 6: 9 requires to be further explained by a statement of what was included in the “blessing” and the “praising” is unwarranted, since these are ideas requiring no supplement to explain them (Gen. 30:13; Psa. 41: 3; 107:32), and the poet, if he had wished to explain the praise as to its contents, would have done this otherwise (cf. Pro. 31:28f.) than in a way so fitted to mislead. Rightly, Thrupp (1862) regards Son. 6:10 as the chorus of the daughters of Jerusalem. He divides as follows:

- (1) The Anticipation, Son. 1: 2-2: 7;
- (2) the Awaiting, Son. 2: 8-3: 5;
- (3) the Espousal and its Results, Son. 3: 6-5: 1;
- (4) the Absence, Son. 5: 2-8;
- (5) the Presence, 5: 9-8: 4;
- (6) Love’s Triumph, Son. 8: 5-12, with the Conclusion, Son. 8:13, 14.

But how can Son. 5: 9 begin a new formal part? It is certainly the reply to Shulamith’s adjuration of the daughters of Jerusalem, and not at all the commencement of a new scene, much less of a new act.

In our division into six parts, the separate acts, for the most part necessarily, and in every case without any violence, divide themselves into two scenes each, thus: —

Act I 1: 2-2: 7	Scene 1 1: 2-8	Scene 2 1: 9-2: 7
“ II 2: 8-3: 5	“ 2: 8ff.	“ 3: 1-5
“ III 3: 6-5: 1	“ 3: 6ff.	“ 4: 1-5: 1
“ IV 5: 2-6: 9	“ 5: 2-6: 3	“ 6: 4-9
“ V 6:10-8: 4	“ 6:10-7: 6	“ 7: 7-8: 4
“ VI 8: 5-14	“ 8: 5-7	“ 8: 8-14

The first scene of the first act I formerly (1851) extended to 1:17, but it reaches only to 1: 8; for up to this point Solomon is absent, but with 1: 9 he begins to converse with Shulamith, and the chorus is silent — the scene has thus changed. Kingsbury in his translation (1871) rightly places over 1: 9 the superscription, “The Entrance of the King.”

The change of scenery is not regulated in accordance with stage decoration, for the Song is not a theatrical piece. <sup>f13</sup>

The first act is played both in the dining-room and in the wine-room appertaining to the women of the royal palace. In the second act, Shulamith is again at home. In the third act, which represents the marriage, the bride makes

her entrance into Jerusalem from the wilderness, and what we further then hear occurs during the marriage festival. The locality of the fourth act is Jerusalem, without being more particularly defined. That of the fifth act is the park of Etam, and then Solomon's country house there. And in the sixth act we see the newly-married pair first in the way to Shulem, and then in Shulamith's parental home. In the first half of the dramatic pictures, Shulamith rises to an equality with Solomon; in the second half, Solomon descends to an equality with Shulamith. At the close of the first, Shulamith is at home in the king's palace; at the close of the second, Solomon is at home with her in her Galilean home.

.....

In our monograph on the Song (1851), we believe we have proved that it distinctly bears evidences of its Solomonic origin. The familiarity with nature, the fulness and extent of its geographical and artistic references, the mention made of so many exotic plants and foreign things, particularly of such objects of luxury as the Egyptian horses, point to such an authorship; in common with Psa. 72, it has the multiplicity of images taken from plants; with the Book of Job, the dramatic form; with the Proverbs, manifold allusions to Genesis. If not the production of Solomon, it must at least have been written near his time, since the author of Pro. 1-9, the introduction to the older Book of Proverbs, for the origin of which there is no better defined period than that of Jehoshaphat (909-883 B.C.), and the author or authors of the supplement (Pro. 22:17-24:22), reveal an acquaintance with the Song. Ewald also, and Hitzig, although denying that Solomon is the author because it is directed against him, yet see in it a produce of the most flourishing state of the language and of the people; they ascribe it to a poet of the northern kingdom about 950 B.C. Modern Jewish criticism surpasses, however, on the field of O.T. history, the anachronisms of the Tübingen school. As Zunz has recently (*Deu. Morgenl. Zeitsch.* xxvii.) sought to show that the Book of Leviticus was written about a thousand years after Moses, that there never was a prophet Ezekiel, that the dates of this book are fictitious, etc.; so Grätz attempts to prove that the Song in its Graecising language and Greek customs and symbols bears evidences of the Syro-Macedonian age; <sup>fl4</sup> that the poet was acquainted with the idylls of Theocritus and the Greek erotic poets, and, so far as his Israelitish standpoint admitted, imitates them; and that he placed an ideal picture of pure Jewish love over against the immorality of the Alexandrine court and its Hellenistic partisans, particularly of Joseph b. Tobia, the collector of taxes in the time of Ptolemy Euergetes (247-221 B.C.), — a picture in which “the Shepherd,” <sup>fl5</sup> now grown into a fixed idea, renders welcome service, in contrast to Solomon, in whom the poet glances at the court of Alexandria. One is thus reminded of Kirschbaum (1833), who hears in Eze. 33: 5 an echo of Cicero's *dixi et salvavi animam*, and in the Son. 2:17, a reference to the Bethar of Barcochba. We do not deny the

penetration which this chief of Jewish historians has expended on the establishment of his hypothesis; but the same penetration may prove that the Babylon.-Assyr. “*syllabaries*” of the time of Asurbanipal (667-626) belong to the Greek era, because there occurs therein the word *azamillav* (knife), and this is the Greek *σμίλη*; or that the author of Pro. 1-9 alludes in 7:23 to Eros and his quivers, and in 9: 1 betrays a knowledge of the seven *artes liberales*. Parallels to the Song are found wherever sensuous love is sung, also in the *Pastoralia* of Longus, without the least dependence of one author upon another. And if such a relation is found between Theocritus and the Song, then it might rather be concluded that he became acquainted with it in Alexandria from Jewish literates,<sup>fl6</sup> than that the author of the Song has imitated Greek models, as Immanuel Romi, the Arabians and Dante; besides, it is not at all the Song lying before us which Grätz expounds, but the Song modified by violent corrections of all kinds, and fitted to the supposed tendency. Thus he changes (Son. 1: 3) *שְׁמֵיךָ* (thine unguent) into *בְּשֵׁמֶיךָ*, and *שֶׁמֶן תִּזְרַק* (ointment poured forth) into *שֶׁמֶךְ תִּמְרוֹק*. — Shulamith says this of her beautiful shepherd, and what follows (Son. 1: 4) the damsels say to him; he changes *מִשְׁכְּנִי* into *מִשְׁכְּנוֹ*, *הַבֵּיאֲנִי* into *הַבֵּיאֲנוּ*, and then remarks: “Shulamith mentions it as to the praise of her beloved, that the damsels, attracted by his beauty, love him, and say to him, ‘Draw us, we will run after thee; though the king brought us into his changers, we would rejoice only with thee, and prefer thee to the king.’” “His too confident conjectural criticism presents us with imaginary words, such as (Son. 3:10) *אֶהְיֶה* (ebony); with unfortunate specimens of style, such as (Son. 6:10), “Thou hast made me weak, O daughter of Aminadab;” and with unheard-of renderings, such as (Son. 8: 5), “There where thy mother has wounded thee;” for he supposes that Shulamith is chastised by her mother because of her love. *This* Song is certainly not written by Solomon, nor yet does it date from the Syro-Macedonian time, but was invented in Breslau in the 19th century of our era!

Grätz (1871) has placed yet farther down than the Song the Book of Ecclesiastes, in which he has also found Graecisms; the tyrannical king therein censured is, as he maintains, Herod the Great, and the last three verses (Eccl. 12:12-14) are not so much the epilogue of the book as that of the Hagiographa which closes with it. Certainly, if this was first formed by the decision of the conference in Jerusalem about 65, and of the synod in Jabne about 90, and the reception of the Books of Ecclesiastes and the Song was carried not without controversy, then it lies near to regard these two books as the most recent, originating not long before. But the fact is this: We learn from *Jud-ajim* iii. 5, iv. 6, cf. *Edujoth* v. 3, that in the decade before the destruction of Jerusalem the saying was current among the disciples of Hillel and Shammai, that “all Holy

Scriptures (*Kethub̂m*) pollute the hands,”<sup>17</sup> but that the question whether Ecclesiastes is included was answered in the negative by the school of Shammai, and in the affirmative by the school of Hillel — of the Song nothing is here said. But we learn further, that several decades later the Song also was comprehended in this controversy along with Ecclesiastes; and in an assembly of seventy-two doctors of the law in Jabne, that decree, “all Holy Scriptures (*Kethub̂m*) pollute the hands,” was extended to Ecclesiastes and the Song. R. Akiba (or some one else) asserted, in opposition to those who doubted the canonicity of the Song, “No day in the whole history of the world is so much worth as that in which the Song of Songs was given; for all the *Kethub̂m* are holy, but the Song of Songs is most holy.” From this Grätz draws the conclusion that the Hagiographa was received as canonical for the first time about 65, and that its canon was finally fixed so as to include Ecclesiastes and the Song, not till about 90; but this conclusion rests on the false supposition that “Holy Scriptures” (*Kethub̂m*) is to be understood exclusive of the Hagiographa, which is just as erroneous as that *Sepĥarim* designates the prophets, with the exclusion of the Hagiographa. Holy *Kethub̂m* is a general designation, without distinction, of all the canonical books, e.g., *Bathra* i. 6, and *Sephar̂m* in like manner, with the exception only of the *Tôra*, *Megilla* i. 8, 333. 1, *Shabbath* 115b. And it rests on a misapprehension of the question discussed: the question was not whether Ecclesiastes and the Song should be admitted, but whether they had been justly admitted, and whether the same sacred character should be ascribed to them as to the other holy writings; for in *Bathra* 14b -15a (without a parallel in the Palest. Talmud) the enriching of the canon by the addition of the Books of Isaiah, Proverbs, the Song, and Ecclesiastes, is ascribed to the Hezekiah-Collegium (Pro. 21: 5), and thus is dated back in the period before the rise of the great synagogue. That Philo does not cite the Song proves nothing; he cites none of the five Megilloth. But Josephus (*C. Ap.* 1, § 8; cf. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 10), since he enumerates five books of the Mosaic law, thirteen books of prophetic history and prediction, and four books of a hymno-ethical character, certainly means by these four the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song, which in the Alexandrine canon stand thus connected. His work, *Cont. Apion*, was not indeed written till about 100 A.D.; but Josephus there speaks of a fact which had existed for centuries. The Song and Ecclesiastes formed part of the sacred books among the Hellenists as well as among the Palestinian Jews of the first Christian century; but, as those Talmud notices show, not without opposition. The Old Testament canon, as well as that of the New Testament, had then also its *Antilegomena*. These books were opposed not because of their late origin, but because their contents apparently militated against the truth of revelation and the spiritual nature of revealed religion. Similar doubts, though not so strong and lasting, were also uttered with reference to Proverbs, Esther, and Ezekiel.

The history of the exposition of this book is given in detail by Christian D. Ginsburg in *The Song of Songs*, London 1857; and by Zöckler in “The Song,” forming part of Lange’s *Bibelwerk*, 1868, and supplemented by an account of the English interpretations and translations in the Anglo-American translation of this work by Green. Zunz, in the preface to Rebenstein’s (Bernstein’s) *Lied der Lieder*, 1834, has given an historical account of the Jewish expositors. Steinschneider’s **הַמְזֻכָּר** (*Heb. Bibliograph.* 1869, p. 110ff.) presents a yet fuller account of the Jewish commentaries. The Munich royal library contains a considerable number of these, — e.g., by Moses b. Tibbon, Shemiah, Immanuel Romi, Moses Calais (who embraced Christianity). Our commentary presents various new contributions to the history of the interpretation of this book. No other book of Scripture has been so much abused, by an unscientific spiritualizing, and an over-scientific unspiritual treatment, as this has. Luther says, at the close of his exposition: *Quodsi erro, veniam meretur primus labor, nam aliorum cogitationes longe plus absurditatis habent.* To inventory the *maculatur* of these absurdities is a repulsive undertaking, and, in the main, a useless labour, from which we absolve ourselves.

## EXPOSITION

**Son. 1: 1.** The title of the book at once denotes that it is a connected whole, and is the work of one author. — Ch. 1: 1. *The Song of Songs, composed by Solomon.* The genitival connection, “Song of Songs,” cannot here signify the Song consisting of a number of songs, any more than calling the Bible “The Book of books” leads us to think of the 24 + 27 canonical books of which it consists. Nor can it mean “one of Solomon’s songs;” the title, as it here stands, would then be the paraphrase of **שִׁיר שִׁירֵי שֶׁ**, chosen for the purpose of avoiding the redoubled genitives; but “one of the songs” must rather have been expressed by **שִׁיר מִשִּׁירֵי**. It has already been rightly explained in the *Midrash*:<sup>†18</sup> “the most praiseworthy, most excellent, most highly-treasured among the songs.” The connection is superl. according to the sense (cf. **ἄβρητα ἀβρητων** of Sophocles), and signifies that song which, as such, surpasses the songs one and all of them; as “servant of servants,” Gen. 9:25, denotes a servant who is such more than all servants together. The plur. of the second word is for this superl. sense indispensable (vid., Dietrich’s *Abhand. zur hebr. Gramm.* p. 12), but the article is not necessary: it is regularly wanting where the complex idea takes the place of the predicate, Gen. 9:25, Exo. 29:37, or of the inner member of a genitival connection of words, Jer. 3:19; but it is also wanting in other places, as Eze. 16: 7 and Ecc. 1: 2; 12: 8, where the indeterminate plur. denotes not totality, but an unlimited number; here it was necessary, because a definite Song — that, namely, lying before us — must be designated as the paragon of

songs. The relative clause, “*asher lishlōmō*,” does not refer to the single word “Songs” (Gr. Venet. τῶν τοῦ), as it would if the expression were שִׁיר מְהֻשָּׁ, but to the whole idea of “the Song of Songs.” A relative clause of similar formation and reference occurs at 1Ki. 4: 2: “These are the princes, *asher lo*, which belonged to him (Solomon).” They who deny the Solomonic authorship usually explain: The Song of Songs which concerns or refers to Solomon, and point in favour of this interpretation to LXX B. ὅ ἐστι Σαλ., which, however, is only a latent genit., for which LXX A. τῶ Σαλ. *Lamed* may indeed introduce the reference of a writing, as at Jer. 23: 9; but if the writing is more closely designated as a “Song,” “Psalm,” and the like, then *Lamed* with the name of a person foll. is always the *Lamed auctoris*; in this case the idea of reference to, as e.g., at Isa. 1: 1, cf. 1Ki. 5:13, is unequivocally expressed by עֵל. We shall find that the dramatized history which we have here, or as we might also say, the fable of the melodrama and its dress, altogether correspond with the traits of character, the favourite turns, the sphere of vision, and the otherwise well-known style of authorship peculiar to Solomon. We may even suppose that the superscription was written by the author, and thus by Solomon himself. For in the superscription of the Proverbs he is surnamed “son of David, king of Israel,” and similarly in Ecclesiastes. But he who entitles him merely “Solomon” is most probably himself. On the other hand, that the title is by the author himself, is not favoured by the fact that instead of the שִׁ, everywhere else used in the book, the fuller form *asher* is employed. There is the same reason for this as for the fact that Jeremiah in his prophecies always uses *asher*, but in the Lamentations interchanges שִׁ with *asher*. This original demonstrative שִׁ is old-Canaanitish, as the Phoenician שִׁ, arrested half-way toward the form *asher*, shows. <sup>119</sup>

In the Book of Kings it appears as a North Palest. provincialism, to the prose of the pre-exilian literature it is otherwise foreign; <sup>120</sup> but the pre-exilian *shir* and *kinah* (cf. also Job. 19:29) make use of it as an ornament. In the post-exilian literature it occurs in poetry (Psa. 122: 3, etc.) and in prose (1Ch. 5:20; 27:27); in Ecclesiastes it is already a component part of the rabbinism in full growth. In a pre-exilian book-title שִׁ in place of *asher* is thus not to be expected. On the other hand, in the Song itself it is no sign of a post-exilian composition, as Grätz supposes. The history of the language and literature refutes this.



# First Act

## THE MUTUAL AFFECTION OF THE LOVERS — SON. 1: 2-2: 7

### FIRST SCENE OF THE ACT, 1: 2-8

The first act of the melodrama, which presents the loving relationship in the glow of the first love, now opens, 1: 5, 6, are evidently the words of Shulamith. Here one person speaks of herself throughout in the singular. But in vv. 2-4 one and several together speak. Ewald also attributes vv. 2-4 to Shulamith, as words spoken by her concerning her shepherd and to him. She says, “Draw me after thee, so will we run,” for she wishes to be brought by him out of Solomon’s court. But how can the praise, “an ointment poured forth is thy name,” — an expression which reminds us of what is said of Solomon, 1Ki. 5:11 [1Ki. 4:31], “and his fame was in all nations round about,” — be applicable to the shepherd? How could Shulamith say to the shepherd, “virgins love thee,” and including herself with others, say to him also, “we will exult and rejoice in thee”? on which Ewald remarks: it is as if something kept her back from speaking of herself alone. How this contradicts the psychology of love aiming at marriage! This love is jealous, and does not draw in rivals by head and ears. No; in vv. 2-4 it is the daughters of Jerusalem, whom Shulamith addresses in v. 5, who speak. The one who is praised is Solomon. The ladies of the palace are at table (*vid.*, under v. 12), and Solomon, after whom she who is placed amid this splendour which is strange to her asks longingly (v. 7), is not now present. The two pentastichal strophes, vv. 2-4, are a scholion, the table song of the ladies; the solo in both cases passes over into a chorus.

**Son. 1: 2.** From these words with which as a solo the first strophe begins:

*Let him kiss me with kisses of his mouth,*

we at once perceive that she who here speaks is only one of many among whom Solomon’s kisses are distributed; for *min* is partitive, as e.g., Exo. 16:27 (cf. Jer. 48:32 and Isa. 16: 9), with the underlying phrase נָשַׁק נְשִׁיקָה, *osculum osculari* = *figere, jungere, dare*. *Nashak* properly means to join to each other and to join together, particularly mouth to mouth. פִּיהוּ is the parallel form of פִּי, and is found in prose as well as in poetry; it is here preferred for the sake of the rhythm. Böttcher prefers, with Hitzig, יִשְׁקֵנִי (“let him give me to drink”); but “to give to drink with kisses” is an expression unsupported.

In line 2 the expression changes into an address:

*For better is thy love than wine.*

Instead of “thy love,” the LXX render “thy breasts,” for they had before them the word written defectively as in the traditional text, and read **יָדִי יָדִי**. Even granting that the dual **יָדַי** or **יָדַי** could be used in the sense of the Greek **μαστοί** (Rev. 1:13), <sup>f21</sup> of the breasts of a man (for which Isa. 32:12, Targ., furnishes no sufficient authority); yet in the mouth of a woman it were unseemly, and also is itself absurd as the language of praise. But, on the other hand, that **יָדִי** is not the true reading (“for more lovely — thus he says to me — are,” etc.), R. Ismael rightly says, in reply to R. Akiba, *Aboda zara* 29b, and refers to **יָדִי מְנִי** following (v. 3), which requires the mas. for **יָדִי**. Rightly the Gr. Venet. **οἱ σοὶ ἔρωτες**, for **יָדִי** is related to **יָדָה**, almost as **ἔρω** to **ἀγάπη**, *Minne* to *Liebe*. It is a plur. like **יָמֵי**, which, although a *plural tantum*, is yet connected with the plur. of the pred. The verbal stem **יָד** is an abbreviated reduplicative stem (Ewald, § 118. 1); the root **יָד** appears to signify “to move by thrusts or pushes” (vid., under *Psa.* 42: 5); of a fluid, “to cause to boil up,” to which the word **יָדָה**, a kitchen-pot, is referred. <sup>f22</sup>

It is the very same verbal stem from which **יָדִי** (David), the beloved, and the name of the foundress of Carthage, **יָדִי** (= **יָדִי**) *Minna*, is derived. The adj. *tov* appears here and at *3a* twice in its nearest primary meaning, denoting that which is pleasant to the taste and (thus particularly in Arab.) to the smell.

**Son. 1: 3.** This comparison *suaves prae vino*, as well as that which in line 3 of the pentastich, v. 3,

*To the smell thy ointments are sweet,*

shows that when this song is sung wine is presented and perfumes are sprinkled; but the love of the host is, for those who sing, more excellent than all. It is maintained that **יָדִי** signifies fragrance emitted, and not smell. Hence Hengst., Hahn, Hölem., and Zöck. explain: in odour thy ointments are sweet. Now the words can certainly, after *Jos.* 22:10, *Job.* 32: 4, *1Ki.* 10:23, mean “sweet in (of) smell,” but in such cases the word with *Lamed* of reference naturally stands after that to which it gives the nearer reference, not as here before it. Therefore Hengst.: *ad odorem unguentorem tuorum quod attinet bonus est*, but such giving prominence to the subject and attraction (cf. *1Sa.* 2: 4a ; *Job.* 15:20) exclude one another; the accentuation correctly places **יָדִי** out of the gen. connection. Certainly this word, like the Arab. *ryḥ*, elsewhere signifies *odor*, and the *Hiph.* **יָרִיחַ** (*araḥ*) *odorari*; but why should not **יָדִי** be also used in the sense of *odoratus*, since in the post-bibl. Heb. **רוֹשׁ הַרִיחַ** means the sense of smell, and also in Germ. “*riechen*” means to emit fragrance as well as to perceive fragrance? We explain after *Gen.* 2: 9, where *Lamed* introduces the

sense of sight, as here the sense of smell. Zöckl. and others reply that in such a case the word would have been לָרִיחַ; but the art. is wanting also at Gen. 2: 9 (cf. 3: 6), and was not necessary, especially in poetry, which has the same relation to the art. as to *asher*, which, wherever practicable, is omitted.

Thus in line 4:

*An ointment poured forth is thy name.*

By “thy ointments,” line 3, spices are meant, by which the palace was perfumed; but the fragrance of which, as line 4 says, is surpassed by the fragrance of his name. שֵׁם (name) and שִׁמֵן (fragrance) form a paranomasia by which the comparison is brought nearer Ecc. 7: 1. Both words are elsewhere mas.; but sooner than שֵׁם, so frequently and universally mas. (although its plur. is שְׁמוֹת, but cf. אֲבוֹת), שִׁמֵן may be used as fem., although a parallel example is wanting (cf. *d<sup>e</sup>vāsh, mōr, nōphēth, kēmāh*, and the like, which are constantly mas.). Ewald therefore translates חֲמַן תּוֹרֵק as a proper name: “O sweet *Salbenduft*” [Fragrance of Ointment]; and Böttcher sees in *turāk* a subst. in the sense of “sprinkling” [*Spreng-Oel*]; but a name like “*Rosenöl*” [oil of roses] would be more appropriately formed, and a subst. form תּוֹרֵק is, in Heb. at least, unexampled (for neither תּוֹנָה nor תּוֹבֵל, in the name Tubal-Cain, is parallel). Fürst imagines “a province in Palestine where excellent oil was got,” called *Turak*; “Turkish” *Rosenöl* recommends itself, on the contrary, by the fact of its actual existence. Certainly less is hazarded when we regard *shēmēn*, as here treated exceptionally, as fem.; thus, not: *ut unguentum nomen tuum effunditur*, which, besides, is unsuitable, since one does not empty out or pour out a name; but: *unguentum quod effunditur* (Hengst., Hahn, and others), an ointment which is taken out of its depository and is sprinkled far and wide, is thy name. The harsh expression שִׁמֵן מוֹרֵק is intentionally avoided; the old Heb. language is not φιλομέτοχος (fond of participles); and, besides, מוֹרֵק sounds badly with מַר, to rub off, to wash away. Perhaps, also, שִׁמֵן יוֹרֵק is intentionally avoided, because of the collision of the weak sounds *n* and *j*. The name *Shēm* is derived from the verb *shāmā*, to be high, prominent, remarkable: whence also the name for the heavens (vid., under Psa. 8: 2). That attractive charm (lines 2, 3), and this glory (line 4), make him, the praised, an object of general love, line 5, v. 3b

*Therefore virgins love thee.*

This “therefore” reminds us of Psa. 45. עֲלָמוֹת (sing. Isa. 7:14), from עָלַם (Arab.), *ghalima, pubescere*, are maidens growing to maturity. The intrans. form אֲדַבְּוֹק, with transitive signification, indicates a pathos. The perf. is not to

be translated *dilexerunt*, but is to be judged of according to Gesen. § 126. 3: they have acquired love to thee (= love thee), as the ἠγάπησάν σε of the Greek translators is to be understood. The singers themselves are the evidence of the existence of this love.

With these words the first pentastich of the table-song terminates. The mystical interpretation regards it as a song of praise and of loving affection which is sung to Christ the King, the fairest of the children of men, by the church which is His own. The Targum, in line first, thinks of the “mouth to mouth” [Num. 12: 8] in the intercourse of Moses with God. Evidence of divine love is also elsewhere thought of as a kiss: the post-bibl. Heb. calls the gentlest death the death בנשיקה, i.e., by which God takes away the soul with a kiss.

**Son. 1: 4.** The second pentastich also begins with a solo:

*4 Draw me, so will we run after thee.*

All recent interpreters (except Böttcher) translate, like Luther, “Draw me after thee, so we run.” Thus also the Targ., but doubtfully: *Trahe nos post te et curremus post viam bonitatis tuae*. But the accentuation which gives *Tiphcha* to מִנִּי requires the punctuation to be that adopted by the Peshito and the Vulg., and according to which the passage is construed by the Greeks (except, perhaps, by the Quinta): Draw me, so will we, following thee, run (vid., Dachselt, *Biblia Accentuata*, p. 983 s.). In reality, this word needs no complement: of itself it already means, one drawing towards, or to himself; the corresponding (Arab.) *masak* signifies, *prehendere prehensumque tenere*; the root is מָשַׁח, *palpare, contrectare*. It occurs also elsewhere, in a spiritual connection, as the expression of the gentle drawing of love towards itself (Hos. 11: 4; Jer. 31: 3); cf. ἑλκύειν, Joh. 6:44; 12:32. If one connects “after thee” with “draw me,” then the expression seems to denote that a certain violence is needed to bring the one who is drawn from her place; but if it is connected with “we will run,” then it defines the desire to run expressed by the cohortative, more nearly than a willing obedience or following. The whole chorus, continuing the solo, confesses that there needs only an indication of his wish, a direction given, to make those who here speak eager followers of him whom they celebrate.

In what follows, this interchange of the *solo* and the *unisono* is repeated:

*4b If the king has brought me into his chambers,  
So will we exult and rejoice in thee.  
We will praise thy love more than wine!  
Uprightly have they loved thee.*

The cohortative **נָרְוֹצָה** (we will run) was the *apodosis imperativi*; the cohortatives here are the *apodosis perfecti hypothetici*. “Suppose that this has happened,” is oftener expressed by the perf. (Psa. 57: 7; Pro. 22:29; 25:16); “suppose that this happens,” by the fut. (Job. 20:24; Ewald, § 357b). **הַדָּרִים** are the *interiora domus*; the root word *hhādār*, as the Arab. *khadar* shows, signifies to draw oneself back, to hide; the *hhēdēr* of the tent is the back part, shut off by a curtain from the front space. Those who are singing are not at present in this innermost chamber. But if the king brings one of them in (**הַבִּיא**), from **בָּא**, *introire*, with *acc. loci*), then — they all say — we will rejoice and be glad in thee. The cohortatives are better translated by the fut. than by the conjunctive (*exultemus*); they express as frequently not what they then desire to do, but what they then are about to do, from inward impulse, with heart delight. The sequence of ideas, “exult” and “rejoice,” is not a *climax descendens*, but, as Psa. 118:24, etc., an advance from the external to the internal, — from jubilation which can be feigned, to joy of heart which gives it truth; for **שָׂמַח** — according to its root signification: to be smoothed, unwrinkled, to be glad <sup>123</sup> — means to be of a joyful, bright, complaisant disposition; and **גִּיל**, cogn. **חִיל**, to turn (wind) oneself, to revolve, means conduct betokening delight. The prep. **ב** in verbs of rejoicing, denotes the object on account of which, and in which, one has joy. Then, if admitted into the closest neighbourhood of the king, they will praise his love more than wine. **נָכַר** denotes to fix, viz., in the memory; *Hiph.*: to bring to remembrance, frequently in the way of praise, and thus directly equivalent to *celebrare*, e.g., Psa. 45:18. The wine represents the gifts of the king, in contradistinction to his person. That in inward love he gives himself to them, excels in their esteem all else he gives. For, as the closing line expresses, “uprightly they love thee,” — viz. they love thee, i.e., from a right heart, which seeks nothing besides, and nothing with thee; and a right mind, which is pleased with thee, and with nothing but thee. Heiligstedt, Zöckler, and others translate: with right they love thee. But the *pluralet*. **מִישְׁרִים** (from **מִישַׁר**, for which the sing. **מִישוֹר** occurs) is an ethical conception (Pro. 1: 3), and signifies, not: the right of the motive, but: the rightness of the word, thought, and act (Pro. 23:16; Psa. 17: 2; 58: 2); thus, not: *jure*; but: *recte, sincere, candide*. Hengst., Thrupp, and others, falsely render this word like the LXX, Aquil., Symm., Theod., Targ., Jerome, Venet., and Luther, as subject: rectitudes [abstr. for concr.] = those who have rectitude, the upright. Hengstenberg’s assertion, that the word never occurs as in adv., is set aside by a glance at Psa. 58: 2; 75: 3; and, on the other hand, there is no passage in which it is sued as *abstr. pro concr.* It is here, as elsewhere, an adv. acc. for which the word **בְּמִישְׁרִים** might also be used.

The second pentastich closes similarly with the first, which ended with “love thee.” What is there said of this king, that the virgins love him, is here more generalized; for *diligunt te* is equivalent to *diligeris* (cf. 8: 1, 7). With these words the table-song ends. It is erotic, and yet so chaste and delicate, — it is sensuous, and yet so ethical, that here, on the threshold, we are at once surrounded as by a mystical cloudy brightness. But how is it to be explained that Solomon, who says (Pro. 27: 2), “Let another praise thee, and not thine own mouth,” begins this his Song of Songs with a song in praise of himself? It is explained from this, that here he celebrates an incident belonging to the happy beginning of his reign; and for him so far fallen into the past, although not to be forgotten, that what he was and what he now is are almost as two separate persons.

**Son. 1: 5.** After this choral song, Shulamith, who has listened to the singers not without being examined by their inquisitive glances as a strange guest not of equal rank with them, now speaks:

*5 Black am I, yet comely, ye daughters of Jerusalem,  
As the tents of Kedar, as the hangings of Solomon.*

From this, that she addresses the ladies of the palace as “daughters of Jerusalem” (*Ker-רושלים*, a *du. fractus*; like עפרון for עפרון, 2Ch. 13:19), it is to be concluded that she, although now in Jerusalem, came from a different place. She is, as will afterwards appear, from Lower Galilee; — and it may be remarked, in the interest of the mystical interpretation, that the church, and particularly her first congregations, according to the prophecy (Isa. 8:23), was also Galilean, for Nazareth and Capernaum are their original seats; — and if Shulamith is a poetico-mystical Mashal or emblem, then she represents the synagogue one day to enter into the fellowship of Solomon — i.e., of the son of David, and the daughters of Jerusalem, i.e., the congregation already believing on the Messiah. Yet we confine ourselves to the nearest sense, in which Solomon relates a self-experience. Shulamith, the lightly esteemed, cannot boast that she is so ruddy and fair of countenance as they who have just sung how pleasant it is to be beloved by this king; but yet she is not so devoid of beauty as not to venture to love and hope to be loved: “Black am I, yet comely.” These words express humility without abjectness. She calls herself “black,” although she is not so dark and unchangeably black as an “Ethiopian” (Jer. 13:23). The verb שָׁחַר has the general primary idea of growing dark, and signifies not necessarily soot-blackness (modern Arab. *shuhwar*, soot), but blackness more or less deep, as שָׁחַר, the name of the morning twilight, or rather the morning grey, shows; for (Arab.) *sahar*<sup>24</sup> denotes the latter, as distinguished from (Arab.) *fajr*, the morning twilight (vid., under Isa. 14:12; 47:11). She speaks of herself as a Beduin who appears to herself as (Arab.)

*sawda*, black, and calls <sup>f25</sup> the inhabitants of the town (Arab.) *ḥawaryyat* (*cute candidas*). The *Vav* we have translated “yet” (“yet comely”); it connects the opposite, which exists along with the blackness. נְאֻנָּה is the fem. of the adj. נְאֻנָּה = נְאֻנָּה = נְאֻנִי, which is also formed by means of the doubling of the third stem-letter of נְאֻנָּה = נְאֻר, נְאֻר (to bend forward, to aim; to be corresponding to the aim, conformable, becoming, beautiful), e.g., like רֵעֵן, to be full of sap, green. Both comparisons run parallel to *nigra et bella*; she compares on the one hand the tents of Kedar, and on the other the tapestry of Solomon. אֹהֶל signifies originally, in general, the dwelling-place, as בֵּית the place where one spends the night; these two words interchange: *ohel* is the house of the nomad, and *bäith* is the tent of him who is settled. קָדַר (with the *Tsere*, probably from (Arab.) *ḳadar*, to have ability, be powerful, though of after the Heb. manner, as Theodoret explains and Symm. also translates: σκοτασμός, from (Heb.) *Kadar*, *atrum esse*) is the name of a tribe of North. Arab. Ishmaelites (Gen. 25:13) whom Pliny speaks of (*Cedraei* in his *Hist. Nat.* 5:11), but which disappeared at the era of the rise of Islam; the Karaite Jefeth uses for it the word (Arab.) *Ḳarysh*, for he substitutes the powerful Arab tribe from which Muhammed sprung, and rightly remarks: “She compares the colour of her skin to the blackness of the hair tents of the Koreishites,” — even to the present day the Beduin calls his tent his “hair-house” (*bêt wabar*, or, according to a more modern expression, *bêt saʿr*, בֵּית שַׁעַר); for the tents are covered with cloth made of the hair of goats, which are there mostly black-coloured or grey. On the one hand, dark-coloured as the tents of the Kedarenes, she may yet, on the other hand, compare herself to the beautiful appearance of the יְרִיעוֹת of Solomon. By this word we will have to think of a pleasure-tent or pavilion for the king; *pavillon* (softened from Lat. *papilio*) is a pleasure-tent spread out like the flying butterfly. This Heb. word could certainly also mean curtains for separating a chamber; but in the tabernacle and the temple the curtains separating the Most Holy from the Holy Place were not so designated, but are called פְּרֻכָּת and מִסְכָּה; and as with the tabernacle, so always elsewhere, יְרִיעוֹת (from יָרַע, to tremble, to move hither and thither) is the name of the cloths or tapestry which formed the sides of the tent (Isa. 54: 2); of the tent coverings, which were named in parall. with the tents themselves as the clothing of their framework (Hab. 3: 7; Jer. 4:20; 10:20; 49:29). Such tent hangings will thus also be here meant; precious, as those described Exo. 26 and 36, and as those which formed the tabernacle on Zion (2Sa. 7; cf. 1Ch. 17: 1) before the erection of the temple. Those made in Egypt <sup>f26</sup> were particularly prized in ancient times.



**Son. 1: 6.** Shulamith now explains, to those who were looking upon her with inquisitive wonder, how it is that she is swarthy:

*6a Look not on me because I am black,  
Because the sun has scorched me.*

If the words were אֶל-תִּראוּ (תִּראִינָהּ) בִּי, then the meaning would be: look not at me, stare not at me. But אֶל-תִּראִנִי, with שׁ (elsewhere כִּי) following, means: Regard me not that I am blackish (*subnigra*); the second שׁ is to be interpreted as co-ordin. with the first (that...that), or assigning a reason, and that objectively (for). We prefer, with Böttch., the former, because in the latter case we would have had 01558שמשׁ. The *quinqueliterum* שְׁחַרְחַרְתָּ signifies, in contradistinction to שְׁחֹר, that which is black here and there, and thus not altogether black. This form, as descriptive of colour, is diminutive; but since it also means *id quod passim est*, if the accent lies on *passim*, as distinguished from *raro*, it can be also taken as increasing instead of diminishing, as in וְיִפְּחֶהּ, וְיִפְּכֶהּ. The LXX trans. παραέβλεψέ (Symm. παρανέβλεψέ) με ὁ ἥλιος: the sun has looked askance on me. But why only askance? The Venet. better: κατείδέ με; but that is too little. The look is thought of as scorching; wherefore Aquila: συνέκαυσέ με, it has burnt me; and Theodotion: περιέφρυξέ με, it has scorched me over and over. שְׁרַף signifies here not *adspicere* (Job. 3: 9; 41:10) so much as *adurere*. In this word itself (cogn. שְׂרַף; Arab. *sadaf*, whence *asadaf*, black; cf. אֶשׁ and אֶשׁ, Job. 17: 1), the looking is thought of as a scorching; for the rays of the eye, when they fix upon anything, gather themselves, as it were, into a focus. Besides, as the Scriptures ascribe twinkling to the morning dawn, so it ascribes eyes to the sun (2Sa. 12:11), which is itself as the eye of the heavens.<sup>127</sup>

The poet delicately represents Shulamith as regarding the sun as fem. Its name in Arab. and old Germ. is fem., in Heb. and Aram. for the most part mas. My lady the sun, she, as it were, says, has produced on her this swarthy.

She now says how it has happened that she is thus sunburnt:

*6b My mother's sons were angry with me,  
Appointed me as keeper of the vineyards —  
Mine own vineyard have I not kept.*

If “mother’s sons” is the parallel for “brothers” (אֶחָיו), then the expressions are of the same import, e.g., Gen. 27:29; but if the two expressions stand in apposition, as Deu. 13: 7 [6], then the idea of the natural brother is sharpened; but when “mother’s sons” stands thus by itself alone, then, after Lev. 18: 9, it means the relationship by one of the parents alone, as “father’s wife” in the

language of the O.T. and also 1Co. 5: 5 is the designation of a step-mother. Nowhere is mention made of Shulamith's father, but always, as here, only of her mother, Son. 3: 4; 8: 2; 6: 9; and she is only named without being introduced as speaking. One is led to suppose that Shulamith's own father was dead, and that her mother had been married again; the sons by the second marriage were they who ruled in the house of their mother. These brothers of Shulamith appear towards the end of the melodrama as rigorous guardians of their youthful sister; one will thus have to suppose that their zeal for the spotless honour of their sister and the family proceeded from an endeavour to accustom the fickle or dreaming child to useful activity, but not without step-brotherly harshness. The form נָחַרו, Ewald, § 193c, and Olsh. p. 593, derive from נָחַר, the *Niph.* of which is either נָחַר or נָחַר (= נָחַר), Gesen. § 68, An. 5; but the plur. of this נָחַר should, according to rule, have been נָחַרו (cf. however, נָחַלו, *profanantur*, Eze. 7:24); and what is more decisive, this נָחַר from נָחַר everywhere else expresses a different passion from that of anger; Böttch. § 1060 (2, 379). נָחַר is used of the burning of anger; and that נָחַרו (from נָחַר = נָחַר) can be another form for נָחַרו, is shown, e.g., by the interchange of נָחַרו and נָחַרו; the form נָחַרו, like נָחַלו, Amo. 6: 6, resisted the bringing together of the ח and the half guttural ר. *Nēhērā* (here as Isa. 41:11; 45:24) means, according to the original, mid. signif. of the *Niph.*, to burn inwardly, ἀναφλέγεσθαι = ὀργίζεσθαι. Shulamith's address consists intentionally of clauses with perfects placed together: she speaks with childlike artlessness, and not "like a book;" in the language of a book, וַיִּשְׁמוֹנִי would have been used instead of שָׁמְנִי. But that she uses נָחַר (from נָחַר, R. נָחַר = נָחַר; cf. Targ. Gen. 37:11 with Luk. 2:51), and not נָחַר, as they were wont to say in Judea, after Pro. 27:18, and after the designation of the tower for the protection of the flocks by the name of "the tower of the *nōtsrīm*" [the watchmen], 2Ki. 17: 9, shows that the maid is a Galilean, whose manner of speech is Aramaizing, and if we may so say, platt-Heb. (= Low Heb.), like the Lower Saxon *plattdeutsch*. Of the three forms of the particip. נָחַר, נָחַר, נָחַר, we here read the middle one, used subst. (Ewald, § 188b), but retaining the long ē (ground-form, *nātir*).

The plur. אֶתְהַבֵּי does not necessarily imply that she had several vineyards to keep, it is the categ. plur. with the art. designating the genus; *custodiens vineas* is a keeper of a vineyard. But what kind of vineyard, or better, vine-garden, is that which she calls בְּרַמֵּי שְׁלִי, i.e., *meam ipsius vineam*? The personal possession is doubly expressed; *shēlli* is related to *cārmī* as a nearer defining apposition: my vineyard, that which belongs to me (vid., Fr. Philippi's *Status*

*constr.* pp. 112-116). Without doubt the figure refers to herself given in charge to be cared for by herself: vine-gardens she had kept, but her own vine-garden, i.e., her own person, she had not kept. Does she indicate thereby that, in connection with Solomon, she has lost herself, with all that she is and has? Thus in 1851 I thought; but she certainly seeks to explain why she is so sunburnt. She intends in this figurative way to say, that as the keeper of a vineyard she neither could keep nor sought to keep her own person. In this connection *cāarmī*, which by no means = the colourless *memet ipsam*, is to be taken as the figure of the person in its external appearance, and that of its fresh-blooming attractive appearance which directly accords with **קַרְמָה**, since from the stem-word **קָרַם** (Arab.), *karuma*, the idea of that which is noble and distinguished is connected with this designation of the planting of vines (for **קָרַם**, [Arab.] *karm*, cf. *karmat*, of a single vine-stock, denotes not so much the soil in which the vines are planted, as rather the vines themselves): her *kērēm* is her (Arab.) *karamat*, i.e., her stately attractive appearance. If we must interpret this mystically then, supposing that Shulamith is the congregation of Israel moved at some future time with love to Christ, then by the step-brothers we think of the teachers, who after the death of the fathers threw around the congregation the fetters of their human ordinances, and converted fidelity to the law into a system of hiring service, in which all its beauty disappeared. Among the allegorists, Hengstenberg here presents the extreme of an interpretation opposed to what is true and fine.

**Son. 1: 7.** These words (vv. 5-6) are addressed to the ladies of the palace, who look upon her with wonder. That which now follows is addressed to her beloved:

**7 O tell me, thou whom my soul loveth: where feedest thou?  
Where caustest thou it (thy flock) to lie down at noon?  
Among the flocks of thy companions!**

The country damsel has no idea of the occupation of a king. Her simplicity goes not beyond the calling of a shepherd as of the fairest and the highest. She thinks of the shepherd of the people as the shepherd of sheep. Moreover, Scripture also describes governing as a tending of sheep; and the Messiah, of whom Solomon is a type, is specially represented as the future Good Shepherd. If now we had to conceive of Solomon as present from the beginning of the scene, then here in v. 7 would Shulamith say that she would gladly be alone with him, far away from so many who are looking on her with open eyes; and, indeed, in some country place where alone she feels at home. The entreaty “O tell me” appears certainly to require (cf. Gen. 37:19) the presence of one to whom she addresses herself. But, on the other hand, the entreaty only asks that he should let her know where he is; she longs to know where his occupation detains him,

that she may go out and seek him. Her request is thus directed toward the absent one, as is proved by v. 8. The vocat., “O thou whom my soul loveth,” is connected with אַתָּה, which lies hid in הַגִּידָה (“inform thou”). It is a circumlocution for “beloved” (cf. Neh. 13:26), or “the dearly beloved of my soul” (cf. Jer. 12: 7). The entreating request, *indica quaeso mihi ubi pascis*, reminds one of Gen. 37:16, where, however, *ubi* is expressed by אֵיפֶה, while here by אֵיכָה, which in this sense is *ἀπ. λεγ.* For *ubi* = אֵיפֶה, is otherwise denoted only by אֵיכָה (אֵיכוֹ), 2Ki. 6:13, and usually אֵיָה, North Palest., by Hosea אֵיָה. This אֵיכָה elsewhere means *quomodo*, and is the key-word of the *K-na*, as אֵיָה is of the *Mashal* (the satire); the Song uses for it, in common with the Book of Esther, אֵיכָכָה. In themselves כָּה and בָּה, which with אֵי preceding, are stamped as interrog. in a sense analogous to *hic, ecce, κείνος*, and the like; the local, temporal, polite sense rests only on a conventional *usus loq.*, Böttch. § 530. She wishes to know where he feeds, viz., his flock, where he causes it (viz., his flock) to lie down at mid-day. The verb רָבַץ (R. >GNEBEH<, with the root signif. of condensation) is the proper word for the lying down of a four-footed animal: *complicatis pedibus procumbere (cubare)*; *Hiph.* of the shepherd, who causes the flock to lie down; the Arab. *rab’a* is the name for the encampment of shepherds. The time for encamping is the mid-day, which as the time of the double-light, i.e., the most intense light in its ascending and descending, is called צֹהַר יוֹם. שְׁלֵמָה, occurring only here, signifies *nam cur*, but is according to the sense = *ut ne*, like אֲשֶׁר לָמָּה, Dan. 1:10 (cf. Ezr. 7:23); לָמָּה, without *Dag. forte euphone.*, is, with the single exception of Job. 7:20, always *milra*, while with the *Dag.* it is *milel*, and as a rule, only when the following word begins with אֵיָה carries forward the tone to the *ult.* Shulamith wishes to know the place where her beloved feeds and rests his flock, that she might not wander about among the flocks of his companions seeking and asking for him. But what does בְּעֵמָּה mean? It is at all events the *part. act. fem.* of עָמַי which is here treated after the manner of the strong verb, the kindred form to the equally possible עָמָה (from *‘ataja*) and עֵמָּה. As for the meaning, *instar errabundae* (Syr., Symm., Jerome, Venet., Luther) recommends itself; but עָמָה must then, unless we wish directly to adopt the reading בְּעֵמָּה (Böttch.), have been transposed from מַעָה (תַּעָה), which must have been assumed if עָמָה, in the usual sense of *velare* (cf. עָמַר), did not afford an appropriate signification. Indeed, *velans*, viz., *sese*, cannot denote one whom consciousness veils, one who is weak or fainting (Ges. *Lex.*), for the *part. act.* expresses action, not passivity. But it can denote one who covers herself (the LXX, perhaps, in this sense *ὡς περιβαλλομένη*), because she mourns (Rashi); or after Gen. 38:14 (cf. Martial, 9:32) one who muffles herself

up, because by such affected apparent modesty she wishes to make herself known as a Hierodoule or harlot. The former of these significations is not appropriate; for to appear as mourning does not offend the sense of honour in a virtuous maiden, but to create the appearance of an immodest woman is to her intolerable; and if she bears in herself the image of an only beloved, she shrinks in horror from such a base appearance, not only as a debasing of herself, but also as a desecration of this sanctuary in her heart. Shulamith calls entreatingly upon him whom her soul loveth to tell her how she might be able directly to reach him, without feeling herself wounded in the consciousness of her maidenhood and of the exclusiveness of her love. It is thereby supposed that the companions of her only beloved among the shepherds might not treat that which to her is holy with a holy reserve, — a thought to which Hattendorff has given delicate expression in his exposition of the Song, 1867. If Solomon were present, it would be difficult to understand this entreating call. But he is not present, as is manifest from this, that she is not answered by him, but by the daughters of Jerusalem.

*8 If thou knowest not, thou fairest of women,  
Go after the footprints of the flock,  
And feed thy kids beside the shepherds' tents.*

**Son. 1: 8.** הַיָּפִיָּהּ, standing in the address or call, is in the voc.; the art. was indispensable, because “the beautiful one among women” = the one distinguished for beauty among them, and thus is, according to the meaning, superlative; cf. Jud. 6:15, Amo. 2:16, with Jud. 5:24; Luk. 1:28; Ewald, § 313c. The verb יָפָהּ refers to the fundamental idea: *integrum, completum esse*, for beauty consists in well-proportioned fulness and harmony of the members. That the ladies of the court are excited to speak thus may arise from this, that one often judges altogether otherwise of a man, whom one has found not beautiful, as soon as he begins to speak, and his countenance becomes intellectually animated. And did not, in Shulamith’s countenance, the strange external swarthyness borrow a brightness from the inner light which irradiated her features, as she gave so deep and pure an expression to her longing? But the instruction which her childlike, almost childish, *naïvete* deserved, the daughters of Jerusalem do not feel disposed to give her. לֹא יָדַע signifies, often without the obj. supplied, *non sapere*, e.g., Psa. 82: 5; Job. 8: 9. The לֹא־יָדַע subjoined guards against this inclusive sense, in which the phrase here would be offensive. This *dat. ethicus* (vid., 2:10, 11, 13, 17; 4: 6; 8:14), used twice here in v. 8 and generally in the Song, reflects that which is said on the will of the subject, and thereby gives to it an agreeable cordial turn, here one bearing the colour of a gentle reproof: if thou knowest not to thee, — i.e., if thou, in thy simplicity and retirement, knowest it not, viz., that he whom thou thinkest thou must seek for

at a distance is near to thee, and that Solomon has to tend not sheep but people, — now, then, so go forth, viz., from the royal city, and remain, although chosen to royal honours, as a shepherdess beside thine own sheep and kids. One misapprehends the answer if he supposes that they in reality point out the way to Shulamith by which she might reach her object; on the contrary, they answer her ironically, and, entering into her confusion of mind, tell her that if she cannot apprehend the position of Solomon, she may just remain what she is.

עֲקֵב (Arab. *ʿakib*), from עֲקָב, to be convex, arched, is the heel; to go in the heels (the reading fluctuates between the form, with and without *Dag. dirimens* in ע) of one = to press hard after him, to follow him immediately. That they assign to her not goats or kids of goats, but kids, גִּדִּים, is an involuntary fine delicate thought with which the appearance of the elegant, beautiful shepherdess inspires them. But that they name kids, not sheep, may arise from this, that the kid is a near-lying erotic emblem; cf. Gen. 38:17, where it has been fittingly remarked that the young he-goat was the proper courtesan-offering in the worship of Aphrodite (Movers' *Phönizier*, I 680). It is as if they said: If thou canst not distinguish between a king and shepherds, then indulge thy love-thoughts beside the shepherds' tents, — remain a country maiden if thou understandest not how to value the fortune which has placed thee in Jerusalem in the royal palace.

## SECOND SCENE OF THE FIRST ACT, 1: 9-2: 7

**Son. 1: 9-11.** Solomon, while he was absent during the first scene, is now present. It is generally acknowledged that the words which follow were spoken by him:

*9 To a horse in the chariot of Pharaoh  
Do I compare thee, my love.*

*10 Beautiful are thy cheeks in the chains,  
Thy neck in the necklaces.*

*11 Golden chains will we make for thee,  
With points of silver.*

Till now, Shulamith was alone with the ladies of the palace in the banqueting-chamber. Solomon now comes from the banquet-hall of the men (v. 12); and to 2: 7, to which this scene extends, we have to think of the women of the palace as still present, although not hearing what Solomon says to Shulamith. He addresses her, “my love:” she is not yet his bride. רֵעִיָּה (female friend), from רָעָה (רָעָה), to guard, care for, tend, ethically: to delight in something particularly, to take pleasure in intercourse with one, is formed in the same way



as נַעֲרָה; the mas. is רַעָה (= *ra'j*), abbreviated רַ, whence the fem. *rā'yāh* (Jud. 11:37; *Cheth-b*), as well as *rē'āh*, also with reference to the ground-form. At once, in the first words used by Solomon, one recognises a Philip, i.e., a man fond of horses, — an important feature in the character of the sage (vid., Sur. 38 of the Koran), — and that, one fond of Egyptian horses: Solomon carried on an extensive importation of horses from Egypt and other countries (2Ch. 9:28); he possessed 1400 war-chariots and 12,000 horsemen (1Ki. 10:26); the number of stalls of horses for his chariots was still greater (1Ki. 5: 6) [4:26]. Horace (Ode iii. 11) compares a young sprightly maiden to a nimble and timid *equa trima*; Anacreon (60) addresses such an one: “thou Thracian filly;” and Theocritus says (Idyl xviii. 30, 31):

*“As towers the cypress mid the garden’s bloom,  
As in the chariot proud Thessalian steed,  
Thus graceful rose-complexioned Helen moves.”*

But how it could occur to the author of the Song to begin the praise of the beauty of a shepherdess by saying that she is like a horse in Pharaoh’s chariot, is explained only by the supposition that the poet is Solomon, who, as a keen hippologue, had an open eye for the beauty of the horse. Egyptian horses were then esteemed as afterwards the Arabian were. Moreover, the horse was not native to Egypt, but was probably first imported thither by the Hyksos: the Egyptian name of the horse, and particularly of the mare, *ses-t, ses-mut*, and of the chariot, *markabuta*, are Semitic. <sup>128</sup>

סוּסָה is here not *equitatus* (Jerome), as Hengst. maintains: “*Susah* does not denote a horse, but is used collectively;” while he adds, “Shulamith is compared to the whole Egyptian cavalry, and is therefore an ideal person.” The former statement is untrue, and the latter is absurd. *Sūs* means *equus*, and *susā* may, indeed, collectively denote the stud (cf. Jos. 19: 5 with 1Ch. 4:31), but obviously it first denotes the *equa*. But is it to be rendered, with the LXX and the Venet., “to my horse”? Certainly not; for the chariots of Pharaoh are just the chariots of Egypt, not of the king of Israel. The *Chirek* in which this word terminates is the *Ch. compag.*, which also frequently occurs where, as here and Gen. 49:11, the second member of the word-chain is furnished with a prep. (vid., under Psa. 113). This *i* is an old genitival ending, which, as such, has disappeared from the language; it is almost always accented as the suff. Thus also here, where the *Metheg* shows that the accent rests on the *ult*. The plur. רַכְבֵּי, occurring only here, is the amplificative poetic, and denotes state equipage. רַמָּה is the trans. of רַמָּה, which combines the meanings *aequum* and *aequalem esse*. Although not allegorizing, yet, that we may not overlook the judiciousness of the comparison, we must remark that Shulamith is certainly a “daughter of Israel;” a daughter of the people who increased in Egypt, and, set



free from the bondage of Pharaoh, became the bride of Jahve, and were brought by the law as a covenant into a marriage relation to Him.

The transition to v. 10 is mediated by the effect of the comparison; for the head-frame of the horse's bridle, and the poitral, were then certainly, must as now, adorned with silken tassels, fringes, and other ornaments of silver (vid., Lane's *Modern Egypt*, I 149). Jerome, absurdly, after the LXX: *pulchrae sunt genae tuae sicut turturis*. The name of the turtle, תוֹר, redupl. *turtur*, is a pure onomatopoeia, which has nothing to do with תוֹר, whence תוֹר, to go round about, or to move in a circle; and turtle-dove's cheeks — what absurdity! Birds have no cheeks; and on the sides of its neck the turtle-dove has black and white variegated feathers, which also furnishes no comparison for the colour of the cheeks. תוֹרִים are the round ornaments which hang down in front on both sides of the head-band, or are also inwoven in the braids of hair in the forehead; תוֹר, *circumire*, signifies also to form a circle or a row; in Aram. it thus denotes, e.g., the hem of a garment and the border round the eye. In נָאוֹי (vid., at 5a) the *Aleph* is silent, as in לְאֵמֶר, אֶבֶל, חֲרוֹזִים are strings of pearls as a necklace; for the necklace (Arab. *kharaz*) consists of one or more, for the most part, of three rows of pearls. The verb חָרַז signifies, to bore through and to string together; e.g., in the Talm., fish which one strings on a rod or line, in order to bring them to the market. In Heb. and Aram. the secondary sense of stringing predominates, so that to string pearls is expressed by חָרוּ, and to bore through pearls, by קָדַח; in Arab., the primary meaning of piercing through, e.g., *michraz*, a shoemaker's awl.

After v. 11, one has to represent to himself Shulamith's adorning as very simple and modest; for Solomon seeks to make her glad with the thought of a continued residence at the royal court by the promise of costly and elegant ornaments. Gold and silver were so closely connected in ancient modes of representation, that in the old Aegypt. silver was called *nub het*, or white gold. Gold derived its name of זָהָב from its splendour, after the witty Arab. word *zahab*, to go away, as an unstable possession; silver is called בְּסָפֶי, from בָּסַף, *scindere, abscindere*, a piece of metal as broken off from the mother-stone, like the Arab. *dhukrat*, as set free from the lump by means of the pickaxe (cf. at Psa. 19:11; 84: 3). The name of silver has here, not without the influence of the rhythm (v. 8: 9), the article designating the species; the Song frequently uses this, and is generally in using the art. not so sparing as poetry commonly is. <sup>129</sup>

עֵט makes prominent the points of silver as something particular, but not separate. In נַעֲשֵׂה, Solomon includes himself among the other inhabitants, especially the women of the palace; for the *plur. majest.* in the words of God of

Himself (frequently in the Koran), or persons of rank of themselves (general in the vulgar Arab.), is unknown in the O.T. They would make for her golden globules or knobs with (i.e., provided with...; cf. Psa. 89:14) points of silver sprinkled over them, — which was a powerful enticement for a plain country damsel.

**Son. 1:12.** Now for the first time Shulamith addresses Solomon, who is before her. It might be expected that the first word will either express the joy that she now sees him face to face, or the longing which she had hitherto cherished to see him again. The verse following accords with this expectation:

*12 While the king is at his table,  
My nard has yielded its fragrance.*

שׁוֹ אֲשֶׁר or אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר, with fut. foll., usually means: *usque eo*, until this and that shall happen, 2: 7, 17; with the perf. foll., until something happened, 3: 4. The idea connected with “until” may, however, be so interpreted that there comes into view not the end of the period as such, but the whole length of the period. So here in the subst. clause following, which in itself is already an expression of continuance, *donec = dum (erat)*; so also עַד alone, without *asher*, with the part. foll. (Job. 1:18), and the infin. (Jud. 3:26; Exo. 33:22; Jon. 4: 2; cf. 2Ki. 9:22); seldomer with the fin. foll., once with the perf. foll. (1Sa. 14:19), once (for Job. 8:21 is easily explained otherwise) with the fut. foll. (Psa. 141:10, according to which Gen. 49:10 also is explained by Baur and others, but without עַד כִּי in this sense of limited duration: “so long as,” being anywhere proved). מִסְבֵּה is the inflected מִסָּבָה, which, like the post-bibl. מִסְבָּה, signifies the circuit of the table; for סָבָה signifies also, after 1Sa. 16:11 (the LXX rightly, after the sense οὐ μὴ κατακλιθῶμεν), to seat themselves around the table, from which it is to be remarked that not till the Greek-Roman period was the Persian custom of reclining at table introduced, but in earlier times they sat (1Sa. 20: 5; 1Ki. 13:20; cf. Psa. 128: 3). Reclining and eating are to be viewed as separate from each other, Amo. 6: 4; הִסָּבָה, “three and three they recline at table,” is in matter as in language *mishnic* (*Berachoth* 42b; cf. *Sanhedrin* 2: 4, of the king: if he reclines at table, the *Tôra* must be opposite him). Thus: While (*usque eo*, so long as), says Shulamith, the king was at his table, my nard gave forth its fragrance.

נָרְדִּי is an Indian word: *naladâ*, i.e., yielding fragrance, Pers. *nard* (*nârd*), Old Arab. *nard-n* (*nârd-n*), is the aromatic oil of an Indian plant *valeriana*, called *Nardostachys* (*Gatâmânsi* (hair-tress nard). Interpreters are wont to represent Shulamith as having a stalk of nard in her hand. Hitzig thinks of the nard with which she who is speaking has besprinkled herself, and he can do this because

he regards the speaker as one of the court ladies. But that Shulamith has besprinkled herself with nard, is as little to be thought of as that she has in her hand a sprig of nard (*spica nardi*), or, as the ancients said, an ear of nard; she comes from a region where no nard grows, and nard-oil is for a country maiden unattainable.<sup>f30</sup>

Horace promises Virgil a *cadus* (= 9 gallons) of the best wine for a small onyx-box full of nard; and Judas estimated at 300 denarii (about £8, 10s.) the genuine nard (how frequently nard was adulterated we learn from Pliny) which Mary of Bethany poured from an alabaster box on the head of Jesus, so that the whole house was filled with the odour of the ointment (Mar. 14: 5; Joh. 12: 2). There, in Bethany, the love which is willing to sacrifice all expressed itself in the nard; here, the nard is a figure of the happiness of love, and its fragrance a figure of the longing of love. It is only in the language of flowers that Shulamith makes precious perfume a figure of the love which she bears in the recess of her heart, and which, so long as Solomon was absent, breathed itself out and, as it were, cast forth its fragrance<sup>f31</sup> (cf. 2:13; 7:14) in words of longing. She has longed for the king, and has sought to draw him towards her, as she gives him to understand. He is continually in her mind.

*13 A bundle of myrrh is my beloved to me,  
Which lieth between by breasts.*

*14 A bunch of cypress-flowers is my beloved to me,  
From the vine-gardens of Engedi.*

**Son. 1:13, 14.** Most interpreters, ignoring the lessons of botany, explain 13a of a little bunch of myrrh; but whence could Shulamith obtain this? Myrrh, מֵר (מֵרָה, to move oneself in a horizontal direction hither and thither, or gradually to advance; of a fluid, to flow over the plain<sup>f32</sup>), belongs, like the frankincense, to the amyrids, which are also exotics<sup>f33</sup> in Palestine; and that which is aromatic in the *Balsamodendron myrrha* are the leaves and flowers, but the resin (*Gummi myrrhae*, or merely *myrrha*) cannot be tied in a bunch. Thus the myrrh here can be understood in no other way than as at 5: 5; in general צֵרוֹר, according to Hitzig's correct remark, properly denotes not what one binds up together, but what one ties up — thus *sacculus*, a little bag. It is not supposed that she carried such a little bag with her (cf. Isa. 3:20), or a box of frankincense (Luth. musk-apple); but she compares her beloved to a myrrh-repository, which day and night departs not from her bosom, and penetrates her inwardly with its heart-strengthening aroma. So constantly does she think of him, and so delightful is it for her to dare to think of him as her beloved.

The 14th verse presents the same thought. כִּפְרִי is the cypress-cluster or the cypress-flowers, κύπρος (according to Fürst, from כִּפְרִי = עֵפֶר, to be whitish, from the colour of the yellow-white flowers), which botanists call *Lawsonia*, and in the East *Alhennā*; its leaves yield the orange colour with which the Moslem women stain <sup>134</sup>

their hands and feet. אֶשְׁכֵּל (from שָׁכַל, to interweave) denotes that which is woven, tresses, or a cluster or garland of their flowers. Here also we have not to suppose that Shulamith carried a bunch of flowers; in her imagination she places herself in the vine-gardens which Solomon had planted on the hill-terraces of Engedi lying on the west of the Dead Sea (Ecc. 2: 4), and chooses a cluster of flowers of the cypress growing in that tropical climate, and says that her beloved is to her internally what such a cluster of cypress-flowers would be to her externally. To be able to call him her beloved is her ornament; and to think of him refreshes her like the most fragrant flowers.

**Son. 1:15.** In this ardour of loving devotion, she must appear to the king so much the more beautiful.

*15 Lo, thou art fair, my love.  
Lo, thou art fair; thine eyes are doves.*

This is a so-called *comparatio decurtata*, as we say: feet like the gazelle, i.e., to which the swiftness of the gazelle's feet belongs (Hab. 3:19); but instead of "like doves," for the comparison mounts up to equalization, the expression is directly, "doves." If the pupil of the eye were compared with the feathers of the dove (Hitz.), or the sprightliness of the eye with the lively motion hither and thither of the dove (Heiligst.), then the eulogium would stand out of connection with what Shulamith has just said. But it stands in reference to it if her eyes are called doves; and so the likeness to doves' eyes is attributed to them, because purity and gentleness, longing and simplicity, express themselves therein. The dove is, like the myrtle, rose, and apple, an attribute of the goddess of love, and a figure of that which is truly womanly; wherefore יְיִמָּה (the Arab. name of a dove), *Columbina*, and the like names of women, *columba* and *columbari*, are words of fondness and caressing. Shulamith gives back to Solomon his eulogium, and rejoices in the prospect of spending her life in fellowship with him.

*16 Behold, thou art comely, my beloved; yea charming;  
Yea, our couch is luxuriously green.*

*17 The beams of our house are cedars,  
Our wainscot of cypresses.*

**Son. 1:16, 17.** If v. 16 were not the echo of her heart to Solomon, but if she therewith meant some other one, then the poet should at least not have used **הַבְּנֵי**, but **הַבְּנֵה**. Hitzig remarks, that up to “my beloved” the words appear as those of mutual politeness — that therefore **נְעִים** (charming) is added at once to distinguish her beloved from the king, who is to her insufferable. But if a man and a woman are together, and he says **הַבְּנֵי** and she says **הַבְּנֵי**, that is as certainly an interchange of address as that one and one are two and not three. He praises her beauty; but in her eyes it is rather he who is beautiful, yea charming: she rejoices beforehand in that which is assigned to her. Where else would her conjugal happiness find its home but among her own rural scenes? The city with its noisy display does not please her; and she knows, indeed, that her beloved is a king, but she thinks of him as a shepherd. Therefore she praises the fresh green of their future homestead; cedar tops will form the roof of the house in which they dwell, and cypresses its wainscot. The bed, and particularly the bridal-bower (*D. M. Z.* xxii. 153), — but not merely the bed in which one sleeps, but also the cushion for rest, the divan (*Amo.* 6: 4), — has the name **עֶרְשׁ**, from **עָרַשׁ**, to cover over; cf. the “network of goats’ hair” (*1Sa.* 19:13) and the **κωνωπέιον** of Holofernes (*Judith* 10:21; 13: 9), (whence our *kanapee* = canopy), a bed covered over for protection against the **κωνωπες**, the gnats. **רַעֲנָן**, whence here the fem. adj. accented on the *ult.*, is not a word of colour, but signifies to be extensible, and to extend far and wide, as *lentus* in *lenti salices*; we have no word such as this which combines in itself the ideas of softness and juicy freshness, of bending and elasticity, of looseness, and thus of overhanging ramification (as in the case of the weeping willow). The beams are called **קָרוֹת**, from **קָרָה**, to meet, to lay crosswise, to hold together (cf. *congingere* and *contignare*). **רְחִימָנוּ** (after another reading, **רַח**, from **רְחִימָנוּ**, with *Kametz* immutable, or a virtual *Dag.*) is North Palest. = **רְחָה** (*Ker*), for in place of **רְחִימָנוּ**, troughs (*Exo.* 2:16), the Samarit. has **רַחֲמִים** (cf. *sahar* and *sahhar*, *circumire*, *zahar* and *zahhar*, whence the Syr. name of scarlet); here the word, if it is not defect. plur. (*Heiligst.*), is used as collect. sing. of the hollows or panels of a wainscoted ceiling, like **φάτναι**, whence the LXX **φατνώματα** (*Symm.* **φατνώσεις**), and like *lacunae*, whence *lacunaria*, for which Jerome has here *laquearia*, which equally denotes the wainscot ceiling. *Abulwaf-d* glosses the word rightly by **מַרְזָבִים**, gutters (from **רָחַט**, to run); only this and **οἱ δῶδρομοι** of the Gr. Venet. is not an architectural expression, like **רַחֲמִים**, which is still found in the Talm. (*vid.*, *Buxtorf’s Lex.*). To suppose a transposition from **רַחֲמִינוּ**, from **רָחַט**, to turn, to carve (*Ew.*, *Heiligst.*, *Hitz.*), is accordingly not necessary. As the **ת** in **בְּרוֹתִים** belongs to the North Palest. (Galilean) form of speech, <sup>B5</sup> so also **ח** for **ה** in this word: an

exchange of the gutturals was characteristic of the Galilean idiom (vid., Talm. citations by Frankel, *Einl. in d. jerus. Talm.* 1870, 7b). Well knowing that a mere hut was not suitable for the king, Shulamith's fancy converts one of the magnificent nature-temples of the North Palest. forest-solitudes into a house where, once together, they will live each for the other. Because it is a large house, although not large by art, she styles it by the poet. plur. *bāattenu*. The mystical interpretation here finds in Isa. 60:13 a favourable support.

**Son. 2: 1.** What Shulamith now further says confirms what had just been said. City and palace with their splendour please her not; forest and field she delights in; she is a tender flower that has grown up in the quietness of rural life.

*2: 1 I am a meadow-flower of Sharon,  
A lily of the valleys.*

We do not render: “the wild-flower,” “the lily,” ...for she seeks to represent herself not as the one, but only as one of this class; the definiteness by means of the article sometimes belongs exclusively to the second number of the genit. word-chain. מלאך ה' may equally (vid., at 1:11, Hitz. on Psa. 113: 9, and my *Comm.* on Gen. 9:20) mean “an angel” or “the angel of Jahve;” and בת' יש' “a virgin,” or “the virgin of Israel” (the personification of the people). For *hhāvatstsēlēth* (perhaps from *hhivtsēl*, a denom. quadril. from *bētsēl*, to form bulbs or bulbous knolls) the Syr. Pesh. (Isa. 35: 1) uses *chamsaljotho*, the meadow-saffron, *colchicum autumnale*; it is the flesh-coloured flower with leafless stem, which, when the grass is mown, decks in thousands the fields of warmer regions. They call it *filius ante patrem*, because the blossoms appear before the leaves and the seed-capsules, which develop themselves at the close of winter under the ground. Shulamith compares herself to such a simple and common flower, and that to one in Sharon, i.e., in the region known by that name. *Sharon* is *per aphaer.* derived from ישרון. The most celebrated plain of this name is that situated on the Mediterranean coast between Joppa and Caesarea; but there is also a trans-Jordanic Sharon, 1Ch. 5:16; and according to Eusebius and Jerome, there is also another district of this name between Tabor and the Lake of Tiberias,<sup>B6</sup> which is the one here intended, because Shulamith is a Galilean: she calls herself a flower from the neighbourhood of Nazareth. Aquila translates: “A rosebud of Sharon;” but שושנה (designedly here the fem. form of the name, which is also the name of a woman) does not mean the Rose which was brought at a later period from Armenia and Persia, as it appears,<sup>B7</sup> and cultivated in the East (India) and West (Palestine, Egypt, Europe). It is nowhere mentioned in the canonical Scriptures, but is first found in Sir. 24:14; 39:13; 50: 8; Wisd. 2: 8; and Est. 1: 6, LXX. Since all the *rosaceae* are five-leaved, and all the *liliaceae* are six-leaved, one might suppose, with Aben Ezra,

that the name *sosan* (*susan*) is connected with the numeral שש, and points to the number of leaves, especially since one is wont to represent to himself the Eastern lilies as red. But they are not only red, or rather violet, but also white: the Moorish-Spanish *azucena* denotes the white lily.<sup>138</sup>

The root-word will thus, however, be the same as that of שש, *byssus*, and שיש, white marble. The comparison reminds us of Hos. 14: 6 [5], “I shall be as the dew unto Israel: he shall grow as the lily.” העמקים are deep valleys lying between mountains. She thinks humbly of herself; for before the greatness of the king she appears diminutive, and before the comeliness of the king her own beauty disappears — but he takes up her comparison of herself, and gives it a notable turn.

*2 As a lily among thorns,  
So is my love among the daughters.*

**Son. 2: 2.** By החוהים are not meant the thorns of the plant itself, for the lily has no thorns, and the thorns of the rose are, moreover, called *kotsim*, and not *hhohhim*;<sup>139</sup> besides, *ben* (among) contradicts that idea, since the thorns are on the plant itself, and it is not among them — thus the *hhohhim* are not the thorns of the flower-stem, but the thorn-plants that are around. חוה designates the thorn-bush, e.g., in the allegorical answer of King Josiah to Amaziah, 2Ki. 14: 9. Simplicity, innocence, gentleness, are the characteristics in which Shulamith surpasses all בנות, i.e., all women (vid., 6: 9), as the lily of the valley surpasses the thorn-bushes around it. “Although thorns surround her, yet can he see her; he sees her quiet life, he finds her beautiful.” But continuing this reciprocal rivalry in the praise of mutual love, she says:

*3a As an apple-tree among the trees of the wood,  
So is my beloved among the sons.*

**Son. 2: 3.** The apple-tree, the name of which, תפוח, is formed from נפח, and denominates it from its fragrant flower and fruit, is as the king among fruit trees, in Shulamith’s view. נאר (from נאר, to be rough, rugged, uneven) is the wilderness and the forest, where are also found trees bearing fruit, which, however, is for the most part sour and unpalatable. But the apple-tree unites delicious fruit along with a grateful shade; and just such a noble tree is the object of her love.

*3b Under his shadow it delighted me to sit down;  
And his fruit is sweet to my taste.*

In *concupivi et consedi* the principal verb completes itself by the co-ordinating of a verb instead of an adv. or inf. as Isa. 42:21; Est. 8: 7; Ewald, § 285.



However, *concupivi et consedi* is yet more than *concupivi considerare*, for thereby she not only says that she found delight in sitting down, but at the same time also in sitting down in the shadow of this tree. The *Piel* חָמַד, occurring only here, expresses the intensity of the wish and longing. The shadow is a figure of protection afforded, and the fruit a figure of enjoyment obtained. The taste is denoted by חָךְ = חָנַךְ, from חָנַךְ, to chew, or also *imbuere*; and that which is sweet is called מְתוּק, from the smacking connected with an agreeable relish. The *usus loq.* has neglected this image, true to nature, of physical circumstances in words, especially where, as here, they are transferred to the experience of the soul-life. The taste becomes then a figure of the soul's power of perception (αἰσθητικόν); a man's fruit are his words and works, in which his inward nature expresses itself; and this fruit is sweet to those on whom that in which the peculiar nature of the man reveals itself makes a happy, pleasing impression. But not only does the person of the king afford to Shulamith so great delight, he entertains her also with what can and must give her enjoyment.

*4 He has brought me into the wine-house,  
And his banner over me is love.*

**Son. 2: 4.** After we have seen the ladies of the palace at the feast, in which wine is presented, and after Solomon, till now absent, has entered the banqueting-chamber (Arab. *mégliis*), by בֵּית הַיַּיִן we are not to understand the vineyard, which would be called *bēth hāggēphānim* or *bēth hā'ānāvim*, as in Act. 1:12, Pesh. the Mount of Olives, *bēth zaite*.<sup>40</sup>

He has introduced her to the place where he royally entertains his friends. Well knowing that she, the poor and sunburnt maiden, does not properly belong to such a place, and would rather escape away from it, he relieves her from her fear and bashfulness, for he covers her with his fear-inspiring, awful, and thus surely protecting, banner; and this banner, which he waves over her, and under which she is well concealed, is "love." דָּגַל (from דָּגַל, to cover) is the name of the covering of the shaft or standard, i.e., *pannus*, the piece of cloth fastened to a shaft. Like a pennon, the love of the king hovers over her; and so powerful, so surpassing, is the delight of this love which pervades and transports her, that she cries out:

*5 Support me with grape-cakes,  
Refresh me with apples:  
For I am sick with love.*

**Son. 2: 5.** She makes use of the intensive form as one in a high degree in need of the reanimating of her almost sinking life: סָמַךְ is the intens. of סָמַךְ, to prop up, support, or, as here, to under-prop, uphold; and רָפַד, the intens. of רָפַד

(R. רָר), to raise up from beneath (vid., at Pro. 7:16), to furnish firm ground and support. The apple is the Greek attribute of Aphrodite, and is the symbol of love; but here it is only a means of refreshing; and if thoughts of love are connected with the apple-tree (Son. 2: 3; 8: 5), that is explained from Shulamith's rural home. Böttcher understands quinces; Epstein, citrons; but these must needs have been more closely denoted, as at Pro. 25:11, by some addition to the expression. אֲשִׁשׁוֹת (from אֲשִׁשׂ, to establish, make firm) are (cf. Isa. 16: 7; Hos. 3: 1) grapes pressed together like cakes; different from צְמוּקִים, dried grapes (cf. דְּבִלָה), fig-cakes (Arab. *dabbûle*, a mass pressed together), and πλακοῦς, *placenta*, from the pressed-out form. A cake is among the gifts (2Sa. 6:19) which David distributed to the people on the occasion of the bringing up of the ark; date-cakes, e.g., at the monastery at Sinai, are to the present day gifts for the refreshment of travellers. If Shulamith's cry was to be understood literally, one might, with Noack, doubt the correctness of the text; for "love-sickness, even in the age of passion and sentimentality, was not to be cured with roses and apples." But

(1) sentimentality, i.e., susceptibility, does not belong merely to the Romantic, but also to Antiquity, especially in the Orient, as e.g., is shown by the symptoms of sympathy with which the prophets were affected when uttering their threatenings of judgment; let one read such outbreaks of sorrow as Isa. 21: 3, which, if one is disposed to scorn, may be derided as hysterical fits. Moreover, the Indian, Persian, and Arabic erotic (vid., e.g., the Romance *Siret 'Antar*) is as sentimental as the German has at any time been.

(2) The subject of the passage here is not the curing of love-sickness, but bodily refreshment: the cry of Shulamith, that she may be made capable of bearing the deep agitation of her physical life, which is the consequence, not of her love-sickness, but of her love-happiness.

(3) The cry is not addressed (although this is grammatically possible, since אֲמַכְנָה is, according to rule, = אֲמַכְנָה אֵתִי) to the daughters of Jerusalem, who would in that case have been named, but to some other person; and this points to its being taken not in a literal sense.

(4) It presupposes that one came to the help of Shulamith, sick and reduced to weakness, with grapes and apple-scent to revive her fainting spirit. The call of Shulamith thus means: hasten to me with that which will revive and refresh me, for I am sick with love. This love-sickness has also been experienced in the spiritual sphere. St. Ephrem was once so overcome by such a joy that he cried out: "Lord, withdraw Thine hand a little, for my heart is too weak to receive so great joy." And J. R. Hedinger (†1704) was on his deathbed overpowered with such a stream of heavenly delight that he cried: "Oh, how good is the Lord! Oh,

how sweet is Thy love, my Jesus! Oh, what a sweetness! I am not worthy of it, my Lord! Let me alone; let me alone!” As the spiritual joy of love, so may also the spiritual longing of love consume the body (cf. Job. 19:27; Psa. 63: 2; 84: 3); there have been men who have actually sunk under a longing desire after the Lord and eternity. It is the state of love-ecstasy in which Shulamith calls for refreshment, because she is afraid of sinking. The contrast between her, the poor and unworthy, and the king, who appears to her as an ideal of beauty and majesty, who raises her up to himself, was such as to threaten her life. Unlooked for, extraordinary fortune, has already killed many. Fear, producing lameness and even death, is a phenomenon common in the Orient. <sup>41</sup>

If Pharaoh’s daughter, if the Queen of Sheba, finds herself in the presence of Solomon, the feeling of social equality prevents all alarm. But Shulamith is dazzled by the splendour, and disconcerted; and it happens to her in type as it happened to the seer of Patmos, who, in presence of the ascended Lord, fell at His feet as one dead, Rev. 1:17. If beauty is combined with dignity, it has always, for gentle and not perverted natures, something that awakens veneration and tremor; but if the power of love be superadded, then it has, as a consequence, that combination of awe and inward delight, the psychological appearance of which Sappho, in the four strophes which begin with “*Φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος ἴσος θεοῖσιν ἔμμεν ὄνῆρ,*” has described in a manner so true to nature. We may thus, without carrying back modern sentimentality into antiquity, suppose that Shulamith sank down in a paroxysm caused by the rivalry between the words of love and of praise, and thus thanking him, — for Solomon supports and bears her up, — she exclaims:

*6 His left hand is under my head,  
And his right hand doth embrace me.*

**Son. 2: 6.** With his left hand he supports her head that had fallen backwards, and with his right he embraces her [*herzet* ], as Luther rightly renders it (as he also renders the name *Habakkuk* by “*der Herzer*” = the embracer); for **חֶבֶק** signifies properly to enfold, to embrace; but then generally, to embrace lovingly, to fondle, of that gentle stroking with the hand elsewhere denoted by **חֶלֶק**, *mulcere*. The situation here is like that at Gen. 29:13; 48:10; where, connected with the dat., it is meant of loving arms stretched out to embrace. If this sympathetic, gentle embracing exercises a soothing influence on her, overcome by the power of her emotions; so love mutually kindled now celebrates the first hour of delighted enjoyment, and the happy Shulamith calls to those who are witnesses of her joy:

*7 I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem,  
By the gazelles or the hinds of the field,  
That ye arouse not and disturb not love  
Till she pleases.*

**Son. 2: 7.** It is permitted to the Israelites to swear, נִשְׁבַּע, only by God (Gen. 21:23); but to adjure, הִשְׁבִּיאַ, by that which is not God, is also admissible, although this example before us is perhaps the only direct one in Scripture. צִבִי (= צִבִי, dialect. מַבִי), fem. צִבְיָה (Aram. מַבִּיתָא, Act. 9:36), plur. *tsebaim* or *tsebajim*, fem. *tsabaōth* (according with the pl. of צִבְיָה), softened from *tsebajōth*, is the name for the gazelle, from the elegance of its form and movements. אֵילוֹת is the connecting form of אֵילוֹת, whose consonantal *Yod* in the Assy. and Syr. is softened to the diphthong *ailuv*, *ailā*; the gen. “of the field,” as not distinguishing but describing, belongs to both of the animals, therefore also the first is without the article. אֵו (after the etymon corresponding to the Lat. *vel*) proceeds, leaving out of view the repetition of this so-called Slumber-Song (Son. 3: 5; cf. 8: 4, as also 2: 9), from the endeavour to give to the adjuration the greatest impression; the expression is varied, for the representations flit from image to image, and the one, wherever possible, is surpassed by the other (vid., at Pro. 30:31). Under this verse Hengst. remarks: “The bride would not adjure by the hinds, much more would she adjure by the stage.” He supposes that Solomon is here the speaker; but a more worthless proof for this could not be thought of. On the contrary, the adjuration by the gazelles, etc., shows that the speaker here is one whose home is the field and wood; thus also not the poet (Hitz.) nor the queen-mother (Böttch.), neither of whom is ever introduced as speaking. The adjuration is that love should not be disturbed, and therefore it is by the animals that are most lovely and free, which roam through the fields. Zöckler, with whom in this one point Grätz agrees, finds here, after the example of Böttch. and Hitz., the earnest warning against wantonly exciting love in themselves (cf. Lat. *irritamenta veneris*, *irritata voluptas*) till God Himself awakens it, and heart finds itself in sympathy with heart. But the circumstances in which Shulamith is placed ill accord with such a general moralizing. The adjuration is repeated, Son. 3: 5; 8: 4, and wherever Shulamith finds herself near her beloved, as she is here in his arms. What lies nearer, then, than that she should guard against a disturbance of this love-ecstasy, which is like a slumber penetrated by delightful dreams? Instead of אֶתְכֶם, תְּעִירוּ, and תְּעוֹרְרוּ, should be more exactly the words אֶתְכֶן, תְּעַרְנָה, and תְּעוֹרְרָנָה; but the gram. distinction of the *genera* is in Heb. not perfectly developed. We meet also with the very same *synallage generis*, without this adjuration formula, at Son. 5: 8; 7: 1; 4: 2; 6: 8, etc.; it is also elsewhere frequent; but in the Song it perhaps belongs to the foil of the

vulgar given to the highly poetic. Thus also in the vulgar Arab. the fem. forms *jaḳtulna, taḳtulna*, corresponding to תִּקְטְלֵנָה, are fallen out of use. With העיר, *expergefacere*, there is connected the idea of an interruption of sleep; with עורר, *excitare*, the idea, which goes further, of arousing out of sleep, placing in the full activity of awakened life. <sup>142</sup>

The one adjuration is, that love should not be awakened out of its sweet dream; the other, that it should not be disturbed from its being absorbed in itself. The *Pasek* between תעירו and the word following has, as at Lev. 10: 6, the design of keeping the two *Vavs* distinct, that in reading they might not run together; it is the *Pasek* which, as Ben Asher says, serves “to secure to a letter its independence against the similar one standing next it.” האִהְבָּה is not *abstr. pro concreto*, but love itself in its giving and receiving. Thus closes the second scene of the first act: Shulamith lies like one helpless in the arms of Solomon; but in him to expire is her life; to have lost herself in him, and in him to find herself again, is her happiness.

## Second Act

### THE MUTUAL SEEKING AND FINDING OF THE LOVERS

#### — CH. 2: 8-3: 5

#### FIRST SCENE OF THE SECOND ACT, 2: 8-17

With 2: 8 the second act begins. The so-called slumber-song (Son. 3: 5) closes it, as it did the first act; and also the refrain-like summons to hasten to the mountains leaves no doubt regarding the close of the first scene. The locality is no longer the royal city. Shulamith, with her love-sickness, is once more at home in the house which she inhabits along with her own friends, of whom she has already (Son. 1: 6) named her brothers. This house stands alone among the rocks, and deep in the mountain range; around are the vineyards which the family have planted, and the hill-pastures on which they feed their flocks. She longingly looks out here for her distant lover.

*8 Hark, my beloved! lo, there he comes!  
Springs over the mountains,  
Bounds over the hills.*

*9 My beloved is like a gazelle,  
Or a young one of the harts.  
Lo, there he stands behind our wall!  
He looks through the windows,  
Glances through the lattices.*

**Son. 2: 8.** The word **קול**, in the expression **קול הודי**, is to be understood of the call of the approaching lover (Böttch.), or only of the sound of his footsteps (Hitz.); it is an interjectional clause (sound of my beloved!), in which *kōl* becomes an interjection almost the same as our “*horch*” [“hear!”]. Vid., under Gen. 4:10. **וְהָ** after **הִנֵּה** sharpens it, as the demonst. *ce* in *ecce = en ce*. **בָּא** is though of as partic., as is evident from the accenting of the fem. **בָּאָה**, e.g., Jer. 10:22. **דִּלַּג** is the usual word for springing; the parallel **קָפַץ** (**קָפַץ**), Aram. **קָפַץ**, **קָפַץ**, signifies properly *contrahere* (cogn. **קָמַץ**, whence *Kametz*, the drawing together of the mouth, more accurately, of the muscles of the lips), particularly to draw the body together, to prepare it for a spring. In the same manner, at the present day, both in the city and in the Beduin Arab. *kamaz*, for which also *famaz*, is used of the springing of a gazelle, which consists in a tossing up of the legs stretched out perpendicularly. ‘Antar says similarly, as Shulamith here of the swift-footed *schêbûb* (*D. M. Zeitung*, xxii. 362); *wahu jegmiz gamazât el-gazâl*, it leaps away with the springing of a gazelle.

**Son. 2: 9.** The figure used in v. 8 is continued in v. 9. **צִבִּי** is the gazelle, which is thus designated after its Arab. name *ghazâl*, which has reached us probably through the Moorish-Spanish *gazela* (distinct from “ghasele,” after the Pers. *ghazal*, love-poem). **עֹפָר** is the young hart, like the Arab. *ghufar* (*ghafar*), the young chamois, probably from the covering of young hair; whence also the young lion may be called **בִּפְיֹר**. Regarding the effect of **אוֹ** passing from one figure to another, vid., under 2: 7a. The meaning would be plainer were v. 9a joined to v. 8, for the figures illustrate quick-footed speed (2Sa. 2:18; 1Ch. 12: 8; cf. Psa. 18:34 with Hab. 3:19 and Isa. 35: 6). In v. 9b he comes with the speed of the gazelle, and his eyes seek for the unforgotten one. **כָּתַל** (from **כָּתַל**, *compingere, condensare*; whence, e.g., Arab. *mukattal*, pressed together, rounded, *ramassé*; vid., regarding R. **כַּת** at Psa. 87: 6), Aram. **כּוּתַל** (Jos. 2:15; Targ. word for **קִיר**), is meant of the wall of the house itself, not of the wall surrounding it. Shulamith is within, in the house: her beloved, standing behind the wall, stands without, before the house (Tympe: *ad latus aversum parietis*, viz., out from it), and looks through the windows, — at one time through this one, at another through that one, — that he might see her and feast his eyes on her. We have here two verbs from the fulness of Heb. synon. for one idea of seeing. **הִשְׁגִּיחַ**, from **שָׁגַח**, occurring only three times in the O.T., refers, in respect of the roots **שָׁג**, **שָׁךְ**, **שָׁק**, to the idea of piercing or splitting (whence also **שָׁנַע**, to be furious, properly pierced, *percitum esse*; cf. *oestrus*, sting of a gadfly = madness, Arab. transferred to hardness = madness), and means fixing by reflexion and meditation; wherefore **הִשְׁגָּחָהּ** in post-bibl.

Heb. is the name for Divine Providence. **הַצִּיץ**, elsewhere to twinkle and to bloom, appears only here in the sense of seeing, and that of the quick darting forward of the glance of the eye, as *blick* [glance] and *blitz* [lightning] (*blic*) are one word; “he saw,” says Goethe in *Werther*, “the glance of the powder” (Weigand).<sup>f43</sup>

The plur. *fenestras* and *transennas* are to be understood also as *synechdoche totius pro parte*, which is the same as the plur. of *categ.*; but with equal correctness we conceive of him as changing his standing place. **חַלּוֹן** is the window, as an opening in the wall, from **חָלַל**, *perforare*. **חַרְרָבִים** we combine most certainly (vid., Pro. 12:27) with (Arab.) *khark*, *fissura*, so that the idea presents itself of the window broken through the wall, or as itself broken through; for the window in the country there consists for the most part of a pierced wooden frame of a transparent nature, — not (as one would erroneously conclude, from the most significant name of a window **שְׁבָכָה**, now *schubbâke*, from **שָׁבַךְ**, to twist, to lattice, to close after the manner of our Venetian blinds) of rods or boards laid crosswise. **הַצִּיץ** accords with the looking out through the pierced places of such a window, for the glances of his eye are like the penetrating rays of light.

**Son. 2:10.** When now Shulamith continues:

*10a My beloved answered and said to me,  
Arise, my love, my fair one, and go forth!*

the words show that this first scene is not immediately dramatic, but only mediately; for Shulamith speaks in monologue, though in a dramatic manner narrating an event which occurred between the commencement of their love-relation and her home-bringing.<sup>f44</sup>

She does not relate it as a dream, and thus it is not one. Solomon again once more passes, perhaps on a hunting expedition into the northern mountains after the winter with its rains, which made them inaccessible, is over; and after long waiting, Shulamith at length again sees him, and he invites her to enjoy with him the spring season. **עָנָה** signifies, like *ἀποκρίνεσθαι*, not always to answer to the words of another, but also to speak on the occasion of a person appearing before one; it is different from **עָנָה**, the same in sound, which signifies to sing, properly to sing through the nose, and has the root-meaning of replying (of the same root as **עָנָן**, clouds, as that which meets us when we look up toward the heavens); but taking speech in hand in consequence of an impression received is equivalent to an answer. With **קוּמִי** he calls upon her to raise herself from her stupor, and with **וּלְכִי־לְךָ**, French *va-t-en*, to follow him.



11 For, lo! the winter is past,  
The rain is over, is gone.

12 The flowers appear in the land;  
The time of song has come,  
And the voice of the turtle makes itself heard in our land.

13 The fig-tree spices her green figs,  
And the vines stand in bloom, they diffuse fragrance; —  
Rise up, my love, my fair one, and go forth!

**Son. 2:11-13.** The winter is called **סְתָו**, perhaps from a verb **סָתָה** (of the same root as **סָתַם**, **סָתַר**, without any example, since **סוּת**, Gen. 49:11, is certainly not derived from a verb **סוּת**), to conceal, to veil, as the time of being overcast with clouds, for in the East winter is the rainy season; (Arab.) *shataā* is also used in the sense of rain itself (vid., *D. M. Zeitsch.* xx. 618); and in the present day in Jerusalem, in the language of the people, no other name is used for rain but *shataā* (not *metar*). The word **סָתָיו**, which the *Ker*-substitutes, only means that one must not read **סָתוּ**, but **סָתוּ**, with long *a*; in the same way **עָנָיו**, humble, from **עָנָה**, to be bowed down, and **שָׁלִיו**, a quail, from **שָׁלָה**, to be fat, are formed and written. Rain is here, however, especially mentioned: it is called *gēshēm*, from *gāshām*, to be thick, massy (cf. *revivim*, of density). With **עָבַר**, to pass by, there is interchanged **הָלַף**, which, like (Arab.) *khalaf*, means properly to press on, and then generally to move to another place, and thus to remove from the place hitherto occupied. In **הָלַף לּוֹ**, with the *dat. ethicus*, which throws back the action on the subject, the winter rain is thought of as a person who has passed by. **נָצַן**, with the noun-ending *ân*, is the same as **נִיסָן**, and signifies the flower, as the latter the flower-month, *floréal*; in the use of the word, **נָצַן** is related to **נִץ** and **נָצָה**, probably as little flower is to flower. In *hāzzāmīr* the idea of the song of birds (Arab. *gharad*) appears, and this is not to be given up. The LXX, Aquila, Symm., Targ., Jerome, and the Venet. translate *tempus putationis*: the time of the pruning of vines, which indeed corresponds to the *usus loq.* (cf. **זָמַר**, to prune the vine, and **זְמַרְרָה**, a pruning-knife), and to similar names, such as **אָסַף** [ingathering of fruit], but supplies no reason for her being invited out into the open fields, and is on this account improbable, because the poet further on speaks for the first time of vines. **זָמַר** (**זְמַר**) is an onomatopoeia, which for the most part denotes song and music; why should **זְמַר** thus not be able to denote singing, like **זְמַרָה**, — but not, at least not in this passage, the singing of men (Hengst.), for they are not silent in winter; but the singing of birds, which is truly a sign of the spring, and as a characteristic feature, is added <sup>145</sup> to this lovely picture of spring? Thus there is also suitably

added the mention of the turtle-dove, which is a bird of passage (vid., Jer. 8: 7), and therefore a messenger of spring. נִשְׁמַע is 3rd pret.: it makes itself heard.

The description of spring is finished by a reference to the fig-tree and the vine, the standing attributes of a prosperous and peaceful homestead, 1Ki. 5: 5; 2Ki. 18:31. פֶּנֶן (from פִּנְנָה, and thus named, not from their hardness, but their delicacy) are the little fruits of the fig-tree which now, when the harvest-rains are over, and the spring commences with the equinox of Nisan, already begin to assume a red colour; the verb הִנְתָּה does not mean “to grow into a bulb,” as Böttch. imagines; it has only the two meanings, *condire* (*condiri*, post-bibl. syn. of בָּשַׁל) and *rubescere*. From its colour, wheat has the name חֲנִמָּה = חֲמָה; and here also the idea of colour has the preference, for becoming fragrant does not occur in spring, — in the history of the cursing of the fig-tree at the time of the Passover, Mark (Mar. 11:13) says, “for the time of figs was not yet.” In fig-trees, by this time the green of the fruit-formation changes its colour, and the vines are סִמְרָה, blossom, i.e., are in a state of bloom (LXX κυπρίζουσαι; cf. 7:13, κυπρισμός) — it is a clause such as Exo. 9:31, and to which “they diffuse fragrance” (v. 13) is parallel. This word סִמְרָה is usually regarded as a compound word, consisting of סִם, scent, and הִדָּר, brightness = blossom (vid., Gesen. *Thes.*); it is undeniable that there are such compound formations, e.g., שְׁלֵאֲנָן, from שָׁלָה and שָׁאֲן; חֲלָמִישׁ, from (Arab.) *ḥams*, to be hard, and *hals*, to be dark-brown. <sup>f46</sup>

But the traditional reading סִמְרָה (not סִמְרָה) is unfavourable to this view; the middle *ā* accordingly, as in צִלְצֵל, presents itself as an *ante*-tone vowel (Ewald, § 154a), and the stem-word appears as a quadril. which may be the expansion of סִדָּר, to range, put in order in the sense of placing asunder, unfolding. Symm. renders the word by οὐράνθη, and the Talm. idiom shows that not only the green five-leaved blossoms of the vine were so named, but also the fruit-buds and the first shoots of the grapes. Here, as the words “they diffuse fragrance” (as at 7:14 of the mandrakes) show, the vine-blossom is meant which fills the vineyard with an incomparably delicate fragrance. At the close of the invitation to enjoy the spring, the call “Rise up,” etc., with which it began, is repeated. The *Cheth*-ב לְכִי, if not an error in writing, justly set aside by the *Ker*ˆ, is to be read לְכִי (cf. Syr. *bechi*, in thee, *l'votечи*, to thee, but with occult *i*) — a North Palestinism for לָדָה, like 2Ki. 4: 2, where the *Ker*ˆ has substituted the usual form (vid., under Psa. 103 introd.) for this very dialectic form, which is there undoubtedly original.

**Son. 2:14.** Solomon further relates how he drew her to himself out of her retirement:

*My dove in the clefts of the rock,  
In the hiding-place of the cliff;  
Let me see thy countenance,  
Let me hear thy voice!*

*For thy voice is sweet and thy countenance comely.*

“Dove” (for which Castellio, *columbula*, like *vulticulum*, *voculam*) is a name of endearment which Shulamith shares with the church of God, Psa. 74:19; cf. 56: 1; Hos. 7:11. The wood-pigeon builds its nest in the clefts of the rocks and other steep rocky places, Jer. 48:28. <sup>147</sup>

That Shulamith is thus here named, shows that, far removed from intercourse with the world, her home was among the mountains. חֲגֹר, from חָגַר, or also חָגַר, requires a verb חָגַר = (Arab.) *khajja*, *findere*. סֶלַע, as a Himyar. lexicographer defines it, is a cleft into the mountains after the nature of a defile; with צוּר, only the ideas of inaccessibility and remoteness are connected; with סֶלַע, those of a secure hiding-place, and, indeed, a convenient, pleasant residence. מְדַרְגָּה is the stairs; here the rocky stairs, as the two chalk-cliffs on the Rügen, which sink perpendicularly to the sea, are called “*Stubbenkammer*,” a corruption of the Slavonic *Stupnhkamen*, i.e., the Stair-Rock. “Let me see,” said he, as he called upon her with enticing words, “thy countenance;” and adds this as a reason, “for thy countenance is lovely.” The word מְרֵאִיךְ, thus pointed, is sing.; the *Jod Otians* is the third root letter of מְרֵאִיךְ, retained only for the sake of the eye. It is incorrect to conclude from *ashrēch*, in Ecc. 10:17, that the *ech* may be also the plur. suff., which it can as little be as *ēhu* in Pro. 29:18; in both cases the sing. *ēshēr* has substituted itself for *ashrē*. But, inversely, *māraīch* cannot be sing.; for the sing. is simply *marēch*. Also *mārāv*, Job. 41: 1, is not sing.: the sing. is *marēhu*, Job. 4:16; Son. 5:15. On the other hand, the determination of such forms as מְרֵאִיךְ, מְרֵאִיךְ, is difficult: these forms may be sing. as well as plur. In the passage before us, מְרֵאִים is just such a non-numer. plur. as פְּנִים. But while *panīm* is an extensive plur., as Böttcher calls it: the countenance, in its extension and the totality of its parts, — *marīm*, like *marōth*, vision, a stately term, Exo. 40: 2 (vid., Deitrich’s *Abhand.* p. 19), is an amplificative plur.: the countenance, on the side of its fulness of beauty and its overpowering impression.

**Son. 2:15, 16.** There now follows a *cantiuncula*. Shulamith comes forward, and, singing, salutes her beloved. Their love shall celebrate a new spring. Thus

she wishes everything removed, or rendered harmless, that would disturb the peace of this love:

*15 Catch us the foxes, the little foxes,  
The spoilers of the vineyards;  
For our vineyards are in bloom!*

*16 My beloved is mine, and I am his;  
Who feeds [his flock] among the lilies.*

If the king is now, on this visit of the beloved, engaged in hunting, the call: “Catch us,” etc., if it is directed at all to any definite persons, is addressed to those who follow him. But this is a vine-dresser’s ditty, in accord with Shulamith’s experience as the keeper of a vineyard, which, in a figure, aims at her love-relation. The vineyards, beautiful with fragrant blossom, point to her covenant of love; and the foxes, the little foxes, which might destroy these united vineyards, point to all the great and little enemies and adverse circumstances which threaten to gnaw and destroy love in the blossom, ere it has reached the ripeness of full enjoyment. שְׂעָלִים comprehends both foxes and jackals, which “destroy or injure the vineyards; because, by their holes and passages which they form in the ground, loosening the soil, so that the growth and prosperity of the vine suffers injury” (Hitzig). This word is from שָׂעַל (R. שָׁל), to go down, or into the depth. The little foxes are perhaps the jackals, which are called *tānnim*, from their extended form, and in height are seldom more than fifteen inches. The word “jackal” has nothing to do with שׁוּעָל, but is the Persian-Turkish *shaghal*, which comes from the Sanscr. *crgāla*, the howler (R. *krag*, like *kap-āla*, the skull; R. *kap*, to be arched). Moreover, the mention of the foxes naturally follows 14a, for they are at home among rocky ravines. Hitzig supposes Shulamith to address the foxes: hold for us = wait, ye rascals! But שָׂחָז, Aram. שָׂחַד, does not signify to wait, but to seize or lay hold of (synon. לָכַד, Jud. 15: 4), as the lion its prey, Isa. 5:29. And the plur. of address is explained from its being made to the king’s retinue, or to all who could and would give help. Fox-hunting is still, and has been from old times, a sport of rich landowners; and that the smaller landowners also sought to free themselves from them by means of snares or otherwise, is a matter of course, — they are proverbially as destroyers, Neh. 3:35 [4: 3], and therefore a figure of the false prophets, Eze. 13: 4. מַחְבְּלֵי הַבְּרָמִ' are here instead of מַחְבְּ בְּרָמִ'. The articles are generally omitted, because poetry is not fond of the article, where, as here (cf. on the other hand, 1: 6), the thoughts and language permit it; and the fivefold ם is an intentional mere *verborum sonus*. The clause וּבְכֹרֵי סִמְדָר is an explanatory one, as appears from the *Vav* and the subj. preceding, as well

as from the want of a *finitum*. סָמְדָר maintains here also, *in pausa*, the sharpening of the final syllable, as חֲצִי, Deu. 28:42.

The 16th verse is connected with the 15th. Shulamith, in the pentast. song, celebrates her love-relation; for the praise of it extends into v. 15, is continued in v. 16, and not till v. 17 does she address her beloved. Luther translates:

*My beloved is mine, and I am his;  
He feeds [his flock] among the roses.*

He has here also changed the “lilies” of the Vulgate into “roses;” for of the two queens among the flowers, he gave the preference to the popular and common rose; besides, he rightly does not translate הָרִעָה, in the mid. after the *pascitur inter lilia* of the Vulgate: who feeds himself, i.e., pleases himself; for רעה has this meaning only when the object expressly follows, and it is evident that פִּשְׁוֹ cannot possibly be this object, after Gen. 37: 2, — the object is thus to be supplied. And which? Without doubt, *gregem*; and if Heiligst., with the advocates of the shepherd-hypothesis, understands this feeding (of the flock) among the lilies, of feeding on a flowery meadow, nothing can be said against it. But at 6: 2f., where this saying of Shulamith is repeated, she says that her beloved בִּנְיָיִם feeds and gathers lilies. On this the literal interpretation of the *qui pascit (gregem) inter lilia* is wrecked; for a shepherd, such as the shepherd-hypothesis supposes, were he to feed his flock in a garden, would be nothing better than a thief; such shepherds, also, do not concern themselves with the plucking of flowers, but spend their time in knitting stockings. It is Solomon, the king, of whom Shulamith speaks. She represents him to herself as a shepherd; but in such a manner that, at the same time, she describes his actions in language which rises above ordinary shepherd-life, and, so to speak, idealizes. She, who was herself a shepherdess, knows from her own circle of thought nothing more lovely or more honourable to conceive and to say of him, than that he is a shepherd who feeds among lilies. The locality and the surroundings of his daily work correspond to his nature, which is altogether beauty and love. Lilies, the emblem of unapproachable highness, awe-inspiring purity, lofty elevation above what is common, bloom where the lily-like (king) wanders, whom the Lily names her own. The mystic interpretation and mode of speaking takes “lilies” as the figurative name of holy souls, and a lily-stalk as the symbol of the life of regeneration. Mary, who is celebrated in song as the *rosa mystica*, is rightly represented in ancient pictures with a lily in her hand on the occasion of the Annunciation; for if the people of God are called by Jewish poets “a people of lilies,” she is, within this lily-community, this *communio sanctorum*, the lily without a parallel.

**Son. 2:17.** Shulamith now further relates, in a dramatic, lively manner, what she said to her beloved after she had saluted him in a song:

*17 Till the day cools and the shadows flee away,  
Turn; make haste, my beloved,  
Like a gazelle or a young one of the hinds  
On the craggy mountains.*

With the perf., **שׁוּב אֵדָה** (cf. **אֵדָה אֵדָה**, Gen. 24:33) signifies, till something is done; with the fut., till something will be done. Thus: till the evening comes — and, therefore, before it comes — may he do what she requires of him. Most interpreters explain **בֹּב**, *verte te*, with the supplement *ad me*; according to which Jerome, Castell., and others translate by *revertere*. But Psa. 71:21 does not warrant this rendering; and if Shulamith has her beloved before her, then by **בֹּב** she can only point him away from herself; the parall. 8:14 has **בִּרְחֵב** instead of **בֹּב**, which consequently means, “turn thyself from here away.” Rather we may suppose, as I explained in 1851, that she holds him in her embrace, as she says, and inseparable from him, will wander with him upon the mountains. But neither that *ad me* nor this *mecum* should have been here (cf. on the contrary 8:14) unexpressed. We hold by what is written. Solomon surprises Shulamith, and invites her to enjoy with him the spring-time; not alone, because he is on a hunting expedition, and — as denoted by “catch us” (v. 15) — with a retinue of followers. She knows that the king has not now time to wander at leisure with her; and therefore she asks him to set forward his work for the day, and to make haste on the mountains till “the day cools and the shadows flee.” Then she will expect him back; then in the evening she will spend the time with him as he promised her. The verb **פִּיַח**, with the guttural letter *Hheth* and the labial *Pe*, signifies *spirare*, here of being able to be breathed, i.e., cool, like the expression **רִיַח רִיַח**, Gen. 3: 8 (where the guttural *Hheth* is connected with *Rēsh*). The shadows flee away, when they become longer and longer, as if on a flight, when they stretch out (Psa. 109:23; 102:12) and gradually disappear. Till that takes place — or, as we say, will be done — he shall hasten with the swiftness of a gazelle on the mountains, and that on the mountains of separation, i.e., the riven mountains, which thus present hindrances, but which he, the “swift as the gazelle” (vid., 2: 9), easily overcomes. Rightly, Bochart: *montes scissionis, ita dicti propter, ῥωχμούς et χάσματα*. Also, Luther’s “*Scheideberge*” are “mountains with peaks, from one of which to the other one must spring.” We must not here think of *Bithron* (2Sa. 2:29), for that is a mountain ravine on the east of Jordan; nor of Bar-Cochba’s **בִּיתֵר** (Kirschbau, Landau), because this mountain (whether it be sought for to the south of Jerusalem or to be north of Antipatris) ought properly to be named **בִּיתֵתֵר** (vid., Aruch). It is worthy of

observation, that in an Assyrian list of the names of animals, along with *šbi* (gazelle) and *apparu* (the young of the gazelle or of the hind), the name *bitru* occurs, perhaps the name of the *rupicapra*. At the close of the song, the expression “mountain of spices” occurs instead of “mountain of separation,” as here. There no more hindrances to be overcome lie in view, the rock-cliffs have become fragrant flowers. The request here made by Shulamith breathes self-denying humility, patient modesty, inward joy in the joy of her beloved. She will not claim him for herself till he has accomplished his work. But when he associates with her in the evening, as with the Emmaus disciples, she will rejoice if he becomes her guide through the new-born world of spring. The whole scene permits, yea, moves us to think of this, that the Lord already even now visits the church which loves Him, and reveals Himself to her; but that not till the evening of the world is His *parousia* to be expected.

### SECOND SCENE OF THE SECOND ACT, 3: 1-5

In the first scene, Shulamith relates what externally happened to her one day when the evening approached. In this second scene, she now relates what she inwardly experienced when the night came. She does not indeed say that she dreamed it; but that it is a dream is seen from this, that that which is related cannot be represented as an external reality. But it at once appears as an occurrence that took place during sleep.

*3: 1 On my bed in the nights  
I sought him whom my soul loveth:  
I sought him, and found him not.*

**Son. 3: 1.** She does not mean to say that she sought him beside herself on her couch; for how could that be of the modest one, whose home-bringing is first described in the next act — she could and might miss him there neither waking nor sleeping. The commencement is like Job. 33:15. She was at night on her couch, when a painful longing seized her: the beloved of her soul appeared to have forsaken her, to have withdrawn from her; she had lost the feeling of his nearness, and was not able to recover it. לִילוֹת is neither here nor at 3: 8 necessarily the categ. plur. The meaning may also be, that this pain, arising from a sense of being forgotten, always returned upon her for several nights through: she became distrustful of his fidelity; but the more she apprehended that she was no longer loved, the more ardent became her longing, and she arose to seek for him who had disappeared.

*2 So I will arise, then, and go about the city,  
The markets, and the streets;  
I will seek him whom my soul loveth! —  
I sought him, and found him not.*



**Son. 3: 2.** How could this night-search, with all the strength of love, be consistent with the modesty of a maiden? It is thus a dream which she relates. And if the beloved of her soul were a shepherd, would she seek him in the city, and not rather without, in the field or in some village? No; the beloved of her soul is Solomon; and in the dream, Jerusalem, his city is transported close to the mountains of her native home. The resolution expressed by “I will arise, then,” is not introduced by “then I said,” or any similar phrase: the scene consists of a monologue which dramatically represents that which is experienced. Regarding the second *Chatef-Pathach* of **וַאֲסִי**, vid., Baer’s *Genesis*, p. 7. **שְׁנָקִים** is the plur of **שָׁק** (= *shavk*), as **שְׁנָרִים** of **שָׁר** (= *shavr*); the root-word **שָׁק** (Arab. *shaḳ*) signifies to press on, to follow after continuously; (Arab.) *suwaḳ* designates perhaps, originally, the place to which one drives cattle for sale, as in the desert; (Arab.) *sawaḳ* designates the place to which one drives cattle for drink (Wetzst.). The form **שָׁקְשָׁה** is without the *Daghesh*, as are all the forms of this verb except the imper.; the semi-guttural nature of the *Koph* has something opposing the simple *Sheva*.

**Son. 3: 3.** Shulamith now relates what she further experienced when, impelled by love-sorrow, she wandered through the city:

*3 The watchmen who go about in the city found me:  
“Have ye seen him whom my soul loveth?”*

Here also (as in v. 2) there is wanting before the question such a phrase as, “and I asked them, saying:” the monologue relates dramatically. If she described an outward experience, then the question would be a foolish one; for how could she suppose that the watchmen, who make their rounds in the city (Epstein, against Grätz, points for the antiquity of the order to Psa. 127: 1; Isa. 62: 6; cf. 21:11), could have any knowledge of her beloved! But if she relates a dream, it is to be remembered that feeling and imagination rise higher than reflection. It is in the very nature of a dream, also, that things thus quickly follow one another without fixed lineaments. This also, that having gone out by night, she found in the streets him whom she sought, is a happy combination of circumstances formed in the dreaming soul; an occurrence without probable external reality, although not without deep inner truth:

*4 Scarcely had I passed from them,  
When I found him whom my soul loveth.  
I seized him, and did not let him go  
Until I brought him into the house of my mother,  
And into the chamber of her that gave me birth.*

**Son. 3: 4.** כְּפַאֵלָּט = *paululum*, here standing for a sentence: it was as a little that I passed, etc. Without שׁ, it would be *paululum transii*; with it, *paululum fuit quod transii*, without any other distinction than that in the latter case the *paululum* is more emphatic. Since Shulamith relates something experienced earlier, אֶחְזְקֶנּוּ is not fitly rendered by *teneo*, but by *tenui*; and וְלֹא אֶרְפְּנֵהוּ, not by *et non dimittam eum*, but, as the neg. of וְאֶרְפְּנֵהוּ, *et dimisi eum*, — not merely *et non dimittebam eum*, but *et non dimisi eum*. In Gen. 32:27 [26], we read the cogn. שְׁלַח, which signifies, to let go (“let me go”), as הִרְפֵּהוּ, to let loose, to let free. It is all the same whether we translate, with the subjective colouring, *donec introduxerim*, or, with the objective, *donec introduxi*; in either case the meaning is that she held him fast till she brought him, by gentle violence, into her mother’s house. With בֵּיתָהּ there is the more definite parallel חָדַרָהּ, which properly signifies (vid., under 1: 4), *recessus, penetrale*; with אִמִּי, the seldom occurring (only, besides, at Hos. 2: 7) הַזָּרָהּ, *part.f. Kal* of הָרָהּ, to conceive, be pregnant, which poetically, with the accus., may mean *parturire* or *parere*. In Jacob’s blessing, Gen. 49:26, as the text lies before us, his parents are called הַזָּרִי; just as in Arab. *ummāni*, properly “my two mothers,” may be used for “my parents;” in the Lat. also, *parentes* means father and mother zeugmatically taken together.

**Son. 3: 5.** The closing words of the monologue are addressed to the daughters of Jerusalem.

*5 I adjure you, O ye daughters of Jerusalem,  
By the gazelles or the hinds of the field,  
That ye awake not and disturb not love  
Till she pleases.*

We are thus obliged apparently to think of the daughters of Jerusalem as being present during the relation of the dream. But since Shulamith in the following Act is for the first time represented as brought from her home to Jerusalem, it is more probable that she represented her experience to herself in secret, without any auditors, and feasting on the visions of the dream, which brought her beloved so near, that she had him by herself alone and exclusively, that she fell into such a love-ecstasy as 2: 7; and pointing to the distant Jerusalem, deprecates all disturbance of this ecstasy, which in itself is like a slumber pervaded by pleasant dreams. In two monologues dramatically constructed, the poet has presented to us a view of the thoughts and feelings by which the inner life of the maiden was moved in the near prospect of becoming a bride and being married. Whoever reads the Song in the sense in which it is incorporated with the canon, and that, too, in the historical sense fulfilled in the N.T., will not be able to read the two scenes from Shulamith’s experience without finding

therein a mirror of the intercourse of the soul with God in Christ, and cherishing thoughts such, e.g., as are expressed in the ancient hymn:

*Quando tandem venies, meus amor?  
Propera de Libano, dulcis amor!  
Clamat, amat sponsula: Veni, Jesu,  
Dulcis veni Jesu!*

## Third Act

### THE BRINGING OF THE BRIDE AND THE MARRIAGE — CH. 3: 6-5: 1

#### FIRST SCENE OF THE THIRD ACT, 3: 6-11

In this third Act the longing of the loving one after her beloved is finally appeased. The first scene<sup>48</sup> represents her home-bringing into the royal city. A gorgeous procession which marches towards Jerusalem attracts the attention of the inhabitants of the city.

*6 Who is this coming up from the wilderness  
Like pillars of smoke,  
Perfumed with myrrh and frankincense,  
With all aromatics of the merchants?*

**Son. 3: 6.** It is possible that **זאת** and **עלה** may be connected; but **זֶה עֲנִי**, Psa. 34: 7 (this poor man, properly, this, a poor man), is not analogous, it ought to be **זאת העלה**. Thus *zoth* will either be closely connected with **מי**, and make the question sharper and more animated, as is that in Gen. 12:18, or it will be the subject which then, as in Isa. 63: 1, Job. 38: 2, cf. below 7: 5b, Jon. 4:17, Amo. 9:12, is more closely written with indeterminate participles, according to which it is rightly accented. But we do not translate with Heiligst. *quid est hoc quod adscendit*, for *mī* asks after a person, *mā* after a thing, and only *per attract.* does *mī* stand for *mā* in Gen. 33: 8; Jud. 13:17; Mic. 1: 5; also not *quis est hoc* (Vaih.), for *zoth* after *mi* has a personal sense, thus: *quis (quaenam) haec est*. That it is a woman that is being brought forward those who ask know, even if she is yet too far off to be seen by them, because they recognise in the festal gorgeous procession a marriage party. That the company comes up from the wilderness, it may be through the wilderness which separates Jerusalem from Jericho, is in accordance with the fact that a maiden from Galilee is being brought up, and that the procession has taken the way through the Jordan valley (*Ghôr*); but the scene has also a typical colouring; for the wilderness is, since the time of the Mosaic deliverance out of Egypt, an emblem of the transition from a state of bondage to freedom, from humiliation to glory (vid., under

Isa. 40: 3; Hos. 1:16; Psa. 68: 5). The pomp is like that of a procession before which the censer of frankincense is swung. Columns of smoke from the burning incense mark the line of the procession before and after. תִּמְרוֹת (תִּמְרָה) here and at Job. 3 (vid., Norzi) is formed, as it appears, from יָמַר, to strive upwards, a kindred form to אָמַר; cf. Isa. 61: 6 with 17: 6, Psa. 94: 4; the verb תָּמַר, whence the date-palm receives the name תְּמָר, is a secondary formation, like תָּאָב to אָבָה. Certainly this form תִּמְרָה (cf. on the contrary, תְּלִלָה) is not elsewhere to be supported; Schlottm. sees in it תְּמָרוֹת, from תְּמָרָה; but such an expansion of the word for *Dag. dirimens* is scarcely to be supposed. This naming of the pillars of smoke is poet., as Jon. 3: 3; cf. “a pillar of smoke,” Jud. 20:40. She who approaches comes from the wilderness, brought up to Jerusalem, placed on an elevation, “like pillars of smoke,” i.e., not herself likened thereto, as Schlottm. supposes it must be interpreted (with the *tertium comp.* of the slender, precious, and lovely), but encompassed and perfumed by such. For her whom the procession brings this lavishing of spices is meant; it is she who is incensed or perfumed with myrrh and frankincense. Schlottm. maintains that מְקַטְרֶת cannot mean anything else than “perfumed,” and therefore he reads מְקַטְרֶת (as Aq. ὑπὸ θυμιάματος, and Jerome). But the word *mekuttērēth* does not certainly stand alone, but with the genit. foll.; and thus as “rent in their clothes,” 2Sa. 13:31, signifies not such as are themselves rent, but those whose clothes are rent (Ewald, § 288*b*, compare also de Sacy, II § 321), so מְקַטְרֶת וגו' can also mean those for whom (for whose honour) this incense is expended, and who are thus fumigated with it. מֶר, myrrh, (Arab.) *murr* (vid., above under 1:13), stands also in Exo. 30:23 and Psa. 45: 9 at the head of the perfumes; it came from Arabia, as did also frankincense *levōnā*, Arab. *lubân* (later referred to benzoin); both of the names are Semitic, and the circumstance that the *Tōra* required myrrh as a component part of the holy oil, Exo. 30:23, and frankincense as a component part of the holy incense, Exo. 30:34, points to Arabia as the source whence they were obtained. To these two principal spices there is added מְכַל (cf. Gen. 6:20; 9: 2) as an *et cetera*. רֹכֵל denotes the travelling spice merchants (traders in aromatics), and traders generally. אֲבָקָה, which is related to אָבַק as powder to dust (cf. *abacus*, a reckoning-table, so named from the sand by means of which arithmetical numbers were reckoned), is the name designating single drugs (i.e., dry wares; cf. the Arab. *elixir* = ξηρόν).

**Son. 3: 7, 8.** The description of the palanquin now following, one easily attributes to another voice from the midst of the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

*7 Lo! Solomon's palanquin,  
Threescore heroes are around it,  
Of the heroes of Israel,*

*8 All of them armed with the sword, expert in war.  
Each with his sword on his thigh,  
Against fear in the nights.*

Since אֲפֵרַיִן, 9a, is not by itself a word clearly intelligible, so as to lead us fully to determine what is here meant by מִטָּה as distinguished from it, we must let the connection determine. We have before us a figure of that which is called in the post-bibl. Heb. הַבְּנִיטָה בְּלָה (the bringing-home of the bride). The bridegroom either betook himself to her parents' house and fetched his bride thence, which appears to be the idea lying at the foundation of Psa. 45, if, as we believe, the ivory-palaces are those of the king of Israel's house; or she was brought to him in festal procession, and he went forth to meet her, 1 Macc. 9:39 — the prevailing custom, on which the parable of the ten virgins (Mat. 25) is founded. <sup>149</sup>

Here the bride comes from a great distance; and the difference in rank between the Galilean maid and the king brings this result, that he does not himself go and fetch her, but that she is brought to him. She comes, not as in old times Rebecca did, riding on a camel, but is carried in a *mittā*, which is surrounded by an escort for protection and as a mark of honour. Her way certainly led through the wilderness, where it was necessary, by a safe convoy, to provide against the possibility (*min* in *mippahad*, cf. Isa. 4: 6; 25: 4) of being attacked by robbers; whereas it would be more difficult to understand why the marriage-bed in the palace of the king of peace (1Ch. 22: 9) should be surrounded by such an armed band for protection. That Solomon took care to have his chosen one brought to him with royal honours, is seen in the lavish expenditure of spices, the smoke and fragrance of which signalized from afar the approach of the procession, — the *mittā*, which is now described, can be no other than that in which, sitting or reclining, or half sitting, half reclining, she is placed, who is brought to him in such a cloud of incense. Thus *mittā* (from *nāthā*, to stretch oneself out), which elsewhere is also used of a bier, 2Sa. 3:21 (like the Talm. עֶרֶשׁ = עָרַשׁ), will here signify a portable bed, a sitting cushion hung round with curtains after the manner of the Indian palanquin, and such as is found on the Turkish caiques or the Venetian gondolas. The appositional nearer definition שְׁלֵשׁ, “which belonged to Solomon” (vid., under 6b), shows that it was a royal palanquin, not one belonging to one of the nobles of the people. The bearers are unnamed persons, regarding whom nothing is said; the sixty heroes form only the guard for safety and for honour (*sauvegarde*), or the *escorte* or *convoie*. The sixty are the tenth part (the *élite*) of the royal body-guard, 1Sa. 27: 2; 30: 9, etc.

(Schlottom.). If it be asked, Why just 60? we may perhaps not unsuitably reply: The number 60 is here, as at 6: 8, the number of Israel multiplied by 5, the fraction of 10; so that thus 60 distinguished warriors form the half to the escort of a king of Israel. **הָרַבִּי הַחַיִּי** properly means, held fast by the sword so that it goes not let them free, which, according to the sense = holding fast [= practised in the use of the sword]; the Syr. translation of the Apoc. renders **παντοκράτωρ** by ‘he who is held by all,’ i.e., holding it (cf. Ewald, § 149b). <sup>150</sup>

**Son. 3: 9, 10.** Another voice now describes the splendour of the bed of state which Solomon prepared in honour of Shulamith:

*9 A bed of state hath King Solomon made for himself  
Of the wood of Lebanon.*

*10 Its pillars hath he made of silver,  
Its support of gold, its cushion of purple;  
Its interior is adorned from love  
By the daughters of Jerusalem.*

The sound of the word, the connection and the description, led the Greek translators (the LXX, Venet., and perhaps also others) to render **אֲפִירְיֹן**, by **φορέιον**, litter palanquin (Vulg. *ferculum*). The *appiryon* here described has a silver pedestal and a purple cushion — as we read in Athenaeus v. 13 (II p. 317, ed. Schweigh.) that the philosopher and tyrant Athenion showed himself “on a silver-legged **φορέιον**, with purple coverlet;” and the same author, v. 5 (II p. 253), also says, that on the occasion of a festal procession by Antiochus Epiphanes, behind 200 women who sprinkled ointments from golden urns came 80 women, sitting in pomp on golden-legged, and 500 on silver-legged, **φορέια** — this is the proper name for the costly women’s-litter (Suidas: **φορέιον γυναικείον**), which, according to the number of bearers (Mart. VI 77: six Cappadocians and, ix. 2, eight Syrians), was called **ἑξάφορον** (*hexaphorum*, Mart. II 81) or **ὀκτώφορον** (*octophorum*, Cicero’s *Verr.* v. 10). The Mishna, *Sota* ix. 14, uses *appiryon* in the sense of *phoreion*: “in the last war (that of Hadrian) it was decreed that a bride should not pass through the town in an *appiryon* [on account of the danger], but our Rabbis sanctioned it later [for modesty’s sake];” as here, “to be carried in an *appiryon*,” so in Greek, **προιέναι (καταστείχειν) ἐν φορέῳ**. In the Midrash also, *Bamidbar rabba* c. 12, and elsewhere, *appiryon* of this passage before us is taken in all sorts of allegorical significations in most of which the identity of the word with **φορέιον** is supposed, which is also there written **פִּרְיֹן** (after Aruch), cf. Isa. 49:22, Targ., and is once interchanged with **פּאַפּלִיֹן**, *papilio* (*parillon*), pleasure-tent. But a Greek word in the Song is in itself so improbable, that Ewald describes this derivation of the word as a frivolous jest; so much the more

improbable, as **φορέιον** as the name of a litter (*lectica*) occurs first in such authors (of the **κοινή**) as Plutarch, Polybuis, Herodian, and the like, and therefore, with greater right, it may be supposed that it is originally a Semitic word, which the Greek language adopted at the time when the Oriental and Graeco-Roman customs began to be amalgamated. Hence, if *mittā*, 7a, means a portable bed, — as is evident from this, that it appears as the means of transport with an escort, — then *appiryon* cannot also mean a litter; the description, moreover, does not accord with a litter. We do not read of rings and carrying-poles, but, on the contrary, of pillars (as those of a tent-bed) instead, and, as might be expected, of feet. Schlottm., however, takes *mittā* and *appiryon* as different names for a portable bed; but the words, “an *appiryon* has King Solomon made,” etc., certainly indicate that he who thus speaks has not the *appiryon* before him, and also that this was something different from the *mittā*. While Schlottm. is inclined to take *appiryon*, in the sense of a litter, as a word borrowed from the Greek (but in the time of the first king?), Gesen. in his *Thes.* seeks to derive it, thus understood, from **פָּרַח**, *cito ferri, currere*; but this signification of the verb is imaginary.

We expect here, in accordance with the progress of the scene, the name of the bridal couch; and on the supposition that *appiryon*, *Sota* 12a, as in the Mishna, means the litter (Aruch) of the bride, Arab. *maziffat*, and not *torus nuptialis* (Buxt.), then there is a possibility that *appiryon* is a more dignified word for *‘ērēs*, 1:17, yet sufficient thereby to show that **פּוֹרְיָן** is the usual Talm. name of the marriage-bed (e.g., *Mezia* 23b, where it stand, *per meton.*, for *concupitus*), which is wittily explained by **שְׁפָרְיָן וּרְבִין עֲלֵיהֶּ** (*Kethuboth* 10b, and elsewhere). The Targ. has for it the form **פּוֹרְיָן** (vid., Levy). It thus designates a bed with a canopy (a tent-bed), Deu. 32:50, *Jerus*; so that the ideas of the bed of state and the palanquin (cf. **כִּילָת חַתָּנִים**, canopy, and **כִּילָת חַתָּנִים**, bridal-bed, *Succa* 11a) touch one another. In general, **פּוֹרְיָן** (**פּוֹרְיָן**), as is also the case with *appiryon*, must have been originally a common designation of certain household furniture with a common characteristic; for the Syr. *aprautha*, plur. *parjevatha* (Wiseman’s *Horae*, p. 255), or also *parha* (Castell.), signifies a cradle. It is then to be inquired, whether this word is referable to a root-word which gives a common characteristic with manifold applications. But the Heb. **פָּרַח**, from the R. **פָּרַח**, signifies to split, <sup>151</sup> to tear asunder, to break forth, to bring fruit, to be fruitful, and nothing further. *Pārā* has nowhere the signification to run, as already remarked; only in the Palest.-Aram. **פָּרַח** is found in this meaning (vid., Buxt.). The Arab. *farr* does not signify to run, but to flee; properly (like our “*ausreissen*” = be tear out, to break out), to break open by flight the rank in which one stands (as otherwise turned by horse-dealers: to open wide the horse’s mouth). But, moreover, we do not thus reach



the common characteristic which we are in search of; for if we may say of the litter that it runs, yet we cannot say that of a bed or a cradle, etc. The Arab. *farfâr*, *species vehiculi muliebris*, also does not help us; for the verb *farfar*, to vacillate, to shake, is its appropriate root-word. <sup>152</sup>

With better results shall we compare the Arab. *fary*, which, in *Kal* and *Hiph.*, signifies to break open, to cut out (*couper*, *tailler une étoffe*), and also, figuratively, to bring forth something strange, something not yet existing (*yafry alfaryya*, according to the Arab. *Lex.* = *yaty bal'ajab fy 'amalh*, he accomplishes something wonderful); the primary meaning in *Conj.* viii. is evidently: *yftarra kidban*, to cut out lies, to meditate and to express that which is calumnious (a similar metaphor to *khar'a*, *findere*, viii. *finger*, to cut out something in the imagination; French, *inventer*, *imaginer*). With this *fary*, however, we do not immediately reach פּוֹרָא, אִפְרִיּוֹן; for *fary*, as well as *fara* (*farw*), are used only of cutting to pieces, cutting out, sewing together of leather and other materials (cf. Arab. *farwat*, fur; *farrā*, furrier), but not of cutting and preparing wood.

But why should not the Semitic language have used פָּרָה, פָּרָא, also, in the sense of the verb בָּרָא, which signifies <sup>153</sup> to cut and hew, in the sense of forming (cf. *Pih.* בָּרָא, *sculptere*, Eze. 21:24), as in the Arab. *bara* and *bary*, according to Lane, mean, “be formed or fashioned by cutting (a writing-reed, stick, bow), shaped out, or pared,” — in other words: Why should פָּרָה, used in the Arab. of the cutting of leather, not be used, in the Heb. and Aram., of the preparing of wood, and thus of the fashioning of a bed or carriage? As חֶשְׁבוֹן signifies a machine, and that the work of an engineer, so פְּרִיּוֹן signifies timber-work, carpenter-work, and, lengthened especially by *Aleph prosthet.*, a product of the carpenter’s art, a bed of state. The *Aleph prosthet.* would indeed favour the supposition that *appiryon* is a foreign word; for the Semitic language frequently forms words after this manner, — e.g., אִמְנוּשָׁא, a magician; אִסְתָּרָא, a stater. <sup>154</sup>

But apart from such words as אֲגַרְמֵל, oddly sounding in accord with *κάρταλλος* as *appiryon* with φορέϊον, אֲבֵטְבֵעָה and אֲבֵטְבֵיחַ are examples of genuine Heb. words with such a prosthesis, i.e., an *Aleph*, as in אֲכֹנָב and the like. אֲפַדָן, palace, Dan. 11:45, is, for its closer amalgamation by means of *Dag.*, at least an analogous example; for thus it stands related to the Syr. *opadna*, as, e.g., (Syr.), *oparsons*, net, Ewald, § 163c, to the Jewish-Aram. אֲפַרְסָנָא, or אֲפַרְסָנָא; cf. also אֲפַתָם, “finally,” in relation to the Pehlv. אֲפַדוֹם (Spiegel’s *Literatur der Parsen*, p. 356). <sup>155</sup>

We think we have thus proved that אִפְרִיּוֹן is a Heb. word, which, coming from the verb פָּרָה, to cut right, to make, frame, signifies <sup>156</sup> a bed, and that, as Ewald also renders, a bed of state.

רִפְיָה (from רָפַד, R. רַפ, to lift from beneath, *sublevare*, then *sternere*) is the head of the head of the bed; LXX ἀνάκλιτον; Jerome, *reclinatorium*, which, according to Isidore, is the Lat. vulgar name for the *fulchra*, the reclining (of the head and foot) of the bedstead. Schlottmann here involuntarily bears testimony that *appiryon* may at least be understood of a bed of state as well as of a litter of state; for he remarks: “The four sides of the bed were generally adorned with carved work, ivory, metal, or also, as in the case of most of the Oriental divans, with drapery.” “*Nec mihi tunc*,” says Porpertius, ii. 10, 11, “*fulcro lectus sternatur eburno*.” Here the *fulcrum* is not of ivory, but of gold.

מְרַבֵּץ (from רָבַב, to lie upon anything; Arab. II *componere*; Aethiop. *adipisci*) is that which one takes possession of, sitting or lying upon it, the cushion, e.g., of a saddle (Lev. 15: 9); here, the divan (vid., Lane, *Mod. Egypt*, I 10) arranged on an elevated frame, serving both as a seat and as a couch. Red purple is called אֶרְבֵּץ, probably from רָבַב = רָבַב, as material of variegated colour. By the interior תוֹךְ of the bed, is probably meant a covering which lay above this cushion. רָצַף, to arrange together, to combine (whence רָצְפָה, pavement; Arab. *rusafāt*, a paved way), is here meant like σπορέννυμι, στόρνυμι, στρώννυμι, whence στρώμα. And רָצוּף אֶהָ is not equivalent to רָצוּף אֶהָ (after the construction 1Ki. 22:10; Eze. 9: 2), inlaid with love, but is the adv. accus. of the manner; “love” (cf. *hhesed*, Psa. 141: 5) denotes the motive: laid out or made up as a bed from love on the part of the daughters of Jerusalem, i.e., the ladies of the palace — these from love to the king have procured a costly tapestry or tapestries, which they have spread over the purple cushion. Thus rightly Vaihinger in his *Comm.*, and Merx, *Archiv.* Bd. II 111-114. Schlottmann finds this interpretation of מָן “stiff and hard;” but although מָן in the pass. is not used like the Greek ὑπό, yet it can be used like ὑπό (Ewald, sec. 295b); and if there be no actual example of this, yet we point to Psa. 45 in illustration of the custom of presenting gifts to a newly-married pair. He himself understands אֶהָ personally, as do also Ewald, *Heiligst.*, Böttcher; “the voice of the people,” says Ewald, “knows that the finest ornament with which the invisible interior of the couch is adorned, is a love from among the daughters of Jerusalem, — i.e., some one of the court ladies who was raised, from the king’s peculiar love to her, to the rank of a queen-consort. The speaker thus ingeniously names this newest favourite ‘a love,’ and at the same time designates her as the only thing with which this elegant structure, all adorned on the outside is adorned within.” Relatively better Böttcher: with a

love (beloved one), *prae filiis Hierus*. But even though אהבה, like *amor* and *amores*, might be used of the beloved one herself, yet רצוף does not harmonize with this, seeing we cannot speak of being paved or tapestried with persons. Schlottm. in vain refers for the personal signification of אהבה to 2: 7, where it means love and nothing else, and seeks to bring it into accord with רצוף; for he remarks, “as the stone in mosaic work fills the place destined for it, so the bride the interior of the litter, which is intended for just one person filling it.” But is this not more comical, without intending to be so, than Juvenal’s (i. 1. 32 s.):

*Causidici nova cum veniat lectica Mathonis  
Plena ipso....*

But Schlottm. agrees with us in this, that the marriage which is here being prepared for was the consummation of the happiness of Solomon and Shulamith, not of another woman, and not the consummation of Solomon’s assault on the fidelity of Shulamith, who hates him to whom she now must belong, loving only one, the shepherd for whom she is said to sigh (Son. 1: 4a), that he would come and take her away. “This triumphal procession,” says Rocke,<sup>157</sup> “was for her a mourning procession, the royal litter a bier; her heart died within her with longing for her beloved shepherd.” Touching, if it were only true! Nowhere do we see her up to this point resisting; much rather she is happy in her love. The shepherd-hypothesis cannot comprehend this marriage procession without introducing incongruous and imaginary things; it is a poem of the time of Gellert. Solomon the seducer, and Shulamith the heroine of virtue, are figures as from Gellert’s Swedish Countess; they are moral commonplaces personified, but not real human beings. In the litter sits Shulamith, and the *appiryon* waits for her. Solomon rejoices that now the reciprocal love-bond is to find its conclusion; and what Shulamith, who is brought from a lowly to so lofty a station, experiences, we shall hear her describe in the sequel.

**Son. 3:11.** At the close of the scene, the call now goes forth to the daughters of Zion, i.e., the women of Jerusalem collectively, to behold the king, who now shows himself to the object of his love and to the jubilant crowd, as the festal procession approaches.

*11 Come out, yet daughters of Zion, and see  
King Solomon with the crown  
With which his mother crowned him  
On the day of his espousal,  
And on the day of the gladness of his heart.*

The women of the court, as distinguished from the Galilean maiden, are called “daughters of Jerusalem;” here, generally, the women of Zion or Jerusalem (Lam. 5:11) are called “daughters of Zion.” Instead of צִיּוֹן (since the verb *Lamed Aleph* is treated after the manner of verbs *Lamed He*, cf. Jer. 50:20; Eze. 23:49), צִיּוֹן, and that defect. צִיּוֹן,<sup>f58</sup> is used for the sake of assonance with וְרֵאִינָה;<sup>f59</sup> elsewhere also, as we have shown at Isa. 222:13, an unusual form is used for the sake of the sound. It is seen from the *Sota* (ix. 14) that the old custom for the bridegroom to wear a “crown” was abolished in consequence of the awful war with Vespasian. Rightly Epstein, against Grätz, shows from Job. 31:36, Isa. 28: 1, Psa. 103: 4, that men also crowned themselves. בִּעֲטָרָה (with the crown) is, according to the best authorities, without the art., and does not require it, since it is determined by the relat. clause following. חֲתָנָה is the marriage (the word also used in the post-bibl. Heb., and interchanging with חֲפָה, properly *νυμφών*, Mat. 9:15), from the verb חָתַן, which, proceeding from the root-idea of cutting into (Arab. *khatn*, to circumcise; R. חַת, whence חֲתָן, חֲתָן, חֲתָן), denotes the pressing into, or going into, another family; חֲתָן is he who enters into such a relation of affinity, and חֲתָן the father of her who is taken away, who also on his part is related to the husband.<sup>f60</sup>

Here also the seduction fable is shattered. The marriage with Shulamith takes place with the joyful consent of the queen-mother. In order to set aside this fatal circumstance, the “crown” is referred back to the time when Solomon was married to Pharaoh’s daughter. *Cogitandus est Salomo*, says Heiligst., *qui cum Sulamitha pompa sollemni Hierosolyma redit, eadem corona nuptiali ornatus, qua quum filiam regis Aegyptiorum uxorem duxeret ornatus erat*. But was he then so poor or niggardly as to require to bring forth this old crown? and so basely regardless of his legitimate wife, of equal rank with himself, as to wound her by placing this crown on his head in honour of a rival? No; at the time when this youthful love-history occurred, Pharaoh’s daughter was not yet married. The mention of his mother points us to the commencement of his reign. His head is not adorned with a crown which had already been worn, but with a fresh garland which his mother wreathed around the head of her youthful son. The men have already welcomed the procession from afar; but the king in his wedding attire has special attractions for the women — they are here called upon to observe the moment when the happy pair welcome one another.

## SECOND SCENE OF THE THIRD ACT, 4: 1-5: 1

This scene contains a conversation between Solomon and his beloved, whom he at first calls friend, and then, drawing always nearer to her, bride. The place of

the conversation is, as 5: 1 shows, the marriage hall. That the guests there assembled hear what Solomon says to Shulamith, one need not suppose; but the poet has overheard it from the loving pair. Fairer than ever does Shulamith appear to the king. He praises her beauty, beginning with her eyes.

*4: 1a Lo, thou art fair, my friend! yes, thou art fair!  
Thine eyes are doves behind thy veil.*

**Son. 4: 1.** The Gr. Venet. translates, after Kimchi, “looking out from behind, thy hair flowing down from thy head like a mane.” Thus also Schultens, *capillus plexus*; and Hengst., who compares *πλέγμα*, 1Ti. 2: 9, and *ἐμπλοκή τριχῶν*, 1Pe. 3: 3, passages which do not accord with the case of Shulamith; but neither *עֲמָץ*, Arab. *šmm*, nor *tmm* signifies to plait; the latter is used of the hair when it is too abundant, and ready for the shears. To understand the hair as denoted here, is, moreover, inadmissible, inasmuch as *מבטח* cannot be used of the eyes in relation to the braids of hair hanging before them. Symm. rightly translates *הַצֵּמָה* by *κάλυμμα* [veil] (in the Song the LXX erroneously renders by *σιωπήσεως* [behind thy silence]), Isa. 47: 2. The verb *עָמַץ*, (Arab.) *šmam*, a stopper, and (Arab.) *ašamma*, a plaid in which one veils himself, when he wraps it around him. <sup>161</sup>

The veil is so called, as that which closely hides the face. In the Aram. *עָמַץ*, *Palp. עָמַץ*, means directly to veil, as e.g., *Bereshith rabba* c. 45, *extr.*, of a matron whom the king lets pass before him it is said, *עִמְצָמָה פָּנֶיהָ*. Shulamith is thus veiled. As the Roman bride wore the *velum flammeum*, so also the Jewish bride was deeply veiled; cf. Gen. 24:65, where Rebecca veiled herself (Lat. *nubit*) before her betrothed. *פָּאַד*, constr. *פָּאַד*, a segolate noun, which denotes separation, is a prep. in the sense of *pone*, as in Arab. in that of *post*. Ewald, sec. 217*m*, supposes, contrary to the Arab., the fundamental idea of covering (cogn. *בָּגַד*); but that which surrounds is thought of as separating, and at the same time as covering, the thing which it encompasses. From behind her veil, which covered her face (vid., Bachmann, under Jud. 3:23), her eyes gleam out, which, without needing to be supplemented by *עֵינַי*, are compared, as to their colour, motion, and lustre, to a pair of doves.

From the eyes the praise passes to the hair.

*1b Thy hair is like a flock of goats  
Which repose downwards on Mount Gilead.*

The hair of the bride’s head was uncovered. We know from later times that she wore in it a wreath of myrtles and roses, or also a “golden city” (*עִיר של זהב*), i.e., an ornament which emblematically represented Jerusalem. To see that this

comparison is not incongruous, we must know that sheep in Syria and Palestine are for the most part white; but goats, for the most part, black, or at least dark coloured, as e.g., the brown *gedi Mamri*.<sup>f62</sup>

The verb **נָלַשׁ** is the Arab. *jls*, which signifies, to rest upon; and is distinguished from the synon. *q'd* in this, that the former is used of him who has previously lain down; the latter, of one who first stands and then sits down.<sup>f63</sup>

The *nejd* bears also the name *jals*, as the high land raising itself, and like a dome sitting above the rest of the land. One has to think of the goats as having lain down, and thus with the upper parts of their bodies as raised up. **מָן** in **מָהָר** is used almost as in **מָר מְדָלִי**, Isa. 40:15. A flock of goats encamped on a mountain (rising up, to one looking from a distance, as in a steep slope, and almost perpendicularly), and as if hanging down lengthwise on its sides, presents a lovely view adorning the landscape. Solomon likens to this the appearance of the locks of his beloved, which hang down over her shoulders. She was till now a shepherdess, therefore a second rural image follows:

*2 Thy teeth are like a flock of shorn sheep  
Which comes up from the washing  
All bearing twins,  
And a bereaved one is not among them.*

**Son. 4: 2.** The verb **קָצַב** is, as the Arab. shows, in the sense of *tondere oves*, the synon. of **נָנַן**. With shorn (not to be shorn) sheep, the teeth in regard to their smoothness, and with washed sheep in regard to their whiteness, are compared — as a rule the sheep of Palestine are white; in respect of their full number, in which in pairs they correspond to one another, the one above to the one below, like twin births in which there is no break. The parallel passage, 6: 6, omits the point of comparison of the smoothness. That some days after the shearing the sheep were bathed, is evident from Columella 7: 4. Regarding the incorrect exchange of mas. with fem. forms, vid., under 2: 7. The part. *Hiph.* **מְתַאֲמוֹת** (cf. **διδυματόκος**, Theocr. i. 25) refers to the mothers, none of which has lost a twin of the pair she had borne. In “which come up from the washing,” there is perhaps thought of, at the same time with the whiteness, the *saliva dentium*. The moisture of the saliva, which heightens the glance of the teeth, is frequently mentioned in the love-songs of Mutenebbi, Hariri, and Deschami. And that the saliva of a clean and sound man is not offensive, is seen from this, that the Lord healed a blind man by means of His spittle.

**Son. 4: 3.** The mouth is next praised:

*3a Like a thread of crimson thy lips,  
And thy mouth is lovely,*

As distinguished from red-purple, שְׁנִי אֶרְבֵּן (properly, shining, glistening; for this form has an active signification, like נָקַי, as well as a passive, like עָנִי) — fully, תּוֹלֵאֵת שְׁנִי — signifies the *kermes* or worm-colour; the *karmese*, the red juice of the cochineal. מְדַבֵּר (מְדַבְרִיד) is translated by the LXX “thy speech;” Jerome, *eloquium*; and the Venet. “thy dialogue;” but that would be expressed, though by a ἄπ. λεγ., by דְּבוּרָה. מְדַבֵּר is here the name of the mouth, the naming of which one expects; the preform. is the *mem instrumenti*: the mouth, as the instrument of speech, as the organ by which the soul expresses itself in word and in manner of speech. The poet needed for פִּי אֵלֶּיךָ a fuller, more select word; just as in Syria the nose is not called *anf*, but *minchâr* (from *nachara*, to blow, to breathe hard).

Praise of her temples.

**3b Like a piece of pomegranate thy temples  
Behind thy veil.**

רִקְוֵה is the thin piece of the skull on both sides of the eyes; Lat., mostly in the plur., *tempora*; German, *schläfe*, from *schlaff*, loose, slack, i.e., weak = רַק. The figure points to that soft mixing of colours which makes the colouring of the so-called carnation one of the most difficult accomplishments in the art of painting. The half of a cut pomegranate (Jer. *fragmen mali punici*) is not meant after its outer side, as Zöckler supposes, for he gives to the noun *rakkā*, contrary to Jud. 4:21; 5:26, the meaning of cheek, a meaning which it has not, but after its inner side, which presents <sup>f64</sup> a red mixed and tempered with the ruby colour, — a figure so much the more appropriate, since the ground-colour of Shulamith’s countenance is a subdued white. <sup>f65</sup>

Up to this point the figures are borrowed from the circle of vision of a shepherdess. Now the king derives them from the sphere of his own experience as the ruler of a kingdom. She who has eyes like doves is in form like a born queen.

**4 Like the tower of David thy neck,  
Built in terraces;  
Thereon a thousand shields hang,  
All the armour of heroes.**

**Son. 4: 4.** The tower of David, is, as it appears, “the tower of the flock,” Mic. 4: 4, from which David surveyed the flock of his people. In Neh. 3:25f. it is called the “tower which lieth out from the king’s high house,” i.e., not the palace, but a government house built on Zion, which served as a court of justice. But what is the meaning of the ἄπ. λεγ. תִּלְפִּיּוֹת? Grätz translates: for a



prospect; but the Greek *τηλωπός*, of which he regards **תל** as the Heb. abstr., is a word so rare that its introduction into the Semitic language is on that account improbable. Hengst. translates: built for hanging swords; and he sees in the word a compound of **תל** (from *תלה*, with which forms such as **יָד** = *jadj*, **שָׁד** = *shadj*, **שָׁל**, 2Sa. 6: 7, are compared) and **פִּיּוֹת**; but this latter word signifies, not swords, but edges of the (double-edged) sword; wherefore Kimchi (interpreting **תל** as the constr. of **תל**, as **אל**, in *בְּצִלְאֵל*, is of **צל**) explains: an erection of sharp-cornered stones; and, moreover, the Heb. language knows no such *nm.* *comp. appellativa*: the names of the frog, **צַפְרִידֵעַ**, and the bat, **עַמְלֵף** (cf. the *Beth* in [Arab.] *sa'lab*, fox, with the added *Pe*), are not such; and also *tsalmāvēth*, the shadow of death, is at a later period, for the first time, restamped <sup>166</sup> as such from the original *tsalmuth* (cf. Arab. *zalumat* = *tenebrae*). Gesen. obtains the same meanings; for he explains **לתל** by *exitialibus* (sc., *armis*), from an adj. **תלפי**, from **תלף** = Arab. *talifa*, to perish, the inf. of which, *talaf*, is at the present day a word synon. with *halak* (to perish); (Arab.) *matlaf* (place of going down) is, like **יְשִׁמוֹן**, a poetic name of the wilderness. The explanation is acceptable but hazardous, since neither the Heb. nor the Aram. shows a trace of this verb; and it is thus to be given up, if **תלפ** can be referred to a verbal stem to be found in the Heb. and Aram. This is done in Ewald's explanation, to which also Böttcher and Rödiger give the preference: built for close (crowded) troops (so, viz., that many hundreds or thousands find room therein); the (Arab.) verb *aff*, to wrap together (opp. *nashar*, to unfold), is used of the packing together of multitudes of troops (*liff*, plur. *lufuf*), and also of warlike hand-to-hand conflicts; **תלפ** would be traced to a verb **לפה** synon. therewith, after the form **תאניה**. But if **תלפ** were meant of troops, then they would be denoted as the garrison found therein, and it would not be merely said that the tower was built for such; for the point of comparison would then be, the imposing look of the neck, overpowering by the force of the impression proceeding from within. But now, in the Aram., and relatively in the Talm. Heb., not only **לפר** and **לור** occur, but also **לפי** (Af. **אלפי**), and that in the sense of enclosure, i.e., of joining together, the one working into the other, — e.g., in the Targ.: of the curtain of the tabernacle (**בית לופי**, place of the joining together = **חִבְרַת** or **מַחְבְּרַת** of the Heb. text); and in the Talm.: of the roofs of two houses (*Bathra* 6a, **לופתא**, the joining <sup>167</sup>). Accordingly **לתלפ**, if we interpret the *Lamed* not of the definition, but of the norm, may signify, “in ranks together.” The *Lamed* has already been thus rendered by Döderl.: “in turns” (cf. **לפת**, to turn, to wind); and by Meier, Mr.: “in gradation;” and Aq. and Jerome also suppose that **תלפ** refers to component parts of the building itself, for they understand <sup>168</sup> pinnacles or parapets (*επάλλξεις*, *propugnacula*); as

also the Venet.: εἰς ἐπάλλξεις χιλίας. But the name for pinnacles is פִּנְנָה, and their points, שְׂמֻשׁוֹת; while, on the contrary, תֵּלֶפֶחַ is the more appropriate name for terraces which, connected together, rise the one above the other. Thus to build towers like terraces, and to place the one, as it were, above the other, was a Babylonian custom. <sup>169</sup>

The comparison lies in this, that Shulamith's neck was surrounded with ornaments so that it did not appear as a uniform whole, but as composed of terraces. That the neck is represented as hung round with ornaments, the remaining portion of the description shows.

מָגֶן signifies a shield, as that which protects, like *clupeus (clypeus)*, perhaps connected with *καλύπτειν* and שָׁלֵט, from שָׁלַט = (Arab.) *shalita*, as a hard impenetrable armour. The latter is here the more common word, which comprehends, with מָגֶן, the round shield; also צָנֶה, the oval shield, which covers the whole body; and other forms of shields. אֶלֶף הַמָּגִן, “the thousand shields,” has the indicative, if not (vid., under Son. 1:11) the generic article. The appositional כָּל שְׁלֵטֵי הַגָּ' is not intended to mean: all shields of (*von*) heroes, which it would if the article were prefixed to *col* and omitted before *gibborim*, or if בָּלָם, Son. 3: 8, were used; but it means: all the shields of heroes, as the accentuation also indicates. The article is also here significant. Solomon made, according to 1Ki. 10:16f., 200 golden targets and 300 golden shields, which he put in the house of the forest of Lebanon. These golden shields Pharaoh Shishak took away with him, and Rehoboam replaced them by “shields of brass,” which the guards bore when they accompanied the king on his going into the temple (1Ki. 14:26-28; cf. 2Ch. 12: 9-11); these “shields of David,” i.e., shields belonging to the king's house, were given to the captains of the guard on the occasion of the raising of Joash to the throne, 2Ki. 11:10; cf. 2Ch. 23: 9. Of these brazen shields, as well as of those of gold, it is expressly said how and where they were kept, nowhere that they were hung up outside on a tower, the tower of David. Such a display of the golden shields is also very improbable. We will perhaps have to suppose that 4b describes the tower of David, not as it actually was, but as one has to represent it to himself, that it might be a figure of Shulamith's neck. This is compared to the terraced tower of David, if one thinks of it as hung round by a thousand shields which the heroes bore, those heroes, namely, who formed the king's body-guard. Thus it is not strange that to the 200 + 300 golden shields are here added yet 500 more; the body-guard, reckoned in companies of 100 each, 2Ki. 11: 4, is estimated as consisting of 1000 men. The description, moreover, corresponds with ancient custom. The words are תְּלֹוֹי עָלָיו, not תְּלֹוֹי בּוֹ; the outer wall of the tower is thought of as decorated with shields hung upon it. That shields were thus hung

round on tower-walls, Ezekiel shows in his prophecy regarding Tyre, 27:11; cf. 1 Macc. 4:57, and *supra foris Capitolinae aedis*, Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxv. 3; and although we express the presumption that Solomon's imagination represented David's tower as more gorgeous than it actually was, yet we must confess that we are not sufficiently acquainted with Solomon's buildings to be able to pass judgment on this. These manifold inexplicable references of the Song to the unfolded splendour of Solomon's reign, are favourable to the Solomonic authorship of the book. This grandiose picture of the distinguished beauty of the neck, and the heightening of this beauty by the ornament of chains, is now followed by a beautiful figure, which again goes back to the use of the language of shepherds, and terminates the description:

*5 Thy two breasts are like two fawns,  
Twins of a gazelle,  
Which feed among lilies.*

**Son. 4: 5.** The dual, originating in the inner differ. of the plur., which denotes in Heb. not two things of any sort, but two paired by nature or by art, exists only in the principal form; שְׁדַיִם, as soon as inflected, is unrecognisable, therefore here, where the pair as such is praised, the word שְׁנַיִן is used. The breasts are compared to a twin pair of young gazelles in respect of their equality and youthful freshness, and the bosom on which they raise themselves is compared to a meadow covered with lilies, on which the twin-pair of young gazelles feed. With this tender lovely image the praise of the attractions of the chosen one is interrupted. If one counts the lips and the mouth as a part of the body, which they surely are, there are seven things here praised, as Hengst. rightly counts (the eyes, the hair, teeth, mouth, temples, neck, breasts); and Hahn speaks with right of the sevenfold beauty of the bride.

**Son. 4: 6.** Shulamith replies to these words of praise:

*6 Until the day cools and the shadows flee,  
I will go forth to the mountain of myrrh  
And to the hill of frankincense.*

All those interpreters who suppose these to be a continuation of Solomon's words, lose themselves in absurdities. Most of them understand the mountain of myrrh and the hill of frankincense of Shulamith's attractions, praised in v. 5, or of her beauty as a whole; but the figures would be grotesque (cf. on the other hand 5:13), and אֵלֶךְ לִי אֵלֶךְ prosaic, wherefore it comes that the idea of betaking oneself away connects itself with הֵלֶךְ לִי (Gen. 12: 1; Exo. 18:27), or that it yet preponderates therein (Gen. 22: 2; Jer. 5: 5), and that, for אֵלֶךְ לִי in the passage before us in reference to 2:10, 11, the supposition holds that it will

correspond with the French *jè m'en irai*. With right Louis de Leon sees in the mountain of myrrh and the hill of frankincense names of shady and fragrant places; but he supposes that Solomon says he wishes to go thither to enjoy a siesta, and that he invites Shulamith thither. But we read nothing of this invitation; and that a bridegroom should sleep a part of his marriage-day is yet more unnatural than that, e.g., Wilh. Budäus, the French philologist, spent a part of the same at work in his study. That not Solomon but Shulamith speaks here is manifest in the beginning, "until the day," etc., which at 2:17 are also Shulamith's words. Anton (1773) rightly remarks, "Shulamith says this to set herself free." But why does she seek to make herself free? It is answered, that she longs to be forth from Solomon's too ardent eulogies; she says that, as soon as it is dark, she will escape to the blooming aromatic fields of her native home, where she hopes to meet with her beloved shepherd. Thus, e.g., Ginsburg (1868). But do myrrh and frankincense grow in North Palestine? Ginsburg rests on Florus' *Epitome Rerum Rom.* iii. 6, where Pompey the Great is said to have passed over Lebanon and by Damascus "*per nemora illa odorata, per thuris et balsami sylvas.*" But by these *thuris et balsami sylvae* could be meant only the gardens of Damascus; for neither myrrh nor frankincense is indigenous to North Palestine, or generally to any part of Palestine. Friedrich (1866) therefore places Shulamith's home at Engedi, and supposes that she here once more looks from the window and dotes on the mountain of myrrh and the hill of frankincense, "where, at the approach of twilight, she was wont to look out for her betrothed shepherd." But Shulamith, as her name already denotes, is not from the south, but is a Galilean, and her betrothed shepherd is from Utopia! That myrrh and frankincense were planted in the gardens of Engedi is possible, although (Son. 1:14) mention is made only of the *Al-henna* there. But here places in the neighbourhood of the royal palace must be meant; for the myrrh tree, the gum of which, prized as an aroma, is the Arab. *Balsamodendron Myrrha*, and the frankincense tree, the resin of which is used for incense, is, like the myrrh tree, an Arab. amyrid. The *Boswellia serrata*,<sup>f70</sup> indigenous to the East Indies, furnishes the best frankincense; the Israelites bought it from Sheba (Isa. 60: 6; Jer. 6:20). The myrrh tree as well as the frankincense tree were thus exotics in Palestine, as they are in our own country; but Solomon, who had intercourse with Arabia and India by his own mercantile fleet, procured them for his own garden (Ecc. 2: 5). The modest Shulamith shuns the loving words of praise; for she requests that she may be permitted to betake herself to the lonely places planted with myrrh and frankincense near the king's palace, where she thinks to tarry in a frame of mind befitting this day till the approaching darkness calls her back to the king. It is the importance of the day which suggests to her this ל  
לאל, a day in which she enters into the covenant of her God with Solomon (Pro. 2:17). Without wishing to allegorize, we may yet not omit to observe, that

the mountain of myrrh and the hill of frankincense put us in mind of the temple, where incense, composed of myrrh, frankincense, and other spices, ascended up before God every morning and evening (Exo. 30:34ff.). **הַר הַמִּיָּר** is perhaps a not unintentional accord to **הַר הַמְּוֹרָיָה** (2Ch. 3: 1), the mountain where God appeared; at all events, “mountain of myrrh” and “hill of frankincense” are appropriate names for places of devout meditation, where one holds fellowship with God.

**Son. 4: 7.** This childlike modest disposition makes her yet more lovely in the eyes of the king. He breaks out in these words:

*7 Thou art altogether fair, my love,  
And no blemish in thee.*

Certainly he means, no blemish either of soul or body. In vv. 1-5 he has praised her external beauty; but in v. 6 her soul has disclosed itself: the fame of her spotless beauty is there extended to her would no less than to her external appearance. And as to her longing after freedom from the tumult and bustle of court life, he thus promises to her:

*8 With me from Lebanon, my bride,  
With me from Lebanon shalt thou come;  
Shalt look from the top of Amana,  
From the top of Shenir and Hermon,  
From dens of lions,  
From mountains of leopards.*

**Son. 4: 8.** Zöckl. interprets **אֶתִּי** in the sense of **אֵלַי**, and **תְּשׁוּרִי** in the sense of journeying to this definite place: “he announces to her in overflowing fulness of expression that from this time forth, instead of the lonely mountainous regions, and the dangerous caves and dens, she shall inhabit with him the royal palace.” Thus also Kingsbury. But the interpretation, however plausible, cannot be supported. For (1) such an idea ought to be expressed either by **אֵלַי תָּבֹ** or by **אֶתִּי תֵשֵׁב**, instead of **אֶתִּי תָּבֹ**; (2) Shulamith is not from Lebanon, nor from the Anti-Libanus, which looks toward Damascus; (3) this would be no answer to Shulamith’s longing for lonely quietness. We therefore hold by our explanation given in 1851. He seeks her to go with him up the steep heights of Lebanon, and to descend with him from thence; for while ascending the mountain one has no view before him, but when descending he has the whole panorama of the surrounding region lying at his feet. Thus **תֵּשֵׁב** is not to be understood as at Isa. 57: 9, where it has the meaning of *migrabas*, but, as at Num. 23: 9, it means *spectabis*. With **מָרָה** the idea of prospect lies nearer than that of descending; besides, the meaning *spectare* is secondary, for **שׁוּר**

signifies first “to go, proceed, journey,” and then “going to view, to go in order to view.” *Sêr* in Arab. means “the scene,” and *sêr etmek* in Turkish, “to contemplate” (cf. Arab. *tamashy*, to walk, then, to contemplate). *Lebanon* is the name of the Alpine range which lies in the N.-W. of the Holy Land, and stretches above 20 (German) miles from the Leontes (*Nahr el-Kasm-ê*) northwards to the Eleutheros (*Nahr el-Keb-r*). The other three names here found refer to the Anti-Libanus separated from the Lebanon by the Coelo-Syrian valley, and stretching from the Banis northwards to the plain of *Hamâth*.

*Amana* denotes that range of the Anti-Libanus from which the springs of the river Amana issue, one of the two rivers which the Syrian captain (2Ki. 5:12) named as better than all the waters of Israel. These are the *Amana* and *Pharpar*, i.e., the *Baradâ* and *A'wadsh*; to the union of the *Baradâ* (called by the Greeks *Chrysorrhoeas*, i.e., “golden stream”) with the *Feidshe*, the environs of Damascus owe their *ghuwdat*, their paradisaical beauty.

*Hermon* (from חֶרְמוֹן, to cut off; cf. Arab. *kharom* and *makhrim*, the steep projection of a mountain) is the most southern peak of the Anti-Libanus chain, the lofty mountains (about 10,000 feet above the level of the sea) which form the north-eastern border of Palestine, and from which the springs of the Jordan take their rise.

Another section of the Anti-Libanus range is called *Senir*, not *Shenir*. The name, in all the three places where it occurs (Deu. 3: 9; 1Ch. 5:23), is, in accordance with tradition, to be written with *Sin*. The Onkelos Targum writes סְרִיין; the Jerusalem paraphrases, מוֹרָא דְמַסְרֵי פִירוֹי (the mountain whose fruits become putrid, viz., on account of their superabundance); the Midrash explains otherwise: שְׂהוּא שׁוֹבֵא הַנִּיר (the mountain which resists being broken up by the plough), — everywhere the writing of the word with the letter *Sin* is supposed. According to Deu. 3: 9, this was the Amorite name of Hermon. The expression then denotes that the Amorites called Hermon — i.e., the Anti-Libanus range, for they gave the name of a part to the whole range — by the name *Sen-r*; Abulfeda uses Arab. *sn-r* as the name of the part to the north of Damascus, with which the statement of Schwarz (*Das h. Land*, p. 33) agrees, that the Hermon (Anti-Libanus) to the north-west of Damascus is called *Sen-r*.

נְמֵרִים, panthers, to the present day inhabit the clefts and defiles of the Lebanon, and of the Anti-Libanus running parallel to it; whereas lions have now altogether disappeared from the countries of the Mediterranean. In Solomon's time they were to be met with in the lurking-places of the Jordan valley, and yet more frequently in the remote districts of the northern Alpine chains. From the heights of these Alps Solomon says Shulamith shall alone with him look down from where the lions and panthers dwell. Near these beasts of prey, and yet



inaccessible by them, shall she enjoy the prospect of the extensive pleasant land which was subject to the sceptre of him who held her safe on these cliffs, and accompanied her over these giddy heights. If “mountain of myrrh,” so also “the top of Amana” is not without subordinate reference. *Amana*, proceeding from the primary idea of firmness and verification, signifies fidelity and the faithful covenant as it is established between God and the congregation, for He betrothes it to Himself באמונה (“in faithfulness”), Hos. 2:22 [20]; the congregation of which the apostle (Eph. 5:27) says the same as is here said by Solomon of Shulamith. Here for the first time he calls her בְּלֵאָה, not בְּלֵתִי; for that, according to the *usus loq.*, would mean “my daughter-in-law.” Accordingly, it appears that the idea of “daughter-in-law” is the primary, and that of “bride” the secondary one. בְּלֵאָה, which is = בְּלוּאָה, as חֶלֶה, a cake, is = חֶלְוָה, that which is pierced through (cf. בְּלוּלוֹת, being espoused; Jer. 2: 2), appears to mean <sup>71</sup> (cf. what was said regarding חֶרֶן under 3:11b) her who is comprehended with the family into which, leaving her parents’ house, she enters; not her who is embraced = crowned with a garland (cf. Arab. *qkll*, to be garlanded; *tēkf-l*, garlanding; *iklil*, Syr. *k̄lilo*, a wreath), or her who is brought to completion (cf. the verb, Eze. 27: 4, 11), i.e., has reached the goal of her womanly calling. Besides, בְּלֵאָה, like “*Braut*” in the older German (e.g., Gudrun), means not only her who is betrothed, but also her who has been lately married.

**Son. 4: 9.** All that the king calls his, she now can call hers; for she has won his heart, and with his heart himself and all that is his.

*9 Thou hast taken my heart, my sister-bride;  
Thou hast taken my heart with one of thy glances,  
With a little chain of thy necklace.*

The *Piel* לִבֵּב may mean to make courageous, and it actually has this meaning in the Aram., wherefore the Syr. retains the word; Symm. renders it by ἐθάρσυνάς με. But is it becoming in a man who is no coward, especially in a king, to say that the love he cherishes gives him heart, i.e., courage? It might be becoming, perhaps, in a warrior who is inspired by the thought of his beloved, whose respect and admiration he seeks to gain, to dare the uttermost. But Solomon is no Antar, no wandering knight. <sup>172</sup>

Besides, the first effect of love is different: it influences those whom it governs, not as encouraging, in the first instance, but as disarming them; love responded to encourages, but love in its beginning, which is the subject here, overpowers. We would thus more naturally render: “thou hast unhearted me;” but “to unheart,” according to the Semitic and generally the ancient conception of the



heart (*Psychol.* p. 254), does not so much mean to captivate the heart, as rather to deprive of understanding or of judgment (cf. Hos. 4:11). Such denomin. *Pi.* of names of corporeal members signify not merely taking away, but also wounding, and generally any violent affection of it, as **זָנַב, גָּרַם, וְזָנַב**, Ewald, § 120c; accordingly the LXX, Venet., and Jerome: **ἔκαρδίσωός με**, *vulnerasti cor meum*. The meaning is the same for “thou hast wounded my heart” = “thou hast subdued my heart” (cf. Psa. 45: 6b). With one of her glances, with a little chain of her necklace, she has overcome him as with a powerful charm: *veni, visa sum, vici*. The *Ker* changes **בְּאַחַד** into **בְּאַחַת**; certainly **אֵין** is mostly fem. (e.g., Jud. 16:28), but not only the non-bibl. *usus loq.*, which e.g., prefers **רָעָה** or **אֵין רָע**, of a malignant bewitching look, but also the bibl. (vid., Zec. 3: 9; 4:10) treats the word as of double gender. **עֵנָק** and **צִוְרָנִים** are related to each other as a part is to the whole. With the subst. ending *ōn*, the designation of an ornament designed for the neck is formed from **צִוְאָר**, the neck; cf. **שְׁהָרוֹן**, the “round tires like the moon” of the women’s toilet, Isa. 3:18ff. **עֵנָק** (connected with **עֹנֶק עֵנָק**, *cervix*) is a separate chain (Aram. **עֹנֶקְתָּא**) of this necklace. In the words **אֶחָד עֵנָק**, **אֶחָד** is used instead of **אֶחָד**, occurring also out of genit. connection (Gen. 48:22; 2Sa. 17:22), and the arrangement (vid., under Psa. 89:51) follows the analogy of the pure numerals as **שְׁלֹשׁ נָשִׁים**; it appears to be transferred from the vulgar language to that used in books, where, besides the passage before us, it occurs only in Dan. 8:13. That a glance of the eye may pierce the heart, experience shows; but how can a little chain of a necklace do this? That also is intelligible. As beauty becomes unlike itself when the attire shows want of taste, so by means of tasteful clothing, which does not need to be splendid, but may even be of the simplest kind, it becomes mighty. Hence the charming attractive power of the impression one makes communicates itself to all that he wears, as, e.g., the woman with the issue of blood touched with joyful hope the hem of Jesus’ garment; for he who loves feels the soul of that which is loved in all that stands connected therewith, all that is, as it were, consecrated and charmed by the beloved object, and operates so much the more powerfully if it adorns it, because as an ornament of that which is beautiful, it appears so much the more beautiful. In the preceding verse, Solomon has for the first time addressed Shulamith by the title “bride.” Here with heightened cordiality he calls her “sister-bride.” In this change in the address the progress of the story is mirrored. Why he does not say **בְּלָתִי** (my bride), has already been explained, under 8a, from the derivation of the word. Solomon’s mother might call Shulamith *callathi*, but he gives to the relation of affinity into which Shulamith has entered a reference to himself individually, for he says *āhhothi callā* (my sister-bride): she who as *callā* of his mother is to her a kind of daughter, is as *callā* in relation to himself, as it were, his sister.

**Son. 4:10, 11.** He proceeds still further to praise her attractions.

*10 How fair is thy love, my sister-bride!  
How much better thy love than wine!  
And the fragrance of thy unguents than all spices!*

*11 Thy lips drop honey, my bride;  
Honey and milk are under thy tongue;  
And the fragrance of thy garments is like the fragrance of Lebanon.*

Regarding the connection of the *pluralet*. דְּוֹדִים with the plur. of the pred., vid., at 1: 2*b*. The pred. יָפוּ praises her love in its manifestations according to its impression on the sight; טָבוּ, according to its experience on nearer intercourse. As in v. 9 the same power of impression is attributed to the eyes and to the necklace, so here is intermingled praise of the beauty of her person with praise of the fragrance, the odour of the clothing of the bride; for her soul speaks out not only by her lips, she breathes forth odours also for him in her spices, which he deems more fragrant than all other odours, because he inhales, as it were, her soul along with them. נָפֶת, from נָפַת, *ebullire* (vid., under Pro. 5: 3, also Schultens), is virgin honey, ἄκοιτον (*acetum*, Pliny, xi. 15), i.e., that which of itself flows from the combs (צוּפִים). Honey drops from the lips which he kisses; milk and honey are under the tongue which whispers to him words of pure and inward joy; cf. the contrary, Psa. 140: 4. The last line is an echo of Gen. 27:27. שְׁמֵלָה is שְׁמַל (from שָׂמַל, *complicare, complecti*) transposed (cf. אֶלְהָ from אֹלְהָ, בְּשֵׁבָה from בְּבִשָּׁה). As Jacob's raiment had for his old father the fragrance of a field which God had blessed, so for Solomon the garments of the faultless and pure one, fresh from the woods and mountains of the north, gave forth a heart-strengthening savour like the fragrance of Lebanon (Hos. 4: 7), viz., of its fragrant herbs and trees, chiefly of the balsamic odour of the apples of the cedar.

**Son. 4:12.** The praise is sensuous, but it has a moral consecration.

*12 A garden locked is my sister-bride;  
A spring locked, a fountain sealed.*

גַּן (according to rule masc. Böttch. § 658) denotes the garden from its enclosure; גַּל (elsewhere גְּלָה), the fountain (synon. מְבוּאָה), the waves bubbling forth (cf. Amo. 5:24); and מְעֵיָן, the place, as it were an eye of the earth, from which a fountain gushes forth. Luther distinguishes rightly between *gan* and *gal*; on the contrary, all the old translators (even the Venet.) render as if the word in both cases were *gan*. The *Pasek* between *gan* and *nā'ul*, and between *gal* and *nā'ul*, is designed to separate the two *Nuns*, as e.g., at 2Ch. 2: 9,

Neh. 2: 2, the two *Mems*; it is the orthophonic *Pasek*, already described under 2: 7, which secures the independence of two similar or organically related sounds. Whether the sealed fountain (*fons signatus*) alludes to a definite fountain which Solomon had built for the upper city and the temple place,<sup>173</sup> we do not now inquire. To a locked garden and spring no one has access but the rightful owner, and a sealed fountain is shut against all impurity. Thus she is closed against the world, and inaccessible to all that would disturb her pure heart, or desecrate her pure person.<sup>174</sup>

All the more beautiful and the greater is the fulness of the flowers and fruits which bloom and ripen in the garden of this life, closed against the world and its lust.

*13 What sprouts forth for thee is a park of pomegranates,  
With most excellent fruits;  
Cypress flowers with nards;*

*14 Nard and crocus; calamus and cinnamon,  
With all kinds of incense trees;  
Myrrh and aloes,  
With all the chief aromatics.*

**Son. 4:13, 14.** The common subject to all down to v. 15 inclusive is שְׁלַחֲךָ (‘‘what sprouts for thee’’ = ‘‘thy plants’’), as a figurative designation, borrowed from plants, of all the ‘‘phenomena and life utterances’’ (Böttch.) of her personality. ‘‘If I only knew here,’’ says Rocke, ‘‘how to disclose the meaning, certainly all these flowers and fruits, in the figurative language of the Orient, in the flower-language of love, had their beautiful interpretation.’’ In the old German poetry, also, the phrase *bluomen brechen* [to break flowers] was equivalent to: to enjoy love; the flowers and fruits named are figures of all that the *amata* offers to the *amator*. Most of the plants here named are exotics; פְּרָדִים (heaping around, circumvallation, enclosing) is a garden or park, especially with foreign ornamental and fragrant plants — an old Persian word, the explanation of which, after Spiegel, first given in our exposition of the Song, 1851 (from *pairi* = περί, and *dêz*, R. *diz*, a heap), has now become common property (Justi’s *Handb. der Zendsprache*, p. 180). פְּרֵי מְגָדִים (from מְגָד, which corresponds to The Arab. *mejd*, praise, honour, excellence; vid., Volck under Deu. 33:13) are *fructus laudum*, or *lautitiarum*, excellent precious fruits, which in the more modern language are simply called מְגָדִים (*Shabbath* 127b, מִיְּנֵי מְגָדִים, all kinds of fine fruits); cf. Syr. *magdo*, dried fruit. Regarding כֶּפֶר, vid., under Son. 1:14; regarding מֶר, under Son. 1:13; also regarding נֶרְדִּי, under Son. 1:12. The long vowel of נֶרְדִּי corresponds to the Pers. form *nârd*, but near to which is also *nard*, Indian *nalada* (fragrance-

giving); the  $\bar{e}$  is thus only the long accent, and can therefore disappear in the plur. For נרדים, Grätz reads נרדים, roses, because the poet would not have named nard twice. The conjecture is beautiful, but for us, who believe the poem to be Solomonic, is inconsistent with the history of roses (vid., under 2: 1), and also unnecessary. The description moves forward by steps rhythmically.

פרכם is the *crocus stivus*, the genuine Indian *safran*, the dried flower-eyes of which yield the safran used as a colour, as an aromatic, and also as medicine; *safran* is an Arab. word, and means yellow root and yellow colouring matter. The name פרכם, Pers. *karkam*, Arab. *karkum*, is radically Indian, Sanscr. *kunkuma*. קנה, a reed (from קנה, R. קנ, to rise up, viewed intrans.),<sup>175</sup> viz., sweet reed, *acorus calamus*, which with us now grows wild in marshes, but is indigenous to the Orient.

קנמון is the *laurus cinnamomum*, a tree indigenous to the east coast of Africa and Ceylon, and found later also on the Antilles. It is of the family of the *laurineae*, the inner bark of which, peeled off and rolled together, is the cinnamon-bark (*cannella*, French *cannelle*); Aram. קנמא, as also the Greek κιννάμωμον and κίνναμον, Lat. (e.g., in the 12th book of Pliny) *cinnamomum* and *cinnamum*, are interchanged, from קנ, probably a secondary formation from קנה (like בף, whence בפה, from בף), to which also Syr. *q<sup>n</sup>umā*, ὑπόστασις, and the Talm.-Targ. קנים קנים, an oath (cf. קים), go back, so that thus the name which was brought to the west by the Phoenicians denoted not the tree, but the reed-like form of the rolled dried bark. As “nards” refer to varieties of the nard, perhaps to the Indian and the Jamanic spoken of by Strabo and others, so “all kinds of incense trees” refers definitely to Indo-Arab. varieties of the incense tree and its fragrant resin; it has its name from the white and transparent seeds of this its resin (cf. Arab. *Iubân*, incense and benzoin, the resin of the storax tree, לבנה); the Greek λιβανός, λιβανωτός (Lat. *thus*, frankincense, from θύω), is a word derived from the Phoenicians.

אהלם or אהלים (which already in a remarkable way was used by Balaam, Num. 24: 6, elsewhere only since the time of Solomon) is the Semitized old Indian name of the aloe, *agaru* or *aguru*; that which is aromatic is the wood of the aloe-tree (*aloëxylon agallochum*), particularly its dried root (*agallochum* or *lignum aloës*, ξυλαλόη, according to which the Targ. here: אכסיל אלואין, after the phrase in Aruch) mouldered in the earth, which chiefly came from farther India.<sup>176</sup>

עם, as everywhere, connects things contained together or in any way united (Son. 5: 1; cf. 1:11, as Psa. 87: 4; cf. 1Sa. 16:12). The concluding phrase וגו

עם כּל־רֵי, *cum praestantissimis quibusque aromatibus*, is a poet. *et cetera*. ראשׁ, with the gen. of the object whose value is estimated, denotes what is of *meilleure qualité*; or, as the Talm. says, what is אַלפּא, ἄλφα, i.e., number one. Ezekiel, 27:22, in a similar sense, says, “with chief (ראשׁ) of all spices.”

**Son. 4:15.** The panegyric returns now once more to the figure of a fountain.

*15 A garden-fountain, a well of living water,  
And torrents from Lebanon.*

The *tertium compar.* in v. 12 was the collecting and sealing up; here, it is the inner life and its outward activity. A fountain in gardens (נַיִם, *catag.* pl.) is put to service for the benefit of the beds of plants round about, and it has in these gardens, as it were, its proper sphere of influence. A well of living water is one in which that which is distributed springs up from within, so that it is indeed given to it, but not without at the same time being its own true property. נוֹל is related, according to the Semitic *usus loq.*, to אָזַל, as “*niedergehen*” (to go down) to “*weggehen*” (to go away) (vid., Pro. 5:15); similarly related are (Arab.) *sar*, to go, and *sal* (in which the letter *ra* is exchanged for *lam*, to express the softness of the liquid), to flow, whence *syl* (*sêl*), impetuous stream, rushing water, kindred in meaning to נוֹלִים. Streams which come from Lebanon have a rapid descent, and (so far as they do not arise in the snow region) the water is not only fresh, but clear as crystal. All these figures understood sensuously would be insipid; but understood ethically, they are exceedingly appropriate, and are easily interpreted, so that the conjecture is natural, that on the supposition of the spiritual interpretation of the Song, Jesus has this saying in His mind when He says that streams of living water shall flow “out of the belly” of the believer, Joh. 7:38.

**Son. 4:16.** The king’s praise is for Shulamith proof of his love, which seeks a response. But as she is, she thinks herself yet unworthy of him; her modesty says to her that she needs preparation for him, preparation by that blowing which is the breath of God in the natural and in the spiritual world.

*16 Awake, thou North (wind), and come, thou South!  
Blow through my garden, cause its spices to flow —  
Let my beloved come into his garden,  
And eat the fruits which are precious to him.*

The names of the north and south, denoting not only the regions of the heavens, but also the winds blowing from these regions, are of the fem. gender, Isa. 43: 6. The east wind, קָדִים, is purposely not mentioned; the idea of that which is destructive and adverse is connected with it (vid., under Job. 27:21).

The north wind brings cold till ice is formed, Sir. 43:20; and if the south wind blow, it is hot, Luk. 12:55. If cold and heat, coolness and sultriness, interchange at the proper time, then growth is promoted. And if the wind blow through a garden at one time from this direction and at another from that, — not so violently as when it shakes the trees of the forest, but softly and yet as powerfully as a garden can bear it, — then all the fragrance of the garden rises in waves, and it becomes like a sea of incense. The garden itself then blows, i.e., emits odours; for (פַּחַח = the Arab. *fakh, fah*, cf. *fawh*, pl. *afwâh*, sweet odours, fragrant plants) as in רוּחַ הַיּוֹם, Gen. 3: 8, the idea underlies the expression, that when it is evening the day itself blows, i.e., becomes cool, the causative הִפְיַחְתִּי, connected with the object-accus. of the garden, means to make the garden breezy and fragrant. נוֹל is here used of the odours which, set free as it were from the plants, flow out, being carried forth by the waves of air. Shulamith wishes that in her all that is worthy of love should be fully realized. What had to be done for Esther (Est. 2:12) before she could be brought in to the king, Shulamith calls on the winds to accomplish for her, which are, as it were, the breath of the life of all nature, and as such, of the life-spirit, which is the sustaining background of all created things. If she is thus prepared for him who loves her, and whom she loves, he shall come into his garden and enjoy the precious fruit belonging to him. With words of such gentle tenderness, childlike purity, she gives herself to her beloved.

**Son. 5: 1.** She gives herself to him, and he has accepted her, and now celebrates the delight of possession and enjoyment.

*5: I I am come into my garden, my sister-bride;  
 Have plucked my myrrh with my balsam;  
 Have eaten my honeycomb with my honey;  
 Have drunk my wine with my milk —  
 Eat, drink, and be drunken, ye friends!*

If the exclamation of Solomon, 1a, is immediately connected with the words of Shulamith, 4:16, then we must suppose that, influenced by these words, in which the ardour of love and humility express themselves, he thus in triumph exclaims, after he has embraced her in his arms as his own inalienable possession. But the exclamation denotes more than this. It supposes a union of love, such as is the conclusion of marriage following the betrothal, the God-ordained aim of sexual love within the limits fixed by morality. The poetic expression בָּאתִי לְגַנִּי points to the בּוֹא אֶל, used of the entrance of a man into the woman's chamber, to which the expression (Arab.) *dakhal bihā* (he went in with her), used of the introduction into the bride's chamber, is compared. The road by which Solomon reached this full and entire possession was not short,



and especially for his longing it was a lengthened one. He now triumphs in the final enjoyment which his ardent desire had found. A pleasant enjoyment which is reached in the way and within the limits of the divine order, and which therefore leaves no bitter fruits of self-reproach, is pleasant even in the retrospect. His words, beginning with “I am come into my garden,” breathe this pleasure in the retrospect. Ginsburg and others render incorrectly, “I am coming,” which would require the words to have been אָנִי בָא (הִנֵּה). The series of perfects beginning with בָּאתִי cannot be meant otherwise than retrospectively. The “garden” is Shulamith herself, Son. 4:12, in the fulness of her personal and spiritual attractions, Son. 4:16; cf. בְּרַמִּי, Son. 1: 6. He may call her “my sister-bride;” the garden is then his by virtue of divine and human right, he has obtained possession of this garden, he has broken its costly rare flowers.

אָרָה (in the Mishna dialect the word used of plucking figs) signifies to pluck; the Aethiop. trans. *araku karbê*, I have plucked myrrh; for the Aethiop. has *arara* instead of simply אָרָה. בְּשָׁמִי is here בְּשָׁם deflected. While בְּשָׁם, with its plur. *b̄sāmim*, denotes fragrance in general, and only balsam specially, *bāsām* = (Arab.) *bashām* is the proper name of the balsam-tree (the Mecca balsam), *amyris opobalsamum*, which, according to Forskal, is indigenous in the central mountain region of Jemen (S. Arabia); it is also called (Arab.) *balsaman*; the word found its way in this enlarged form into the West, and then returned in the forms אַפְרֻסוֹמִי, אַפְרֻסוֹמִי, אַפְרֻסוֹמִי (Syr. *afrusomo*), into the East. Balsam and other spices were brought in abundance to King Solomon as a present by the Queen of Sheba, 1Ki. 10:10; the celebrated balsam plantations of Jericho (vid., Winer’s *Real-W.*), which continued to be productive till the Roman period, might owe their origin to the friendly relations which Solomon sustained to the south Arab. princess. Instead of the Indian aloe, 4:14, the Jamanic balsam is here connected with myrrh as a figure of Shulamith’s excellences. The plucking, eating, and drinking are only interchangeable figurative descriptions of the enjoyment of love.

“Honey and milk,” says Solomon, Son. 4:11, “is under thy tongue.” יָאֵר is like יָעָרָה, 1Sa. 14:27, the comb (*favus*) or cells containing the honey, — a designation which has perhaps been borrowed from porous lava. <sup>177</sup>

With honey and milk “under the tongue” wine is connected, to which, and that of the noblest kind, 7:10, Shulamith’s palate is compared. Wine and milk together are οἰνόγαλα, which Chloe presents to Daphnis (Longus, i. 23). Solomon and his Song here hover on the pinnacle of full enjoyment; but if one understands his figurative language as it interprets itself, it here also expresses that delight of satisfaction which the author of Ps. 19: 6a transfers to the



countenance of the rising sun, in words of a chaste purity which sexual love never abandons, in so far as it is connected with esteem for a beloved wife, and with the preservation of mutual personal dignity. For this very reason the words of Solomon, 1*a*, cannot be thought of as spoken to the guests. Between 4:16 and 5: 1*a* the bridal night intervenes. The words used in 1*a* are Solomon's morning salutation to her who has now wholly become his own. The call addressed to the guests at the feast is given forth on the second day of the marriage, which, according to ancient custom, Gen. 29:28, Jud. 14:12, was wont to be celebrated for seven days, Tob. 11:18. The dramatical character of the Song leads to this result, that the pauses are passed over, the scenes are quickly changed, and the times appear to be continuous.

The plur. דוֹדִים Hengst. thinks always designates "love" (*Liebe*); thus, after Pro. 7:28, also here: Eat, friends, drink and intoxicate yourselves in love. But the summons, *inebriamini amoribus*, has a meaning if regarded as directed by the guests to the married pair, but not as directed to the guests. And while we may say רוּחַ דְּדִים, yet not שִׁכַר דוֹ, for *shakar* has always only the accus. of a spirituous liquor after it. Therefore none of the old translators (except only the Venet.: μεθύσθητε ἕρωσιν) understood *dodim*, notwithstanding that elsewhere in the Song it means love, in another than a personal sense; רַעִים and דָּח are here the plur. of the elsewhere parallels רַע and דוֹד, e.g., 5:16*b*, according to which also (cf. on the contrary, 4:16*b*) they are accentuated. Those who are assembled are, as sympathizing friends, to participate in the pleasures of the feast. The Song of Songs has here reached its climax. A Paul would not hesitate, after Eph. 5:31*f.*, to extend the mystical interpretation even to this. Of the antitype of the marriage pair it is said: "For the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself ready" (Rev. 19: 7); and of the antitype of the marriage guests: "Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb" (Rev. 19: 9).

## Fourth Act

### LOVE DISDAINED BUT WON AGAIN — SON. 5: 2-6: 9

#### FIRST SCENE OF THE FOURTH ACT, SON. 5: 2-6: 3

In this fourth Act we are not now carried back to the time when Solomon's relation to Shulamith was first being formed. We are not placed here amid the scenes of their first love, but of those of their married life, and of their original ardour of affection maintaining itself not without trial. This is evident from the circumstance that in the first two Acts the beloved is addressed by the title רַעִיתִי (my friend, beloved), and that the third Act rises <sup>178</sup> to the title כְּלָה

(bride) and אַחְתִּי כְלָה (my sister-bride); in the fourth Act, on the other hand, along with the title *ra'yaihi*, we hear no longer *calla*, nor *ahhothi calla*, but simply *ahhothi*,<sup>179</sup> — a title of address which contributes to heighten the relation, to idealize it, and give it a mystical background. We have here presented to us pictures from the life of the lovers after their marriage has been solemnized. Shulamith, having reached the goal of her longing, has a dream like that which she had (Son. 3: 1-4) before she reached that goal. But the dreams, however they resemble each other, are yet also different, as their issues show; in the former, she seeks him, and having found him holds him fast; here, she seeks him and finds him not. That that which is related belongs to the dream-life in Son. 3, was seen from the fact that it was inconceivable as happening in real life; here that which is related is expressly declared in the introductory words as having occurred in a dream.

*2 I sleep, but my heart keeps waking —  
Hearken! my beloved is knocking:  
Open to me, my sister, my love,  
My dove, my perfect one;  
For my head is filled with dew,  
My locks (are) full of the drops of the night.*

**Son. 5: 2.** The partic. subst. clauses, *2a*, indicate the circumstances under which that which is related in *2b* occurred. In the principal sentence in hist. prose וַיִּדְפֹּק would be used; here, in the dramatic vivacity of the description, is found in its stead the interject. *vocem = auscultata* with the gen. foll., and a word designating<sup>180</sup> state or condition added, thought of as accus. according to the Semitic syntax (like Gen. 4:10; Jer. 10:22; cf. 1Ki. 14: 6). To sleep while the heart wakes signifies to dream, for sleep and distinct consciousness cannot be coexistent; the movements of thought either remain in obscurity or are projected as dreams. עַר = 'awir is formed from עוֹר, to be awake (in its root cogn. to the Aryan *gar*, of like import in γρηγορεῖν, ἐγείρειν), in the same way as מַת = *mawith* from מוֹת. The שׁ has here the conj. sense of "dieweil" (because), like *asher* in Ecc. 6:12; 8:15. The ׀ *dag.*, which occurs several times elsewhere (vid., under Pro. 3: 8; 14:10), is one of the inconsistencies of the system of punctuation, which in other instances does not double the ׀; perhaps a relic of the Babylonian idiom, which was herein more accordant with the lingual nature of the ׀ than the Tiberian, which treated it as a semi-guttural. קַנְזָה, a lock of hair, from קָנַז = קָנַז, *absc-dit*, follows in the formation of the idea, the analogy of קַצִּיר, in the sense of branch, from קָצַר, *desecuit*; one so names a part which is removed without injury to the whole, and which presents itself conveniently for removal; cf. the oath sworn by Egyptian women, *lahajât*

*muḵṣûsi*, “by the life of my separated,” i.e., “of my locks” (Lane, *Egypt*, etc., I 38). The word still survives in the Talmud dialect. Of a beautiful young man who proposed to become a Nazarite, *Nedarim* 9a says the same as the *Jer. Horajoth* iii. 4 of a man who was a prostitute in Rome: his locks were arranged in separate masses, like heap upon heap; in *Bereshith rabba* c. lxx., under Gen. 27:11, קְנִיז, curly-haired, is placed over against קָרְה, bald-headed, and the Syr. also has *ḵausoto* as the designation of locks of hair, — a word used by the Peshito as the rendering of the Heb. קְנִיצוֹת, as the Syro-Hexap. Job. 16:12, the Greek κόμη. מַל, from מָלַל (Arab. *tll*, to moisten, viz., the ground; to squirt, viz., blood), is in Arabic drizzling rain, in Heb. dew; the drops of the night (רְסִיסִים, from רָסַם, to sprinkle, to drizzle)<sup>81</sup> are just drops of dew, for the precipitation of the damp air assumes this form in nights which are not so cold as to become frosty. Shulamith thus dreams that her beloved seeks admission to her. He comes a long way and at night. In the most tender words he entreats for that which he expects without delay. He addresses her, “my sister,” as one of equal rank with himself, and familiar as a sister with a brother; “my love” (רַעִי), as one freely chosen by him to intimate fellowship; “my dove,” as beloved and prized by him on account of her purity, simplicity, and loveliness. The meaning of the fourth designation used by him, תַּמְתִּי, is shown by the Arab. *tam* to be “wholly devoted,” whence *teim*, “one devoted” = a servant, and *mutajjam*, desperately in love with one. In addressing her תַּמְתִּי, he thus designates this love as wholly undivided, devoting itself without evasion and without reserve. But on this occasion this love did not approve itself, at least not at once.

*3 I have put off my dress,  
How shall I put it on again?  
I have washed my feet,  
How shall I defile them again?*

**Son. 5: 3.** She now lies unclothed in bed. כְּתָנֶת is the χιτών worn next to the body, from כְּתָן, linen (diff. from the Arab. *ḵutun*, cotton, whence French *coton*, calico = cotton-stuff). She had already washed her feet, from which it is supposed that she had throughout the day walked barefooted, — how (אֵיכָכָה), how? both times with the tone on the *penult.*;<sup>82</sup> cf. אֵיכָה, where ? 1: 7) should she again put on her dress, which she had already put off and laid aside (פָּשַׁטְתִּי)? why should she soil (אִמְנַפֵּם, relating to the fem. רַגְלִי, for אִמְנַפֵּן) again her feet, that had been washed clean? Shulamith is here brought back to the customs as well as to the home of her earlier rural life; but although she should thus have been enabled to reach a deeper and more lively consciousness of the grace of the king, who stoops to an equality with her, yet she does not meet his

love with an equal requital. She is unwilling for his sake to put herself to trouble, or to do that which is disagreeable to her. It cannot be thought that such an interview actually took place; and yet what she here dreamed had not only inward reality, but also full reality. For in a dream, that which is natural to us or that which belongs to our very constitution becomes manifest, and much that is kept down during our waking hours by the power of the will, by a sense of propriety, and by the activities of life, comes to light during sleep; for fancy then stirs up the ground of our nature and brings it forth in dreams, and thus exposes us to ourselves in such a way as oftentimes, when we waken, to make us ashamed and alarmed. Thus it was with Shulamith. In the dream it was inwardly manifest that she had lost her first love. She relates it with sorrow; for scarcely had she rejected him with these unworthy deceitful pretences when she comes to herself again.

*4 My beloved stretched his hand through the opening,  
And my heart was moved for him.*

**Son. 5: 4.** חוֹר, <sup>fs3</sup> from the verb חוּר, in the sense of to break through (R. חר, whence also חָרוּ, Son. 1:10, and חָרַם, Arab. *kharam*, part. broken through, e.g., of a lattice-window), signifies *foramen*, a hole, also *caverna* (whence the name of the Troglodytes, חָרִי, and the *Haurân*, חוֹרָן), here the loophole in the door above (like *khawkht*, the little door for the admission of individuals in the street or house-door). It does not properly mean a window, but a part of the door pierced through at the upper part of the lock of the door (the door-bolt). מִן־הַחוּר is understood from the standpoint of one who is within; “by the opening from without to within,” thus “through the opening;” stretching his hand through the door-opening as if to open the door, if possible, by the pressing back of the lock from within, he shows how greatly he longed after Shulamith. And she was again very deeply moved when she perceived this longing, which she had so coldly responded to: the interior of her body, with the organs which, after the bibl. idea, are the seat of the tenderest emotions, or rather, in which they reflect themselves, both such as are agreeable and such as are sorrowful, groaned within her, — an expression of deep sympathy so common, that “the sounding of the bowels,” Isa. 63:15, an expression used, and that anthropopathically of God Himself, is a direct designation of sympathy or inner participation. The phrase here wavers between עָלָיו and עָלֵי (thus, e.g., Nissel, 1662). Both forms are admissible. It is true we say elsewhere only *naphshi ‘āli, ruhi ‘āli, libbi ‘āli*, for the *Ego* distinguishes itself from its substance (cf. *System d. bibl. Psychologie*, p. 151f.); *meïi ‘alāi*, instead of *bi* (בִּיקְרָבִי), would, however, be also explained from this, that the bowels are meant, not anatomically, but as *psychical* organs. But the old translators (LXX,

Targ., Syr., Jerome, Venet.) rendered עליו, which rests on later MS authority (vid., Norzi, and de Rossi), and is also more appropriate: her bowels are stirred, viz., over him, i.e., on account of him (Alkabez: בעבורו). As she will now open to him, she is inwardly more ashamed, as he has come so full of love and longing to make her glad.

*5 I arose to open to my beloved,  
And my hands dropped with myrrh,  
And my fingers with liquid myrrh,  
On the handle of the bolt.*

**Son. 5: 5.** The personal pron. אני stands without emphasis before the verb which already contains it; the common language of the people delights in such particularity. The Book of Hosea, the Ephraimite prophet's work, is marked by such a style. מור עבר, with which the parallel clause goes beyond the simple *mōr*, is myrrh flowing over, dropping out of itself, i.e., that which breaks through the bark of the *balsamodendron myrrha*, or which flows out if an incision is made in it; *myrrha stacte*, of which Pliny (xii. 35) says: *cui nulla praefertur*, otherwise מר דרור, from דרר, to gush out, to pour itself forth in rich jets. He has come perfumed as if for a festival, and the costly ointment which he brought with him has dropped on the handles of the bolts (מנעול, keeping locked, after the form מלבוש, drawing on), viz., the inner bolt, which he wished to withdraw. A classical parallel is found in Lucretius, iv. 1171:

*“At lacrimans exclusus amator limina saepe  
Floribus et sertis operit postesque superbos  
Unguit amaracino”...*

Böttch. here puts to Hitzig the question, “Did the shepherd, the peasant of Engedi, bring with him oil of myrrh?” Rejecting this reasonable explanation, he supposes that the Shulamitess, still in Solomon's care, on rising up quickly dipped her hand in the oil of myrrh, that she might refresh her beloved. She thus had it near her before her bed, as a sick person her decoction. The right answer was, that the visitant by night is not that imaginary personage, but it is Solomon. She had dreamed that he stood before her door and knocked. But finding no response, he again in a moment withdrew, when it was proved that Shulamith did not requite his love and come forth to meet it in its fulness as she ought.

*6 I opened to my beloved;  
And my beloved had withdrawn, was gone:  
My soul departed when he spake —  
I sought him, and found him not;  
I called him, and he answered me not.*

**Son. 5: 6.** As the disciples at Emmaus, when the Lord had vanished from the midst of them, said to one another: Did not our heart burn within us when He spake with us? so Shulamith says that when he spake, i.e., sought admission to her, she was filled with alarm, and almost terrified to death. Love-ecstasy (εκστήναι, as contrast to γενέσθαι ἐν ἑαυτῷ) is not here understood, for in such a state she would have flown to meet him; but a sinking of the soul, such as is described by Terence (*And.* I 5. 16):

*“Oratio haec me miseram exanimavit metu.”*

The voice of her beloved struck her heart; but in the consciousness that she had estranged herself from him, she could not openly meet him and offer empty excuses. But now she recognises it with sorrow that she had not replied to the deep impression of his loving words; and seeing him disappear without finding him, she calls after him whom she had slighted, but he answers her not. The words: “My soul departed when he spake,” are the reason why she now sought him and called upon him, and they are not a supplementary remark (Zöckl.); nor is there need for the correction of the text בְּדַבְּרוֹ, which should mean: (my soul departed) when he turned his back (Ewald), or, behind him (Hitz., Böttch.), from דָּבַר = (Arab.) *dabara*, *tergum vertere, praeterire*, — the Heb. has the word דְּבִיר, the hinder part, and as it appears, דָּבַר, to act from behind (treacherously) and destroy, 2Ch. 22:10; cf. under Gen. 34:13, but not the *Kal* דָּבַר, in that Arab. signification. The meaning of הִמָּק has been hit upon by Aquila (ἐκκλινεν), Symmachus (ἀπονεύσας), and Jerome (*declinaverat*); it signifies to turn aside, to take a different direction, as the *Hithpa.* Jer. 31:22: to turn oneself away; cf. הִמּוּקִים, turnings, bendings, 7: 2. אָבַק and אָבַק (cf. Gen. 32:25), Aethiop. *ḥaḳafa*, Amhar. *aḳafa* (reminding us of נָקַץ, *Hiph.* הִקָּץ), are usually compared; all of these, however, signify to “encompass;” but הִמָּק does not denote a moving in a circle after something, but a half circular motion away from something; so that in the Arab. the prevailing reference to fools, *aḥamḳ*, does not appear to proceed from the idea of closeness, but of the oblique direction, pushed sideways. Turning himself away, he proceeded farther. In vain she sought him; she called without receiving any answer. עֲנִי is the correct pausal form of עֲנִי, vid., under Psa. 118: 5. But something worse than even this seeking and calling in vain happened to her.

*7 The watchmen who go about in the city found me,  
They beat me, wounded me;  
My upper garment took away from me,  
The watchmen of the walls.*

**Son. 5: 7.** She sought her beloved, not “in the *midbar*” (open field), nor “in the *kepharim*” (villages), but **בְּעִיר**, “in the city,” — a circumstance which is fatal to the shepherd-hypothesis here, as in the other dream. There in the city she is found by the watchmen who patrol the city, and have their proper posts on the walls to watch those who approach the city and depart from it (cf. Isa. 62: 6). These rough, regardless men, — her story returns at the close like a palindrome to those previously named, — who judge only according to that which is external, and have neither an eye nor a heart for the sorrow of a loving soul, struck (**הִכָּה**, from **נָכַד**, to pierce, hit, strike) and wounded (**פָּצַע**, R. **פִּץ**, to divide, to inflict wounds in the flesh) the royal spouse as a common woman, and so treated her, that, in order to escape being made a prisoner, she was constrained to leave her upper robe in their hands (Gen. 39:12). This upper robe, not the veil which at Son. 4: 1, 3 we found was called *tsammā*, is called **רִדְדִי**. Aben Ezra compares with it the Arab. *ridâ*, a plaid-like over-garment, which was thrown over the shoulders and veiled the upper parts of the body. But the words have not the same derivation. The *ridâ* has its name from its reaching downward, — probably from the circumstance that, originally, it hung down to the feet, so that one could tread on it; but the (Heb.) *r<sup>e</sup> did* (in Syr. the *dalmatica* of the deacons), from **רִדְדִי**, *Hiph.*, 1Ki. 6:32, Targ., Talm., Syr., **רִדְדִי**, to make broad and thin, as *expansum*, i.e., a thin and light upper robe, viz., over the *cuttonëth*, 3a. The LXX suitably translates it here and at Gen. 24:65 (*hatstsäiph*, from *tsa'aph*, to lay together, to fold, to make double or many-fold) by **θέριστρον**, a summer overdress. A modern painter, who represents Shulamith as stripped naked by the watchmen, follows his own sensual taste, without being able to distinguish between *tunica* and *pallium*; for neither Luther, who renders by *schleier* (veil), nor Jerome, who has *pallium* (cf. the saying of Plautus: *tunica propior pallio est*), gives any countenance to such a freak of imagination. The city watchmen tore from off her the upper garment, without knowing and without caring to know what might be the motive and the aim of this her nocturnal walk.

**Son. 5: 8.** All this Shulamith dreamed; but the painful feeling of repentance, of separation and misapprehension, which the dream left behind, entered as deeply into her soul as if it had been an actual external experience. Therefore she besought the daughters of Jerusalem:

**8 I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem,  
If ye find my beloved, —  
What shall ye then say to him?  
“That I am sick of love.”**



That אֵין is here not to be interpreted as the negative particle of adjuration (Böttch.), as at Son. 2: 7; 3: 5, at once appears from the absurdity arising from such an interpretation. The *or. directa*, following “I adjure you,” can also begin (Num. 5:19f.) with the usual אֵין, which is followed by its conclusion. Instead of “that ye say to him I am sick of love,” she asks the question: What shall ye say to him: and adds the answer: *quod aegra sum amore*, or, as Jerome rightly renders, in conformity with the root-idea of חלה: *quia amore languedo*; while, on the other hand, the LXX: ὅτι τερωμένη (saucia) ἀγάπης ἐγὼ εἶμι, as if the word were חללת, from חלל. The question proposed, with its answer, inculcates in a naive manner that which is to be said, as one examines beforehand a child who has to order something. She turns to the daughters of Jerusalem, because she can presuppose in them, in contrast with those cruel watchmen, a sympathy with her love-sorrow, on the ground of their having had similar experiences. They were also witnesses of the origin of this covenant of love, and graced the marriage festival by their sympathetic love.

**Son. 5: 9.** When, therefore, they put to her the question:

*9 What is thy beloved before another (beloved),  
Thou fairest of women?  
What is thy beloved before another (beloved),  
That thou dost adjure us thus?*

the question thus asked cannot proceed from ignorance; it can only have the object of giving them the opportunity of hearing from Shulamith’s own mouth and heart her laudatory description of him, whom they also loved, although they were not deemed worthy to stand so near to him as she did who was thus questioned. Böttch. and Ewald, secs. 325a, 326a, interpret the מן in מדור partitively: *quid amati* (as in Cicero: *quod hominis*) *amatus tuus*; but then the words would have been מהמדוד דודך, if such a phrase were admissible; for מהדוד certainly of itself alone means *quid amati*, what kind of a beloved. Thus the מן is the comparative (*prae amato*), and דוד the sing., representing the idea of species or kind; מדודים, here easily misunderstood, is purposely avoided. The use of the form השבעתנו for השבעתינו is one of the many instances of the disregard of the generic distinction occurring in this Song, which purposely, after the manner of the vulgar language, ignores pedantic regularity.

**Son. 5:10.** Hereupon Shulamith describes to them who ask what her beloved is. He is the fairest of men. Everything that is glorious in the kingdom of nature, and, so far as her look extends, everything in the sphere of art, she appropriates,

so as to present a picture of his external appearance. Whatever is precious, lovely, and grand, is all combined in the living beauty of his person. <sup>184</sup>

She first praises the mingling of colours in the countenance of her beloved.

***10 My beloved is dazzling white and ruddy,  
Distinguished above ten thousand.***

The verbal root **נצ** has the primary idea of purity, i.e., freedom from disturbance and muddiness, which, in the stems springing from it, and in their manifold uses, is transferred to undisturbed health (Arab. *ṣahh*, cf. *baria*, of smoothness of the skin), a temperate stomach and clear head, but particularly to the clearness and sunny brightness of the heavens, to dazzling whiteness (**נצץ**, Lam. 4: 7; cf. **נצח**), and then to parched dryness, resulting from the intense and continued rays of the sun; **נצ** is here adj. from **נצץ**, Lam. 4: 7, bearing almost the same relation to **נצח** as **λαμπρός** to **λευκός**, cogn. with *lucere*. **נצח**, R. **נח**, to condense, is properly dark-red, called by the Turks *kujū kirmesi* (from *kujū*, thick, close, dark), by the French *rouge foncé*, of the same root as **נח**, the name for blood, or a thick and dark fluid. White, and indeed a dazzling white, is the colour of his flesh, and redness, deep redness, the colour of his blood tinging his flesh. Whiteness among all the race-colours is the one which best accords with the dignity of man; pure delicate whiteness is among the Caucasian races a mark of high rank, of superior training, of hereditary nobility; wherefore, Lam. 4: 7, the appearance of the nobles of Jerusalem is likened in whiteness to snow and milk, in redness to corals; and Homer, *Il.* iv. 141, says of Menelaus that he appeared stained with gore, “as when some woman tinges ivory with purple colour.” In this mingling of white and red, this fulness of life and beauty, he is **נצח**, distinguished above myriads. The old translators render *dagul* by “chosen” (Aquila, Symm., Syr., Jerome, Luther), the LXX by **ἐκλεκτοισι**, *e cohorte selectus*; but it means “bannered” (*degel*, 2: 4), as the Venet.: **σεσημαιωμένος**, i.e., thus distinguished, as that which is furnished with a *degel*, a banner, a pennon. Grätz takes *dagul* as the Greek **σημειωτός** (noted). With **נצח**, as a designation of an inconceivable number, Rashi rightly compares Eze. 16: 7. Since the “ten thousand” are here thought of, not in the same manner as **נצח**, the particle *min* is not the compar. *magis quam*, but, as at Gen. 3:14, Jud. 5:24, Isa. 52:14, *prae*, making conspicuous (cf. Virgil, *Aen.* v. 435, *prae omnibus unum*). After this praise of the bright blooming countenance, which in general distinguished the personal appearance of her beloved, so far as it was directly visible, there now follows a detailed description, beginning with his head.

*11 His head is precious fine gold,  
His locks hill upon hill,  
Black as the raven.*

**Son. 5:11.** The word-connection **כֶּתֶם פָּז**, occurring only here, serves as a designation of the very finest pure gold; for **כֶּתֶם** (hiding, then that which is hidden), from **כתם**, R. **כת** (vid., concerning the words appertaining to this root, under Psa. 87: 6), is the name of fine gold, which was guarded as a jewel (cf. Pro. 25:12), and **פָּז** (with long *ā*), is pure gold freed from inferior metals, from **פָּזַז**, to set free, and generally violently to free (cf. *zahav muphaz*, 1Ki. 10:18, with *zahav tahor*, 2Ch. 9:17). The Targ. to the Hagiog. translate **פָּז** by **אֹבְרִיזָא** (e.g., Psa. 119:127), or **אֹבְרִיזִין** (e.g., Psa. 19:11), **ὄβρυζον**, i.e., gold which has stood the fire-proof (*obrussa*) of the cupel or the crucible. Grammatically regarded, the word-connection *kethem paz* is not genit., like *kethem ophir*, but appositional, like *narrāh b<sup>e</sup>thulah*, Deu. 22:28, *z<sup>e</sup>vahim sh<sup>e</sup>lamim*, Exo. 24: 5, etc. The point of comparison is the imposing nobility of the fine form and noble carriage of his head. In the description of the locks of his hair the LXX render **תלתלים** by **ἐλάται**, Jerome by *sicut elatae palmarum*, like the young twigs, the young shoots of the palm. Ewald regards it as a harder parall. form of **זִלְזָלִים**, Isa. 18: 5, vine-branches; and Hitzig compares the *Thousand and One Nights*, iii. 180, where the loose hair of a maiden is likened to twisted clusters of grapes. The possibility of this meaning is indisputable, although (Arab.) *taltalat*, a drinking-vessel made of the inner bark of palm-branches, is named, not from *taltalah*, as the name of the palm-branch, but from *taltala*, to shake down, viz., in the throat. The palm-branch, or the vine-branch, would be named from **תָּלַתַל**, *pendulum esse*, to hang loosely and with a wavering motion, the freq. of **תָּלַה**, *pendere*. The Syr. also think on **תלה**, for it translates “spread out,” i.e., a waving downward; and the Venet., which translates by **ἄπαιωρήματα**. The point of comparison would be the freshness and flexibility of the abundant long hair of the head, in contrast to motionless close-lying smoothness. One may think of Jupiter, who, when he shakes his head, moves heaven and earth. But, as against this, we have the fact: (1) That the language has other names for palm-branches and vine-branches; the former are called in the Son. 7: 9, *sansinnim*. (2) That **תלתלים**, immediately referred to the hair, but not in the sense of “hanging locks” (Böttch.), is still in use in the post-bibl. Heb. (vid., under 5: 2b); the Targ. also, in translating **הַגּוֹרִין הַגּוֹרִין**, *cumuli cumuli*, thinks **תלתלים** = **תְּלִין תְּלִין**, *Menachoth 29b*. A hill is called **תל**, (Arab.) *tall*, from **תָּלַל**, *prosternere*, to throw along, as of earth thrown out, sand, or rubbish; and **תְּלַתַל**, after the form **גְּלַגַל**, in use probably only in the plur., is a hilly country which rises like steps, or presents an undulating

appearance. Seen from his neck upwards, his hair forms in undulating lines, hill upon hill. In colour, these locks of hair are black as a raven, which bears the Semitic name עֹרֵב from its blackness (עֹרֵב), but in India is called *kârava* from its croaking. The raven-blackness of the hair contrasts with the whiteness and redness of the countenance, which shines forth as from a dark ground, from a black border. The eyes are next described.

*12 His eyes like doves by the water-brooks,  
Bathing in milk, stones beautifully set*

**Son. 5:12.** The eyes in their glancing moistness (cf. ὑγρότης τῶν ὀμμάτων, in Plutarch, of a languishing look), and in the movement of their pupils, are like doves which sip at the water-brooks, and move to and fro beside them. אָפִיק, from אָפַק, *continere*, is a watercourse, and then also the water itself flowing in it (vid., under Psa. 18:16), as (Arab.) *wadin*, a valley, and then the river flowing in the valley, *bahr*, the sea-basin (properly the cleft), and then also the sea itself. The pred. “bathing” refers to the eyes (cf. 4: 9), not to the doves, if this figure is continued. The pupils of the eyes, thus compared with doves, seem as if bathing in milk, in that they swim, as it were, in the white in the eye. But it is a question whether the figure of the doves is continued also in יִשְׁבוֹת אֶל-מְלֵאֵת. It would be the case of *milleth* meant “fulness of water,” as it is understood, after the example of the LXX, also by Aquila (εὐχύσεως). Jerome (*fluenta plenissima*), and the Arab. (*piscinas aqua refertas*); among the moderns, by Döpke, Gesen., Hengst., and others. But this pred. would then bring nothing new to 12a; and although in the Syr. derivatives from *m<sup>o</sup>lā* signify flood and high waters, yet the form *milleth* does not seem, especially without מַיִם, to be capable of bearing this signification. Luther’s translation also, although in substance correct: *und stehen in der fülle* (and stand in fulness) (*milleth*, like שְׁלֵמוֹתָא of the Syr., πληρώσεως of the Gr. Venet., still defended by Hitz.), yet does not bring out the full force of *milleth*, which, after the analogy of כִּסְאֵי רִצְפָה, appears to have a concrete signification which is seen from a comparison of Exo. 25: 7; 27:17, 20; 39:13. There מְלֵאֵת and מְלֵאִים signify not the border with precious stones, but, as rightly maintained by Keil, against Knobel, their filling in, i.e., their bordering, setting. Accordingly, *milleth* will be a synon. technical expression: the description, passing from the figure of the dove, says further of the eyes, that they are firm on (in) their setting; אֶל is suitable, for the precious stone is laid within the casket in which it is contained. Hitzig has, on the contrary, objected that מְלֵאֵת and מְלֵאִים denote filling up, and thus that *milleth* cannot be a filling up, and still less the place thereof. But as in the Talm. מוֹלֵיָתָא signifies not only fulness, but also stuffed fowls or pies, and as πληρωμα in its manifold aspects is used not only of that with which

anything is filled, but also of that which is filled (e.g., of a ship that is manned, and Eph. 1:23 of the church in which Christ, as in His body, is immanent), — thus also *milleth*, like the German “*Fassung*,” may be used of a ring-casket (*funda* or *pala*) in which the precious stone is put. That the eyes are like a precious stone in its casket, does not merely signify that they fill the sockets, — for the *bulbus* of the eye in every one fills the *orbita*, — but that they are not sunk like the eyes of one who is sick, which fall back on their supporting edges in the *orbita*, and that they appear full and large as they press forward from wide and open eyelids. The cheeks are next described.

**13a His cheeks like a bed of sweet herbs,  
Towers of spicy plants.**

**Son. 5:13.** A flower-bed is called עֲרוּגָה, from עָרַג, to be oblique, inclined. His cheeks are like such a soft raised bed, and the impression their appearance makes is like the fragrance which flows from such a bed planted with sweet-scented flowers. *Mig'daloth* are the tower-like or pyramidal mounds, and *merkahhim* are the plants used in spicery. The point of comparison here is thus the soft elevation; perhaps with reference to the mingling of colours, but the word chosen (*merkahhim*) rather refers to the lovely, attractive, heart-refreshing character of the impression. The Venet., keeping close to the existing text: αἱ σαγόνες αὐτοῦ ὡς πρασιὰ τοῦ ἀρώματος, πύργοι ἀρωματισμῶν (thus [not ἀρωματιστῶν] according to Gebhardt's just conjecture). But is the punctuation here correct? The sing. כְּעֲרוּגָתִי is explained from this, that the bed is presented as sloping from its height downward on two parallel sides; but the height would then be the nose dividing the face, and the plur. would thus be more suitable; and the LXX, Symm., and other ancient translators have, in fact, read כְּעֲרוּגָתִי. But still less is the phrase *mig'd'loth merkahhim* to be comprehended; for a tower, however diminutive it may be, it not a proper figure for a soft elevation, nor even a graduated flowery walk, or a terraced flowery hill, — a tower always presents, however round one may conceive it, too much the idea of a natural chubbiness, or of a diseased tumour. Therefore the expression used by the LXX, φύττονται μύρεσιν, i.e., מְגִדְלוֹת מֵרֶקֶת, commends itself. Thus also Jerome: *sicut areolae aromatum consitae a pigmentariis*, and the Targ. (which refers לְחֵיִם allegorically to the לוֹחֵי of the law, and *merkahhim* to the refinements of the Halacha): “like the rows of a garden of aromatic plants which produce (*gignent*) deep, penetrating sciences, even as a (magnificent) garden, aromatic plants.” Since we read כְּעֲרוּגָתִי מְגִדְלוֹת, we do not refer *migadloth*, as Hitzig, who retains כְּעֲרוּגָתִי, to the cheeks, although their name, like that of the other members (e.g., the ear, hand, foot), may be fem. (Böttch. § 649), but to the beds of spices; but in this carrying forward of the figure we find, as he does, a reference to the beard and

down on the cheeks. גַּדְל is used of suffering the hair to grow, Num. 6: 5, as well as of cultivating plants; and it is a similar figure when Pindar, *Nem.* v. 11, compares the milk-hair of a young man to the fine woolly down of the expanding vine-leaves (vid., Passow). In *merkahhim* there scarcely lies anything further than that this *flos juventae* on the blooming cheeks gives the impression of the young shoots of aromatic plants; at all events, the *merkahhim*, even although we refer this feature in the figure to the fragrance of the unguents on the beard, are not the perfumes themselves, to which *m<sup>e</sup> gadloth* is not appropriate, but fragrant plants, so that in the first instance the growth of the beard is in view with the impression of its natural beauty.

***13b His lips lilies,  
Dropping with liquid myrrh.***

Lilies, viz., red lilies (vid., under 2: 1), unless the point of comparison is merely loveliness associated with dignity. She thinks of the lips as speaking. All that comes forth from them, the breath in itself, and the breath formed into words, is מוֹר עֵבֶר, most precious myrrh, viz., such as of itself wells forth from the bark of the *balsamodendron*. עֵבֶר, the running over of the eyes (cf. *myrrha in lacrimis*, the most highly esteemed sort, as distinguished from *myrrha in granis*), with which Dillmann combines the Aethiop. name for myrrh, *karbê* (vid., under 5: 5).

***14a His hands golden cylinders,  
Filled in with stones of Tarshish.***

**Son. 5:14.** The figure, according to Gesen., *Heb. Wörterbuch*, and literally also Heilgst., is derived from the closed hand, and the stained nails are compared to precious stones. both statements are incorrect; for (1) although it is true that then Israelitish women, as at the present day Egyptian and Arabian women, stained their eyes with *stibium* (vid., under Isa. 54:11), yet it is nowhere shown that they, and particularly men, stained the nails of their feet and their toes with the orange-yellow of the Alhenna (Lane's *Egypt*, I 33-35); and (2) the word used is not כַּפָּיו, but יָדָיו; it is thus the outstretched hands that are meant; and only these, not the closed fist, could be compared to "lilies," for גָּלִיל signifies not a ring (Cocc., Döpke, Böttch., etc.), but that which is rolled up, a roller, cylinder (Est. 1: 6), from גָּלָל, which properly means not κυκλοῦν (Venet., after Gebhardt: *κεκυκλωμέναι*), but *κυλίνδειν*. The hands thus are meant in respect of the fingers, which on account of their noble and fine form, their full, round, fleshy mould, are compared to bars of gold formed like rollers, garnished (מַמְלְאִים, like מֵאָה, Exo. 28:17) with stones of Tarshish, to which the nails are likened. The transparent horn-plates of the nails,



with the *lunula*, the white segment of a circle at their roots, are certainly, when they are beautiful, an ornament to the hand, and, without our needing to think of their being stained, are worthily compared to the gold-yellow topaz. *Tarshish* is not the onyx, which derives its Heb. name **אֶשֶׁת** from its likeness to the finger-nail, but the *χρυσόλιθος*, by which the word in this passage before us is translated by the Quinta and the Sexta, and elsewhere also by the LXX and Aquila. But the chrysolite is the precious stone which is now called the topaz. It receives the name *Tarshish* from Spain, the place where it was found. Pliny, xxxviii. 42, describes it as *aureo fulgore tralucens*. Bredow erroneously interprets *Tarshish* of amber. There is a kind of chrysolite, indeed, which is called *chryselectron*, because *in colorem electri declinans*. The comparison of the nails to such a precious stone (Luther, influenced by the consonance, and apparently warranted by the *plena hyacinthis* of the Vulg., has substituted golden rings, *vol Türkissen*, whose blue-green colour is not suitable here), in spite of Hengst., who finds it insipid, is as true to nature as it is tender and pleasing. The description now proceeds from the uncovered to the covered parts of his body, the whiteness of which is compared to ivory and marble.

***14b His body an ivory work of art,  
Covered with sapphires.***

The plur. **מַעֲיִם** or **מַאֲיִם**, from **מַעֵה** or **מַעֵי** (vid., under Psa. 40: 9), signifies properly the tender parts, and that the inward parts of the body, but is here, like the Chald. **מַעֵין**, Dan. 2:32, and the **בְּטֵן**, 7: 3, which also properly signifies the inner part of the body, *κοιλία*, transferred to the body in its outward appearance. To the question how Shulamith should in such a manner praise that which is for the most part covered with clothing, it is not only to be answered that it is the poet who speaks by her mouth, but also that it is not the bride or the beloved, but the wife, whom he represents as thus speaking. **עֲשֵׂת** (from the peculiar Hebraeo-Chald. and Targ. **עֲשֵׂת**, which, after Jer. 5:28, like *khalak*, *create*, appears to proceed from the fundamental idea of smoothing) designates an artistic figure. Such a figure was Solomon's throne, made of **שֵׁן**, the teeth of elephants, ivory, <sup>185</sup>

1Ki. 10:18. Here Solomon's own person, without reference to a definite admired work of art, is praised as being like an artistic figure made of ivory, — like it in regard to its glancing smoothness and its fine symmetrical form. When, now, this word of art is described as covered with sapphires (**מַעֲלֹפֶת**, referred to **עֲשֵׂת**, as apparently gramm., or as ideal, fem.), a sapphire-coloured robe is not meant (Hitzig, Ginsburg); for **עֲלֵף**, which only means to disguise, would not at all be used of such a robe (Gen. 38:14; cf. 24:65), nor would the one uniform colour of the robe be designated by sapphires in the plur. The choice of



the verb **עלף** (elsewhere used of veiling) indicates a covering shading the pure white, and in connection with **ספיר**, thought of as accus., a moderating of the bright glance by a soft blue. For **ספיר** (a genuine Semit. word, like the Chald. **שפיר**; cf. regarding **ספר** = **שפר**, under Psa. 16: 6) is the sky-blue sapphire (Exo. 24:10), including the *Lasurstein* (*lapis lazuli*), sprinkled with golden, or rather with gold-like glistening points of pyrites, from which, with the *l* omitted, sky-blue is called *azur* (azure) (vid., under Job. 28: 6). The word of art formed of ivory is quite covered over with sapphires fixed in it. That which is here compared is nothing else than the branching blue veins under the white skin.

*15a His legs white marble columns,  
Set on bases of fine gold.*

**Son. 5:15.** If the beauty of the living must be represented, not by colours, but in figurative language, this cannot otherwise be done than by the selection of minerals, plants, and things in general for the comparison, and the comparison must more or less come short, because dead soulless matter does not reach to a just and full representation of the living. Thus here, also, the description of the lower extremity, which reaches from the thighs and the legs down to the feet, of which last, in the words of an anatomist,<sup>186</sup> it may be said that “they form the pedestal for the bony pillars of the legs.” The comparison is thus in accordance with fact; the **שוקים** (from **שוק** = [Arab.] *sak*, to drive: the movers forward), in the structure of the human frame, take in reality the place of “pillars,” and the feet the place of “pedestals,” as in the tabernacle the wooden pillars rested on small supports in which they were fastened, Exo. 26:18f. But in point of fidelity to nature, the symbol is inferior to a rigid Egyptian figure. Not only is it without life; it is not even capable of expressing the curvilinear shape which belongs to the living. On the other hand, it loses itself in symbol; for although it is in conformity with nature that the legs are compared to pillars of white (according to Aquila and Theod., Parian) marble, — **שיש** = **ישש**, 1Ch. 29: 2 (material for the building of the temple), Talm. **מרמרא**, of the same verbal root as **שושן**, the name of the white lily, — the comparison of the feet to bases of fine gold is yet purely symbolical. Gold is a figure of that which is sublime and noble, and with white marble represents greatness combined with purity. He who is here praised is not a shepherd, but a king. The comparisons are thus so grand because the beauty of the beloved is in itself heightened by his kingly dignity.<sup>187</sup>

*15b His aspect like Lebanon,  
Distinguished as the cedars.*

By **בְּחֹר** the Chald. thinks of “a young man” (from **בְּחָר** = **בָּגַר**, to be matured, as at Psa. 89:20); but in that case we should have expected the word **בְּאָרָר** instead of **בְּאֲרָרִים**. Luther, with all other translators, rightly renders “chosen as the cedars.” His look, i.e., his appearance as a whole, is awe-inspiring, majestic, like Lebanon, the king of mountains; he (the praised one) is chosen, i.e., presents a rare aspect, rising high above the common man, like the cedars, those kings among trees, which as special witnesses of creative omnipotence are called “cedars of God,” Psa. 80:11 [10]. **בְּחֹר**, *electus*, everywhere else an attribute of persons, does not here refer to the look, but to him whose the look is; and what it means in union with the cedars is seen from Jer. 22: 7; cf. Isa. 37:24. Here also it is seen (what besides is manifest), that the fairest of the children of men is a king. In conclusion, the description returns from elevation of rank to loveliness.

*16a His palate is sweets [sweetnesses],  
And he is altogether precious [lovelinesses].*

**Son. 5:16.** The palate, **חֵךְ**, is frequently named as the organ of speech, Job. 6:30; 31:30, Pro. 5: 3; 8: 7; and it is also here used in this sense. The meaning, “the mouth for kissing,” which Böttch. gives to the word, is fanciful; **חֵךְ** (= *hnk*, Arab. *hanak*) is the inner palate and the region of the throat, with the *uvula* underneath the chin. Partly with reference to his words, his lips have been already praised, 13*b*; but there the fragrance of his breath came into consideration, his breath both in itself and as serving for the formation of articulate words. But the naming of the palate can point to nothing else than his words. With this the description comes to a conclusion; for, from the speech, the most distinct and immediate expression of the personality, advance is made finally to the praise of the person. The *pluraliatant*. **מִמְתַּקִּים** and **מִחֲמַדִּים** designate what they mention in richest fulness. His palate, i.e., that which he speaks and the manner in which he speaks it, is true sweetness (cf. Pro. 16:21; Psa. 55:15), and his whole being true loveliness. With justifiable pride Shulamith next says:

*16b This is my beloved and this my friend,  
Ye daughters of Jerusalem!*

The emphatically repeated “this” is here pred. (Luth. “such an one is”...); on the other hand, it is subj. at Exo. 3:15 (Luth.: “that is”...).

**Son. 6: 1.** The daughters of Jerusalem now offer to seek along with Shulamith for her beloved, who had turned away and was gone.

*6: 1 Whither has thy beloved gone,  
Thou fairest of women?  
Whither has thy beloved turned,  
That we may seek him with thee?*

The longing remains with her even after she has wakened, as the after effect of her dream. In the morning she goes forth and meets with the daughters of Jerusalem. They cause Shulamith to describe her friend, and they ask whither he has gone. They wish to know the direction in which he disappeared from her, the way which he had probably taken (פנה, R. פן, to drive, to urge forward, to turn from one to another), that with her they might go to seek him (Vav of the consequence or the object, as at Psa. 83:17). The answer she gives proceeds on a conclusion which she draws from the inclination of her beloved.

*2 My beloved has gone down into the garden,  
To the beds of sweet herbs,  
To feed in the gardens  
And gather lilies.*

**Son. 6: 2.** He is certainly, she means to say, there to be found where he delights most to tarry. He will have gone down — viz. from the palace (Son. 6:11; cf. 1Ki. 20:43 and Est. 7: 7) — into his garden, to the fragrant beds, there to feed in his garden and gather lilies (cf. Old Germ. “to collect *rôsen*”); he is fond of gardens and flowers. Shulamith expresses this in her shepherd-dialect, as when Jesus says of His Father (Joh. 15: 1), “He is the husbandman.” Flowerbeds are the feeding place (vid., regarding לרעות under 2:16) of her beloved. Solomon certainly took great delight in gardens and parks, Ecc. 2: 5. But this historical fact is here idealized; the natural flora which Solomon delighted in with intelligent interest presents itself as a figure of a higher Loveliness which was therein as it were typically manifest (cf. Rev. 7:17, where the “Lamb,” “feeding,” and “fountains of water,” are applied as anagogics, i.e., heavenward-pointing types). Otherwise it is not to be comprehended why it is lilies that are named. Even if it were supposed to be implied that lilies were Solomon’s favourite flowers, we must assume that his taste was determined by something more than by form and colour. The words of Shulamith give us to understand that the inclination and the favourite resort of her friend corresponded to his nature, which is altogether thoughtfulness and depth of feeling (cf. under Psa. 92: 5, the reference to Dante: the beautiful women who gather flowers representing the paradisaical life); lilies, the emblems of unapproachable grandeur, purity inspiring reverence, high elevation above that which is common, bloom there wherever the lily-like one wanders, whom the lily of the valley calls her own. With the words:

*3 I am my beloved's, and my beloved is mine,  
Who feeds among the lilies,*

**Son. 6: 3.** Shulamith farther proceeds, followed by the daughters of Jerusalem, to seek her friend lost through her own fault. She always says, not אִישׁ, but דֹּדִי and רֵעִי; for love, although a passion common to mind and body, is in this Song of Songs viewed as much as possible apart from its basis in the animal nature. Also, that the description hovers between that of the clothed and the unclothed, gives to it an ideality favourable to the mystical interpretation. Nakedness is עֲרֹנָה. But at the cross nakedness appears transported from the sphere of sense to that of the supersensuous.

## SECOND SCENE OF THE FOURTH ACT, SON. 6: 4-9

**Son. 6: 4.** With v. 4 Solomon's address is resumed, and a new scene opens. Shulamith had found him again, and she who is beautiful in herself appears now so much the more beautiful, when the joy of seeing him again irradiates her whole being.

*4 Beautiful art thou, my friend, as Tirzah,  
Comely as Jerusalem,  
Terrible as a battle-array.*

In the praise of her beauty we hear the voice of the king. The cities which are the highest ornament of his kingdom serve him as the measure of her beauty, which is designated according to the root conceptions by תִּרְצָה, after the equality of completeness; by יְסֻסִים, after the quality of that which is well-becoming, pleasing. It is concluded, from the prominence given to Tirzah, that the Song was not composed till after the division of the kingdom, and that its author was an inhabitant of the northern kingdom; for Tirzah was the first royal city of this kingdom till the time of Omri, the founder of Samaria. But since, at all events, it is Solomon who here speaks, so great an historical judgment ought surely to be ascribed to a later poet who has imagined himself in the exact position of Solomon, that he would not represent the king of the undivided Israel as speaking like a king of the separate kingdom of Israel. The prominence given to Tirzah has another reason. Tirzah was discovered by Robinson on his second journey, 1852, in which Van de Velde accompanied him, on a height in the mountain range to the north of *Nablûs*, under the name *Tullûzah*. Brocardus and Breydenback had already pointed out a village called *Thersa* to the east of Samaria. This form of the name corresponds to the Heb. better than that Arab. *Tullûzah*; but the place is suitable, and if *Tullûzah* lies high and beautiful in a region of olive trees, then it still justifies its ancient name, which means pleasantness or sweetness. But it cannot be sweetness on account of which

Tirzah is named before Jerusalem, for in the eye of the Israelites Jerusalem was “the perfection of beauty” (Psa. 50: 2; Lam. 2:15). That there is gradation from Tirzah to Jerusalem (Hengst.) cannot be said; for נְאֻזָה (*decora*) and יְפֵה (*pulchra*) would be reversed if a climax were intended. The reason of it is rather this, that Shulamith is from the higher region, and is not a daughter of Jerusalem, and that therefore a beautiful city situated in the north toward Sunem must serve as a comparison of her beauty. That Shulamith is both beautiful and terrible (נְאֻזָה from אִים) is not contradiction: she is terrible in the irresistible power of the impression of her personality, terrible as *n-dgaloth*, i.e., as troops going forth with their banners unfurled (cf. the *Kal* of this *v. denom.*, Psa. 20: 6). We do not need to supply מְהִנֹת, which is sometimes fem., Psa. 25: 3, Gen. 32: 9, although the attribute would here be appropriate, Num. 2: 3, cf. 10: 5; still less צְבָאוֹת, which occurs in the sense of military service, Isa. 40: 2, and a war-expedition, Dan. 8:12, but not in the sense of war-host, as fem. Much rather *nidgaloth*, thus neut., is meant of bannered hosts, as אֲרָחוֹת (not אֲרָךְ), Isa. 21:13, of those that are marching. War-hosts with their banners, their standards, go forth confident of victory. Such is Shulamith’s whole appearance, although she is unconscious of it — a *veni, vidi, vici*. Solomon is completely vanquished by her. But seeking to maintain himself in freedom over against her, he cries out to her:

*5a Turn away thine eyes from me,  
For overpoweringly they assail me.*

**Son. 6: 5a.** Döpke translates, *ferocire me faciunt*; Hengst.: they make me proud; but although הִרְהִיב, after Psa. 138: 3, may be thus used, yet that would be an effect produced by the eyes, which certainly would suggest the very opposite of the request to turn them away. The verb רָהִיב means to be impetuous, and to press impetuously against any one; the *Hiph.* is the intens. of this trans. signification of the *Kal*: to press overpoweringly against one, to infuse terror, *terrorem incutere*. The LXX translates it by ἀναπτεροῦν, which is also used of the effect of terror (“to make to start up”), and the Syr. by *afred*, to put to flight, because *arheb* signifies to put in fear, as also *arhab* = *khawwaf*, *terrefacere*; but here the meaning of the verb corresponds more with the sense of Arab. *r’b*, to be placed in the state of *ro’b*, i.e., of paralyzing terror. If she directed her large, clear, penetrating eyes to him, he must sink his own: their glance is unbearable by him. This peculiar form the praise of her eyes here assume; but then the description proceeds as at 4: 1b, 2: 3b. The words used there in praise of her hair, her teeth, and her cheeks, are here repeated.

*5b Thy hair is like a flock of goats  
Which repose downwards on Giliad.*

*6 Thy teeth like a flock of lambs  
Which come up from the washing,  
All of them bearing twins,  
And a bereaved one is not among them.*

*7 Like a piece of pomegranate thy temples  
Behind thy veil.*

**Son. 6: 5-7.** The repetition is literal, but yet not without change in the expression, — there, מִדָּהַר גֵּל, here, מִן־הַגֵּל; there, הַקֶּצַע, *tonsarum*, here, אֶגְרֵת, *agnarum* (Symm., Venet. τῶν ἀμνάδων); for רֵחַל, in its proper signification, is like the Arab. *rachil*, *richl*, *richleh*, the female lamb, and particularly the ewe. Hitzig imagines that Solomon here repeats to Shulamith what he had said to another *donna* chosen for marriage, and that the flattery becomes insipid by repetition to Shulamith, as well as also to the reader. But the romance which he finds in the Song is not this itself, but his own palimpsest, in the style of Lucian's transformed ass. The repetition has a morally better reason, and not one so subtle. Shulamith appears to Solomon yet more beautiful than on the day when she was brought to him as his bride. His love is still the same, unchanged; and this both she and the reader or hearer must conclude from these words of praise, repeated now as they were then. There is no one among the ladies of the court whom he prefers to her, — these must themselves acknowledge her superiority.

*8 There are sixty queens,  
And eighty concubines,  
And virgins without number.*

*9 One is my dove, my perfect one, —  
The only one of her mother,  
The choice one of her that bare her.  
The daughters saw her and called her blessed, —  
Queens and concubines, and they extolled her.*

**Son. 6: 8, 9.** Even here, where, if anywhere, notice of the difference of gender was to be expected, הַמָּה stands instead of the more accurate הַנְּהָ (e.g., Gen. 6: 2). The number of the women of Solomon's court, 1Ki. 11: 3, is far greater (700 wives and 300 concubines); and those who deny the Solomonic authorship of the Song regard the poet, in this particular, as more historical than the historian. On our part, holding as we do the Solomonic authorship of the book, we conclude from these low numbers that the Song celebrates a love-relation of Solomon's at the commencement of his reign: his luxury had not then reached the enormous height to which he, the same Solomon, looks back, and which he designates, Ecc. 2: 8, as *vanitas vanitatum*. At any rate, the

number of 60 **מְלָכוֹת**, i.e., legitimate wives of equal rank with himself, is yet high enough; for, according to 2Ch. 11:21, Rehoboam had 18 wives and 60 concubines. The 60 occurred before, at 3: 7. If it be a round number, as sometimes, although rarely, *sexaginta* is thus used (Hitzig), it may be reduced only to 51, but not further, especially here, where 80 stands along with it. **פִּלְגָּשׁ** (**פִּלְגָּשׁ**), Gr. **πάλλαξ, παλλακή** (Lat. *pellex*), which in the form **פִּלְקָתָא** (**פִּלְקָתָא**) came back from the Greek to the Aramaic, is a word as yet unexplained. According to the formation, it may be compared to **חֲרַמֵּשׁ**, from **חָרַם**, to cut off; whence also the harem bears the (Arab.) name *haram*, or the separated *synaeconitis*, to which access is denied. And ending in *is* (**שׁ**) is known to the Assyr., but only as an adverbial ending, which, as *'istinis* = **לְבָדוּ**, alone, *solus*, shows is connected with the pron. *su*. These two nouns appear as thus requiring to be referred to *quadrilitera*, with the annexed **שׁ**; perhaps **פִּלְגָּשׁ**, in the sense of to break into splinters, from **פִּלַּג**, to divide (whence a brook, as dividing itself in its channels, has the name of **פִּלְגָּ**), points to the polygamous relation as a breaking up of the marriage of one; so that a concubine has the name *pillēgēsh*, as a representant of polygamy in contrast to monogamy.

In the first line of v. 9 **אֶחָת** is subj. (one, who is my dove, my perfect one); in the second line, on the contrary, it is pred. (one, *unica*, is she of her mother). That Shulamith was her mother's only child does not, however, follow from this; **אֶחָת**, *unica*, is equivalent to *unice dilecta*, as **יְחִידָה**, Pro. 4: 3, is equivalent to *unice dilectus* (cf. Keil's *Zec.* 14: 7). The parall. **בְּרָה** has its nearest signification *electa* (LXX, Syr., Jerome), not *pura* (Venet.); the fundamental idea of cutting and separating divides itself into the ideas of choosing and purifying. The Aorists, 9*b*, are the only ones in this book; they denote that Shulamith's look had, on the part of the women, this immediate result, that they willingly assigned to her the good fortune of being preferred to them all, — that to her the prize was due. The words, as also at Pro. 31:28, are an echo of Gen. 30:13, — the books of the *Chokma* delight in references to Genesis, the book of pre-Israelitish origin. Here, in vv. 8, 9, the distinction between our typical and the allegorical interpretation is correctly seen. The latter is bound to explain what the 60 and the 80 mean, and how the wives, concubines, and "virgins" of the harem are to be distinguished from each other; but what till now has been attempted in this matter has, by reason of its very absurdity or folly, become an easy subject of wanton mockery. But the typical interpretation regards the 60 and the 80, and the unreckoned number, as what their names denote, — viz. favourites, concubines, and serving-maids. But to see an allegory of heavenly things in such a herd of women — a kind of thing which



the Book of Genesis dates from the degradation of marriage in the line of Cain — is a profanation of that which is holy. The fact is, that by a violation of the law of God (Deu. 17:17), Solomon brings a cloud over the typical representation, which is not at all to be thought of in connection with the Antitype. Solomon, as Jul Sturm rightly remarks, is not to be considered by himself, but only in his relation to Shulamith. In Christ, on the contrary, is no imperfection; sin remains in the congregation. In the Song, the bride is purer than the bridegroom; but in the fulfilling of the Song this relation is reversed: the bridegroom is purer than the bride.

## Fifth Act

### SHULAMITH, THE ATTRACTIVELY FAIR BUT HUMBLE PRINCESS — SON. 6:10-8: 4

#### FIRST SCENE OF THE FIFTH ACT, SON. 6:10-7: 6

The fourth Act, notwithstanding the little disturbances, gives a clear view of the unchanging love of the newly-married pair. This fifth shows how Shulamith, although raised to a royal throne, yet remains, in her childlike disposition and fondness for nature, a lily of the valley. The first scene places us in the midst of the royal gardens. Shulamith comes to view from its recesses, and goes to the daughters of Jerusalem, who, overpowered by the beauty of her heavenly appearance, cry out:

*10 Who is this that looketh forth like the morning-red,  
Beautiful as the moon, pure as the sun,  
Terrible as a battle-host?*

**Son. 6:10.** The question, “Who is this?” is the same as at Son. 3: 6. There, it refers to her who was brought to the king; here, it refers to her who moves in that which is his as her own. There, the “this” is followed by עֲלָה appositionally; here, by הַנִּשְׁקֶה [looking forth] determ., and thus more closely connected with it; but then indetermin., and thus apposit. predicates follow. The verb שָׁקַף signifies to bend forward, to overhang; whence the *Hiph.* הִשְׁקִיף and *Niph.* נִשְׁקַף, to look out, since in doing so one bends forward (vid., under Psa. 14: 2). The LXX here translates it by ἐκκύπτουσα, the Venet. by παρακύπτουσα, both of which signify to look toward something with the head inclined forward. The point of comparison is, the rising up from the background: Shulamith breaks through the shades of the garden-grove like the morning-red, the morning dawn; or, also: she comes nearer and nearer, as the morning-red rises behind the mountains, and then fills always the more widely

the whole horizon. The Venet. translates ὄς ἑωσφόρος; but the morning star is not שֶׁחַר, but בֶּן־שֶׁחַר, Isa. 14:12; *shahhar*, properly, the morning-dawn, means, in Heb., not only this, like the Arab. *shahar*, but rather, like the Arab. *fajr*, the morning-red, — i.e., the red tinge of the morning mist. From the morning-red the description proceeds to the moon, yet visible in the morning sky, before the sun has risen. It is usually called יָרֵךְ, as being yellow; but here it is called לְבָנָה, as being white; as also the sun, which here is spoken of as having risen (Jud. 5:31), is designated not by the word שָׁמֶשׁ, as the unwearied (Psa. 19: 6b, 6a), but, on account of the intensity of its warming light (Psa. 19: 7b), is called חֲמָה. These, in the language of poetry, are favourite names of the moon and the sun, because already the primitive meaning of the two other names had disappeared from common use; but with these, definite attributive ideas are immediately connected. Shulamith appears like the morning-red, which breaks through the darkness; beautiful, like the silver moon, which in soft still majesty shines in the heavens (Job. 31:26); pure (vid., regarding בַּר, בְּרוּר in this signification: smooth, bright, pure under Isa. 49: 2) as the sun, whose light (cf. מְהוֹר with the Aram. מִיְהָרָא, mid-day brightness) is the purest of the pure, imposing as war-hosts with their standards (vid., 6: 4b). The answer of her who was drawing near, to this exclamation, sounds homely and childlike:

*11 To the nut garden I went down  
To look at the shrubs of the valley,  
To see whether the vine sprouted,  
The pomegranates budded.*

*12 I knew it not that my soul lifted me up  
To the royal chariots of my people, a noble (one).*

**Son. 6:11, 12.** In her loneliness she is happy; she finds her delight in quietly moving about in the vegetable world; the vine and the pomegranate, brought from her home, are her favourites. Her soul — viz. love for Solomon, which fills her soul — raised her to the royal chariots of her people, the royal chariots of a noble (one), where she sits besides the king, who drives the chariot; she knew this, but she also knew it not for what she had become without any cause of her own, that she is without self-elation and without disavowal of her origin. These are Shulamith's thoughts and feelings, which we think we derive from these two verses without reading between the lines and without refining. It went down, she says, viz., from the royal palace, cf. 6: 2. Then, further, she speaks of a valley; and the whole sounds rural, so that we are led to think of Etam as the scene. This Etam, romantically (vid., Jud. 15: 8 f.) situated, was, as Josephus (*Antt.* viii. 7. 3) credibly informs us, Solomon's Belvedere. "In the royal

stables,” he says, “so great was the regard for beauty and swiftness, that nowhere else could horses of greater beauty or greater fleetness be found. All had to acknowledge that the appearance of the king’s horses was wonderfully pleasing, and that their swiftness was incomparable. Their riders also served as an ornament to them. They were young men in the flower of their age, and were distinguished by their lofty stature and their flowing hair, and by their clothing, which was of Tyrian purple. They every day sprinkled their hair with dust of gold, so that their whole head sparkled when the sun shone upon it. In such array, armed and bearing bows, they formed a body-guard around the king, who was wont, clothed in a white garment, to go out of the city in the morning, and even to drive his chariot. These morning excursions were usually to a certain place which was about sixty stadia from Jerusalem, and which was called Etam; gardens and brooks made it as pleasant as it was fruitful.” This Etam, from whence (the **עֵין עִיטָם** <sup>188</sup>) a watercourse, the ruins of which are still visible, supplied the temple with water, has been identified by Robinson with a village called *Artas* (by Lumley called *Urtas*), about a mile and a half to the south of Bethlehem. At the upper end of the winding valley, at a considerable height above the bottom, are three old Solomonic pools, — large, oblong basins of considerable compass placed one behind the other in terraces. Almost at an equal height with the highest pool, at a distance of several hundred steps there is a strong fountain, which is carefully built over, and to which there is a descent by means of stairs inside the building. By it principally were the pools, which are just large reservoirs, fed, and the water was conducted by a subterranean conduit into the upper pool. Riding along the way close to the aqueduct, which still exists, one sees even at the present day the valley below clothed in rich vegetation; and it is easy to understand that here there may have been rich gardens and pleasure-grounds (Moritz Lüttke’s *Mittheilung*). A more suitable place for this first scene of the fifth Act cannot be thought of; and what Josephus relates serves remarkably to illustrate not only the description of v. 11, but also that of v. 12.

**אֲגוֹז** is the walnut, i.e., the Italian nut tree (*Juglans regia* L.), originally brought from Persia; the Persian name is *jeuz*, Aethiop. *gûz*, Arab. Syr. *gauz* (*gôz*), in Heb. with **א** prosth., like the Armen. *engus*. **גַּנַּת אֲגוֹז** is a garden, the peculiar ornament of which is the fragrant and shady walnut tree; **גַּנַּת אֲגוֹזִים** would not be a nut garden, but a garden of nuts, for the plur. signifies, Mishn. *nuces* (viz., *juglandes* = *Jovis glandes*, Pliny, xvii. 136, ed. Jan.), as **הַתְּאֵנִים**, figs, in contradistinction to **הַתְּאֵנָה**, a fig tree, only the Midrash uses **אֲגוֹזָה** here, elsewhere not occurring, of a tree. The object of her going down was one, viz., to observe the state of the vegetation; but it was manifold, as expressed in the manifold statements which follow **יִרְדְּתִי**. The first object was the nut garden.

Then her intention was to observe the young shoots in the valley, which one has to think of as traversed by a river or brook; for נַחַל, like *Wady*, signifies both a valley and a valley-brook. The nut garden might lie in the valley, for the walnut tree is fond of a moderately cool, damp soil (Joseph. *Bell.* iii. 10. 8). But the אֲבִי are the young shoots with which the banks of a brook and the damp valley are usually adorned in the spring-time. אָב, shoot, in the Heb. of budding and growth, in Aram. of the fruit-formation, comes from R. אָב, the weaker power of נָב, which signifies to expand and spread from within outward, and particularly to sprout up and to well forth. בָּ רָאָה signifies here, as at Gen. 34: 1, attentively to observe something, looking to be fixed upon it, to sink down into it. A further object was to observe whether the vine had broken out, or had budded (this is the meaning of פָּרַח, breaking out, to send forth, R. פָּר, to break),<sup>189</sup> — whether the pomegranate trees had gained flowers or flower-buds הִנְצוּ, not as Gesen. in his *Thes.* and *Heb. Lex.* states, the *Hiph.* of נִצַּח, which would be הִנְצִיחוּ, but from נִצַּח instead of הִנְצִיחוּ, with the same omission of *Dagesh*, after the forms הִרְעוּ, הִפְרוּ, cf. Pro. 7:13, R. נִסְ נִץ, to glance, bloom (whence *Nisan* as the name of the flower-month, as *Ab* the name of the fruit-month).<sup>190</sup>

Why the pomegranate tree (*Punica granatum L.*), which derives this its Latin name from its fruit being full of grains, bears the Semitic name of רִמּוֹן, (Arab.) *rummân*, is yet unexplained; the Arabians are so little acquainted with it, that they are uncertain whether *ramm* or *raman* (which, however, is not proved to exist) is to be regarded as the root-word. The question goes along with that regarding the origin and signification of *Rimmon*, the name of the Syrian god, which appears to denote<sup>191</sup> “sublimity;” and it is possible that the pomegranate tree has its name from this god as being consecrated to him.<sup>192</sup>

In v. 12, Shulamith adds that, amid this her quiet delight in contemplating vegetable life, she had almost forgotten the position to which she had been elevated. לֹא יָדַעְתִּי may, according to the connection in which it is used, mean, “I know not,” Gen. 4: 9; 21:26, as well as “I knew not,” Gen. 28:16, Pro. 23:35; here the latter (LXX, Aquila, Jerome, Venet., Luther), for the expression runs parallel to יָדַעְתִּי, and is related to it as verifying or circumstantiating it. The connection לֹא יָדַעְתִּי נַפְשִׁי, whether we take the word נַפְשִׁי as permut. of the subject (Luther: My soul knew it not) or as the accus. of the object: I knew not myself (after Job. 9:21), is objectionable, because it robs the following שָׂמַתִּי of its subject, and makes the course of thought inappropriate. The accusative, without doubt, hits on what is right, since it gives the *Rebia*, corresponding to our colon, to יָדַעְתִּי; for that which follows with

נִפְשִׁי שָׁמַי is just what she acknowledges not to have known or considered. For the meaning cannot be that her soul had placed or brought her in an unconscious way, i.e., involuntarily or unexpectedly, etc., for “I knew not,” as such a declaration never forms the principal sentence, but, according to the nature of the case, always a subordinate sentence, and that either as a conditional clause with *Vav*, Job. 9: 5, or as a relative clause, Isa. 47:11; cf. Psa. 49:21. Thus “I knew not” will be followed by what she was unconscious of; it follows in *oratio directa* instead of *obliqua*, as also elsewhere after יָדַע, כִּי, elsewhere introducing the object of knowledge, is omitted, Psa. 9:21; Amo. 5:12. But if it remains unknown to her, if it has escaped her consciousness that her soul placed her, etc., then *naphsi* is here her own self, and that on the side of desire (Job. 23:13; Deu. 12:15); thus, in contrast to external constraint, her own most inward impulse, the leading of her heart. Following this, she has been placed on the height on which she now finds herself, without being always mindful of it. It would certainly now be most natural to regard מְרַכְבֹּת שׁוֹם, after the usual constr. of the verb שׁוֹם with the double accus., e.g., Gen. 28:22, Isa. 50: 2, Psa. 39: 9, as pred. accus. (Venet. ἔθετό με ὀχήματα), as e.g., Hengst.: I knew not, thus my soul brought me (i.e., brought me at unawares) to the chariots of my people, who are noble. But what does this mean? He adds the remark: “Shulamith stands in the place of the war-chariots of her people as their powerful protector, or by the heroic spirit residing in her.” But apart from the syntactically false rendering of לֹא יָדַעְתִּי, and the unwarrantable allegorizing, this interpretation wrecks itself on this, that “chariots” in themselves are not for protection, and thus without something further, especially in this designation by the word מְרַכְבֹּת, and not by רַכֵּב (2Ki. 6:17; cf. 2Ki. 2:12; 13:14), are not war-chariots. מֵרִי will thus be the accus. of the object of motion. It is thus understood, e.g., by Ewald (sec. 281d): My soul brought me to the chariots, etc. The shepherd-hypothesis finds here the seduction of Shulamith. Holländer translates: “I perceived it not; suddenly, it can scarcely be said unconsciously, I was placed in the state-chariots of Amminidab.” But the Masora expressly remarks that עַמִּי נָדִיב are not to be read as if forming one, but as two words, תַּרְיֵן מַלְיִן.<sup>193</sup>

Hitzig proportionally better, thus: without any apprehension of such a coincidence, she saw herself carried to the chariots of her noble people, i.e., as Gesen. in his *Thes.: inter currus comitatus principis*. Any other explanation, says Hitzig, is not possible, since the accus. מֵרִכֵּב in itself signifies only in the direction wither, or in the neighbourhood whence. And certainly it is generally used of the aim or object toward which one directs himself or strives, e.g., Isa. 37:23. *Kodēsh*, “toward the sanctuary,” Psa. 134: 2; cf. *hashshā' rā*,

“toward the gate,” Isa. 22: 7. But the accus. *mārom* can also mean “on high,” Isa. 22:16, the accus. *hashshāmaim* “in the heavens,” 1Ki. 8:32; and as *shalahh hāārēts* of being sent into the land, Num. 13:27, thus may also *sīm mērkāvāh* be used for *sim b<sup>e</sup>mērkāvāh*, 1Sa. 8:11, according to which the Syr. (*b<sup>e</sup>mercabto*) and the Quinta (ἐἰς ἄρματα) translate; on the contrary, Symm. and Jerome destroy the meaning by adopting the reading שְׂמַתְנִי (my soul placed me in confusion). The plur. *mark<sup>e</sup>voth* is thus meant amplifi., like *richvē*, 1: 9, and *battēnu*, 1:17.

As regards the subject, 2Sa. 15: 1 is to be compared; it is the king’s chariot that is meant, yoked, according to 1: 9, with Egypt. horses. It is a question whether *nadiv* is related adjunct. to *ammi*: my people, a noble (people), — a connection which gives prominence to the attribute appositionally, Gen. 37: 2; Psa. 143:10; Eze. 34:12, — or permutat., so that the first gen. is exchanged for one defining more closely: to the royal chariot of my people, a prince. The latter has the preference, not merely because (leaving out of view the proper name *Amminidab*) wherever עַם and נָדִיב are used together they are meant of those who stand prominent above the people, Num. 21:18, Psa. 47:10; 113: 8, but because this נָדִיב and בַּת־נָדִיב evidently stand in interchangeable relation. Yet, even though we take נָדִיב and עַמִּי together, the thought remains the same. Shulamith is not one who is abducted, but, as we read at 3: 6 ff., one who is honourably brought home; and she here expressly says that no kind of external force but her own loving soul raised her to the royal chariots of her people and their king. That she gives to the fact of her elevation just this expression, arises from the circumstance that she places her joy in the loneliness of nature, in contrast to her driving along in a splendid chariot. Designating the chariot that of her noble people, or that of her people, and, indeed, of a prince, she sees in both cases in Solomon the concentration and climax of the people’s glory.

**Son. 7: 1.** Encouraged by Shulamith’s unassuming answer, the daughters of Jerusalem now give utterance to an entreaty which their astonishment at her beauty suggests to them.

*7: 1 Come back, come back, O Shulamith!  
Come back, come back, that we may look upon thee!*

She is now (Son. 6:10 ff.) on the way from the garden to the palace. The fourfold “come back” entreats her earnestly, yea, with tears, to return thither with them once more, and for this purpose, that they might find delight in looking up her; for בָּהִיב signifies to sink oneself into a thing, looking at it, to delight (feast) one’s eyes in looking on a thing. Here for the first time Shulamith

is addressed by name. But **הַשׁוֹב** cannot be a pure proper name, for the art. is vocat., as e.g., **הַבֵּת יְרוּשָׁלַיִם**, “O daughter of Jerusalem!” Pure proper names like **שְׁלֹמֹה** are so determ. in themselves that they exclude the article; only such as are at the same time also nouns, like **יְרֵדָן** and **לְבָנוֹן**, are susceptible of the article, particularly also of the vocat., Psa. 114: 5; but cf. Zec. 11: 1 with Isa. 10:34. Thus **הַשׁוֹב** will be not so much a proper name as a name of descent, as generally nouns in **שְׁ-**(with a few exceptions, viz., of ordinal number, **הַרְרִי**, **מִנִּי**, etc.) are all *gentilicia*. The LXX render **הַשׁוֹב** by **ἡ Σουναμίτις**, and this is indeed but another form for **הַשְּׁוֹנֵמִית**, i.e., she who is from Sunem. Thus also was designated the exceedingly beautiful Abishag, 1Ki. 1: 3, Elisha’s excellent and pious hostess, 2Ki. 4: 8 ff. *Sunem* was in the tribe of Issachar (Jos. 19:18), near to Little Hermon, from which it was separated by a valley, to the south-east of Carmel. This lower Galilean Sunem, which lies south from Nain, south-east from Nazareth, south-west from Tabor, is also called *Shulem*. Eusebius in his *Onomasticon* says regarding it: **Σουβήμη (ἢ Σουλῆμη) κλήρου Ἰσασάχαρ. καὶ ὄν ἐστὶ κώμη Σουλῆμη κ.τ.λ.**, i.e., as Jerome translates it: *Sunem in tribue Issachar. et usque hodie vicus ostenditur nomine Sulem in quinto miliario montis Thabor contra australum plagam*. This place is found at the present day under the name of *Suwlam (Sôlam)*, at the west end of *Jebel ed-Duhi* (Little Hermon), not far from the great plain (*Jisre’el*, now *Zer<sup>en</sup>*), which forms a convenient way of communication between Jordan and the sea-coast, but is yet so hidden in the mountain range that the Talmud is silent concerning this Sulem, as it is concerning Nazareth. Here was the home of the Shulamitess of the Song. The ancients interpret the name by **εἰρημεύουσα**, or by **ἔσκυλευμένη** (vid., Lagarde’s *Onomastica*), the former after Aquila and the Quinta, the latter after Symm. The Targum has the interpretation: **הַשְּׁלֹמִית בְּאַמוֹנְתָהּ עִם הַ** (vid., Rashi). But the form of the name (the Syr. writes **שִׁלְוִמִּיתָא**) is opposed to these allegorical interpretations. Rather it is to be assumed that the poet purposely used, not **הַשׁוֹב**, but **הַשׁוֹל**, to assimilate her name to that of Solomon; and that it has the parallel meaning of one devoted to Solomon, and thus, as it were, of a passively-applied **שְׁלֹמִית** = **Σαλόμη**, is the more probable, as the daughters of Jerusalem would scarcely venture thus to address her who was raised to the rank of a princess unless this name accorded with that of Solomon.

Not conscious of the greatness of her beauty, Shulamith asks, —

***1b α What do you see in Shulamith?***



She is not aware that anything particular is to be seen in her; but the daughters of Jerusalem are of a different opinion, and answer this childlike, modest, but so much the more touching question, —

*1b β As the dance of Mahanaim!*

They would thus see in her something like the dance of *Manahā<sup>2</sup>m*. If this be here the name of the Levitical town (now *Maḥneh*) in the tribe of Gad, north of Jabbok, where Ishbosheth resided for two years, and where David was hospitably entertained on his flight from Absalom (Luthr.: “the dance to *Mahanā<sup>2</sup>m*”), then we must suppose in this trans-Jordanic town such a popular festival as was kept in Shiloh, Jud. 21:19, and we may compare *Abel-Meholah* [= meadow of dancing], the name of Elisha’s birth-place (cf. also Herod. i. 16: “To dance the dance of the Arcadian town of Tegea”). But the Song delights in retrospective references to Genesis (cf. Son. 4:11b, 7:11). At Gen. 32: 3, however, by *Mahanā<sup>2</sup>m* <sup>194</sup>

is meant the double encampment of angels who protected Jacob’s two companies (Gen. 32: 8). The town of *Mahanā<sup>2</sup>m* derives its name from this vision of Jacob’s. The word, as the name of a town, is always without the article; and here, where it has the article, it is to be understood appellatively. The old translators, in rendering by “the dances of the camps” (Syr., Jerome, *choros castrorum*, Venet. *θίασον στρατοπέδων*), by which it remains uncertain whether a war-dance or a parade is meant, overlook the dual, and by exchanging *מַחֲנֵי* with *מַחֲנֵי*, they obtain a figure which in this connection is incongruous and obscure. But, in truth, the figure is an angelic one. The daughters of Jerusalem wish to see Shulamith dance, and they designate that as an angelic sight. *Mahanā<sup>2</sup>m* became in the post-bibl. dialect a name directly for angels. The dance of angels is only a step beyond the responsive song of the seraphim, Isa. 6. *Engelkoere* [angel-choir] and “heavenly host” are associated in the old German poetry. <sup>195</sup>

The following description is undeniably that (let one only read how Hitzig in vain seeks to resist this interpretation) of one dancing. In this, according to biblical representation and ancient custom, there is nothing repulsive. The women of the ransomed people, with Miriam at their head, danced, as did also the women who celebrated David’s victory over Goliath (Exo. 15:20; 1Sa. 18:66). David himself danced (2Sa. 6) before the ark of the covenant. Joy and dancing are, according to Old Testament conception, inseparable (Ecc. 3: 4); and joy not only as the happy feeling of youthful life, but also spiritual holy joy (Psa. 87: 7). The dance which the ladies of the court here desire to see, falls under the point of view of a play of rival individual *artistes* reciprocally acting for the sake of amusement. The play also is capable of moral

nobility, if it is enacted within the limits of propriety, at the right time, in the right manner, and if the natural joyfulness, penetrated by intelligence, is consecrated by a spiritual aim. Thus Shulamith, when she dances, does not then become a Gaditanian (Martial, xiv. 203) or an *Alma* (the name given in Anterior Asia to those women who go about making it their business to dance mimic and partly lascivious dances); nor does she become a *Bajadere* (Isa. 23:15 f.),<sup>196</sup> as also Miriam, Exo. 15:20, Jephthah's daughter, Jud. 11:34, the "daughters of Shiloh," Jud. 21:21, and the woman of Jerusalem, 1Sa. 18: 6, did not dishonour themselves by dancing; the dancing of virgins is even a feature of the times after the restoration, Jer. 31:13. But that Shulamith actually danced in compliance with the earnest entreaty of the daughters of Jerusalem, is seen from the following description of her attractions, which begins with her feet and the vibration of her thighs.

After throwing aside her upper garments, so that she had only the light clothing of a shepherdess or vinedresser, Shulamith danced to and fro before the daughters of Jerusalem, and displayed all her attractions before them. Her feet, previously (Son. 5: 3) naked, or as yet only shod with sandals, she sets forth with the deportment of a prince's daughter.

*2a How beautiful are thy steps in the shoes, O prince's daughter!*

**Son. 7: 2a.** The noun נְדִיב, which signifies noble in disposition, and then noble by birth and rank (cf. the reverse relation of the meanings in *generosus*), is in the latter sense synon. and parallel to מַלְךְ and שֵׁר; Shulamith is here called a prince's daughter because she was raised to the rank of which Hannah, 1Sa. 2: 8, cf. Psa. 113: 8, speaks, and to which she herself, Son. 6:12 points. Her beauty, from the first associated with unaffected dignity, now appears in native princely grace and majesty. פֶּאֵם (from פָּאַם, *pulsare*, as in *nunc pede libero pulsanda tellus*) signifies step and foot, — in the latter sense the poet. Heb. and the vulgar Phoen. word for רֶגֶל; here the meanings *pes* and *passus* (Fr. *pas*, dance-step) flow into each other. The praise of the spectators now turns from the feet of the dancer to her thighs:

*2b The vibration of thy thighs like ornamental chains,  
The work of an artist's hands.*

**Son. 7: 2b.** The double-sided thighs, viewed from the spine and the lower part of the back, are called מְתַנִּים; from the upper part of the legs upwards, and the breast downwards (the lumbar region), thus seen on the front and sidewise, חֲלָצִים or יָרְכִים. Here the manifold twistings and windings of the upper part of the body by means of the thigh-joint are meant; such movements of a circular kind are called חֲמוּקִים, from חָמַק, 5: 6. חֲלָאִים is the plur. of חָלִי = (Arab.)

ḥaly, as צְבָאִים (gazelles) of צִבְי = *zaby*. The sing. חָלִי (or חָלִיָּה = [Arab.] *hulyah*) signifies a female ornament, consisting of gold, silver, or precious stones, and that (according to the connection, Pro. 25: 2; Hos. 2:15) for the neck or the breast as a whole; the plur. חָלִי, occurring only here, is therefore chosen because the bendings of the loins, full of life and beauty, are compared to the free swingings to and fro of such an ornament, and thus to a connected ornament of chains; for חֲמֵי are not the beauty-curves of the thighs at rest, — the connection here requires movement. In accordance with the united idea of חָלִי, the appos. is not מַעֲשֵׂי, but (according to the Palestin.) מַעֲשֵׂה (LXX, Targ., Syr., Venet.). The artist is called אָמָן (*ommân*) (the forms אָמָן and אָמָן are also found), Syr. *avmon*, Jewish-Aram. אָוּמָן; he has, as the master of stability, a name like יָמִין, the right hand: the hand, and especially the right hand, is the *artifex* among the members.<sup>197</sup>

The eulogists pass from the loins to the middle part of the body. In dancing, especially in the Oriental style of dancing, which is the mimic representation of animated feeling, the breast and the body are raised, and the forms of the body appear through the clothing.

**3 Thy navel is a well-rounded basin —  
Let not mixed wine be wanting to it  
Thy body is a heap of wheat,  
Set round with lilies.**

**Son. 7: 3.** In interpreting these words, Hitzig proceeds as if a “voluptuary” were here speaking. He therefore changes שְׂרָרָךְ into שְׂרָרָךְ, “thy *pudenda*.” But (1) it is no voluptuary who speaks here, and particularly not a man, but women who speak; certainly, above all, it is the poet, who would not, however, be so inconsiderate as to put into the mouths of women immodest words which he could use if he wished to represent the king as speaking. Moreover (2) שֵׁר = (Arab.) *surr*, secret (that which is secret; in Arab. especially referred to the *pudenda*, both of man and woman), is a word that is<sup>198</sup> foreign to the Heb. language, which has for “*Geheimnis*” [secret] the corresponding word סוּד (vid., under Psa. 2: 2; 25:14), after the root-signification of its verbal stem (viz., to be firm, pressed together); and (3) the reference — preferred by Döpke, Magnus, Hahn, and others, also without any change of punctuation — of שֵׁר to the *interfeminium mulieris*, is here excluded by the circumstance that the attractions of a woman dancing, as they unfold themselves, are here described. Like the Arab. *surr*, שֵׁר (= *shurr*), from שָׂרַר, to bind fast, denotes properly the umbilical cord, Eze. 16: 4, and then the umbilical scar. Thus, Pro. 3: 8, where most recent critics prefer, for לְשָׂרְךָ, to read, but without any

proper reason, לְשֵׁרֶךְ = לְשֵׁרֶךְ, “to thy flesh,” the navel comes there into view as the centre of the body, — which it always is with new-born infants, and is almost so with grown-up persons in respect of the length of the body, — and as, indeed, the centre. whence the pleasurable feeling of health diffuses its rays of heat. This middle and prominent point of the abdomen shows itself in one lightly clad and dancing when she breathes deeply, even through the clothing; and because the navel commonly forms a little funnel-like hollow (Böttch.: in the form almost of a whirling hollow in the water, as one may see in nude antique statues), therefore the daughters of Jerusalem compare Shulamith’s navel to a “basin of roundness,” i.e., which has this general property, and thus belongs to the class of things that are round. יָנִס does not mean a *Becher* (a cup), but a *Bechen* (basin), *pelvis*; properly a washing basin, *ijjanah* (from יָנַס = *ajan*, to full, to wash = כִּיבַס); then a sprinkling basin, Exo. 24: 6; and generally a basin, Isa. 22:24; here, a mixing basin, in which wine was mingled with a proportion of water to render it palatable (κρατήρ, from κεραννύναι, *temperare*), — according to the Talm. with two-thirds of water. In this sense this passage is interpreted allegorically, *Sanhedrin* 14*b*, 37*a*, and elsewhere (vid., Aruch under מִזְג). מִזְג is not spiced wine, which is otherwise designated (Son. 8: 2), but, as Hitzig rightly explains, mixed wine, i.e., mixed with water or snow (vid., under Isa. 5:22). מִזְג is not borrowed from the Greek μίσγειν (Grätz), but is a word native to all the three chief Semitic dialects, — the weaker form of מָסַךְ, which may have the meaning of “to pour in,” but not merely “to pour in,” but, at that same time, “to mix” (vid., under Isa. 5:22; Pro. 9: 2). סָהַר, with יָנִס, represents the circular form (from סָהַר = סָהַר), corresponding to the navel ring; Kimchi thinks that the moon must be understood (cf. שְׁהַרְוֵן, *lunula*): a moon-like round basin; according to which the Venet., also in Gr., choosing an excellent name for the moon, translates: ῥάντιστρον τῆς ἐκάτης. But “moon-basin” would be an insufficient expression for it; Ewald supposes that it is the name of a flower, without, however, establishing this opinion. The “basin of roundness” is the centre of the body a little depressed; and that which the clause, “may not mixed wine be lacking,” expresses, as their wish for her, is soundness of health, for which no more appropriate and delicate figure can be given than hot wine tempered with fresh water.

The comparison in 3*b* is the same as that of R. Johanan’s of beauty, *Mez’a* 84*a*: “He who would gain an idea of beauty should take a silver cup, fill it with pomegranate flowers, and encircle its rim with a garland of roses.” <sup>199</sup>

To the present day, winnowed and sifted corn is piled up in great heaps of symmetrical half-spherical form, which are then frequently stuck over with

things that move in the wind, for the purpose of protecting them against birds. “The appearance of such heaps of wheat,” says Wetstein (*Isa.* p. 710), “which one may see in long parallel rows on the thrashing-floors of a village, is very pleasing to a peasant; and the comparison of the Song, 7: 3, every Arabian will regard as beautiful.” Such a corn-heap is to the present day called *subbah*, while *‘aramah* is a heap of thrashed corn that has not yet been winnowed; here, with עֲרָמָה, is to be connected the idea of a *subbah*, i.e., of a heap of wheat not only thrashed and winnowed, but also sifted (riddled). סוּג, enclosed, fenced about (whence the post-bibl. סוּג, a fence), is a part. pass. such as פּוֹיֵן, scattered (vid., under Psa. 92:12). The comparison refers to the beautiful appearance of the roundness, but, at the same time, also the flesh-colour shining through the dress; for fancy sees more than the eyes, and concludes regarding that which is veiled from that which is visible. A wheat-colour was, according to the Moslem Sunna, the tint of the first created man. Wheat-yellow and lily-white is a subdued white, and denotes at once purity and health; by πῦρος [wheat] one thinks of πῶπ — heaped up wheat develops a remarkable heat, a fact for which Biesenthal refers to Plutarch’s *Quaest.* In accordance with the progress of the description, the breasts are now spoken of:

*4 Thy two breasts are like two fawns,  
Twins of a gazelle.*

**Son. 7: 4.** 4: 5 is repeated, but with the omission of the attribute, “feeding among lilies,” since lilies have already been applied to another figure. Instead of תְּאוֹמֵי there, we have here תְּאוֹמֵי (*taōme*), the former after the ground-form *ti’ām*, the latter after the ground-form *to’m* (cf. נְאֻלֵי, Neh. 8:29, from נָאֵל = נְאֻל).

*5a Thy neck like an ivory tower.*

**Son. 7: 5.** The article in הַשֵּׁן may be that designating species (vid., under 1:11); but, as at 7: 5 and 4: 4, it appears to be also here a definite tower which the comparison has in view: one covered externally with ivory tablets, a tower well known to all in and around Jerusalem, and visible far and wide, especially when the sun shone on it; had it been otherwise, as in the case of the comparison following, the locality would have been more definitely mentioned. So slender, so dazzlingly white, is imposing, and so captivating to the eye did Shulamith’s neck appear. These and the following figures would be open to the objection of being without any occasion, and monstrous, if they referred to an ordinary beauty; but they refer to Solomon’s spouse, they apply to a queen, and therefore are derived from that which is most splendid in the kingdom over

which, along with him, she rules; and in this they have the justification of their grandeur.

***5b α Thine eyes pools in Heshbon,  
At the gate of the populus (city).***

*Heshbon*, formerly belonging to the Amorites, but at this time to the kingdom of Solomon, lay about 5 1/2 hours to the east of the northern point of the Dead Sea, on an extensive, undulating, fruitful, high table-land, with a far-reaching prospect. Below the town, now existing only in heaps of ruins, a brook, which here takes its rise, flows westward, and streams toward the *Ghôr* as the *Nahr Heshbân*. It joins the Jordan not far above its entrance into the Dead Sea. The situation of the town was richly watered. There still exists a huge reservoir of excellent masonry in the valley, about half a mile from the foot of the hill on which the town stood. The comparison here supposes two such pools, but which are not necessarily together, though both are before the gate, i.e., near by, outside the town. Since שֶׁאֵר, except at Isa. 14:31, is fem., בְּתֵרֵבִים, in the sense of רְבֵתֵי עַם, Lam. 1: 1 (cf. for the non-determin. of the adj., Eze. 21:25), is to be referred to the town, not to the gate (Hitz.); Blau's <sup>f100</sup> conjectural reading, *bath- 'akrabbim*, does not recommend itself, because the craggy heights of the "ascent of Akrabbim" (Num. 34: 4; Jos. 15: 3), which obliquely cross <sup>f101</sup> the *Ghôr* to the south of the Dead Sea, and from remote times formed the southern boundary of the kingdom of the Amorites (Jud. 1:36), were too far off, and too seldom visited, to give its name to a gate of Heshbon. But generally the crowds of men at the gate and the topography of the gate are here nothing to the purpose; the splendour of the town, however, is for the figure of the famed cisterns like a golden border. בְּרֶכֶה (from בְּרַךְ, to spread out, vid., *Genesis*, p. 98; Fleischer in *Levy*, I 420b) denotes a skilfully built round or square pool. The comparison of the eyes to a pool means, as Wetstein <sup>f102</sup> remarks, "either thus glistening like a water-mirror, or thus lovely in appearance, for the Arabian knows no greater pleasure than to look upon clear, gently rippling water." Both are perhaps to be taken together; the mirroring glance of the moist eyes (cf. Ovid, *De Arte Am.* ii. 722:

***"Adspicies obulos tremulo fulgore micantes,  
Ut sol a liquida saepe refulget aqua"),***

and the spell of the charm holding fast the gaze of the beholder.

***5b β Thy nose like the tower of Lebanon,  
Which looks towards Damascus.***

This comparison also places us in the midst of the architectural and artistic splendours of the Solomonic reign. A definite town is here meant; the art.

determines it, and the part. following appositionally without the art., with the expression “towards Damascus” defining it more nearly (vid., under 3: 6), describes it. הַלְבָנוֹן designates here “the whole Alpine range of mountains in the north of the land of Israel” (Furrer); for a tower which looks in the direction of Damascus (פִּינִי, accus., as אֶת־פִּינִי, 1Sa. 22: 4) is to be thought of as standing on one of the eastern spurs of Hermon, or on the top of Amana (Son. 4: 8), whence the Amana (Barada) takes its rise, whether as a watch-tower (2Sa. 8: 6), or only as a look-out from which might be enjoyed the paradisaical prospect. The nose gives to the face especially its physiognomical expression, and conditions its beauty. Its comparison to a tower on a lofty height is occasioned by the fact that Shulamith’s nose, without being blunt or flat, formed a straight line from the brow downward, without bending to the right or left (Hitzig), a mark of symmetrical beauty combined with awe-inspiring dignity. After the praise of the nose it was natural to think of Carmel; Carmel is a promontory, and as such is called *anf el-jebel* (“nose of the mountain-range”).

*6a α Thy head upon thee as Carmel.*

**Son. 7: 6.** We say that the head is “on the man” (2Ki. 6:31; Judith 14:18), for we think of a man ideally as the central unity of the members forming the external appearance of his body. Shulamith’s head ruled her form, surpassing all in beauty and majesty, as Carmel with its noble and pleasing appearance ruled the land and sea at its feet. From the summit of Carmel, clothed with trees) Amo. 9: 3; 1Ki. 18:42), a transition is made to the hair on the head, which the Moslem poets are fond of comparing to long leaves, as vine leaves and palm branches; as, on the other hand, the thick leafy wood is called (vid., under Isa. 7:20) *comata silva* (cf. Oudendorp’s Apuleii *Metam.* p. 744). Grätz, proceeding on the supposition of the existence of Persian words in the Song, regards כַּרְמֶל as the name of a colour; but (1) crimson is designated in the Heb.-Pers. not כַּרְמֶל, but כַּרְמִיל, instead of תּוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי (vid., under Isa. 1:18; Pro. 31:21); (2) if the hair of the head (if ראשׁךָ might be directly understood of this) may indeed be compared to the glistening of purple, not, however, to the listening of carmese or scarlet, then red and not black hair must be meant. But it is not the locks of hair, but the hair in locks that is meant. From this the eulogium finally passes to the hair of the head itself.

*6a β The flowing hair of thy head like purple —  
A king fettered by locks.*

Hitzig supposes that כַּרְמֶל reminded the poet of כַּרְמִיל (carmese), and that thus he hit upon אֶרְבָּנָן (purple); but one would rather think that *Carmel* itself



would immediately lead him to purple, for near this promontory is the principal place where purple shell-fish are found (Seetzen's *Reisen*, IV 277 f.). **דָּלָה** (from **לָלַל**, to dangle, to hang loose, Job. 28: 4, Arab. *tadladal*) is *res pendula*, and particularly *coma pendula*. Hengst. remarks that the "purple" has caused much trouble to those who understand by **הַלֵּה** the hair of the head. He himself, with Gussetius, understand by it the temples, *tempus capitis*; but the word **רָקָה** is used (Son. 4: 3) for "temples," and "purple-like" hair hanging down could occasion trouble only to those who know not how to distinguish purple from carmese. Red purple, **אַרְגָּמָן** (Assyr. *argamannu*, Aram., Arab., Pers., with departure from the primary meaning of the word, **אַרְגָּן**), which derives this name from **רָגַם** = **רָקַם**, material of variegated colour, is dark-red, and almost glistening black, as Pliny says (*Hist. Nat.* ix. 135): *Laus ei* (the Tyrian purple) *summa in colore sanguinis concreti, nigricans adspectu idemque suspectu* (seen from the side) *refulgens, unde et Homero purpureus dicitur sanguis*. The purple hair of Nisus does not play a part in myth alone, but beautiful shining dark black hair is elsewhere also called purple, e.g., **πυρφύρεος πλόκαμος** in Lucian, **πορφυράϊ χαίται** in Anacreon. With the words "like purple," the description closes; and to this the last characteristic distinguishing Shulamith there is added the exclamation: "A king fettered by locks!" For **רְהִיטָה**, from **רָהַט**, to run, flow, is also a name of flowing locks, not the ear-locks (Hitz.), i.e., long ringlets flowing down in front; the same word (Son. 1:17) signifies in its North Palest. form **רְהִיטָה** (*Cheth-b*), a water-trough, *canalis*. The locks of one beloved are frequently called in erotic poetry "the fetters" by which the lover is held fast, for "love wove her net in alluring ringlets" (*Deshâmi* in *Joseph and Zuleika*).<sup>f103</sup>

Goethe in his *Westöst. Divan* presents as a bold yet moderate example: "There are more than fifty hooks in each lock of thy hair;" and, on the other hand, one offensively extravagant, when it is said of a Sultan: "In the bonds of thy locks lies fastened the neck of the enemy." **אַסְרוּרָה** signifies also in Arab. frequently one enslaved by love: *as-ruha* is equivalent to her lover.<sup>f104</sup>

The mention of the king now leads from the imagery of a dance to the scene which follows, where we again hear the king's voice. The scene and situation are now manifestly changed. We are transferred from the garden to the palace, where the two, without the presence of any spectators, carry on the following dialogue.

## SECOND SCENE OF THE FIFTH ACT, SON. 7: 7-8: 4

It is the fundamental thought forming the motive and aim of the Song which now expresses itself in the words of Solomon.

*7 How beautiful art thou, and how charming,  
O love, among delights!*

**Son. 7: 7.** It is a truth of all-embracing application which is here expressed. There is nothing more admirable than love, i.e., the uniting or mingling together of two lives, the one of which gives itself to the other, and so finds the complement of itself; nor than this self-devotion, which is at the same time self-enrichment. All this is true of earthly love, of which Walther v. d. Vogelweide says: “*minne ist sweier herzen wünne*” [love is the joy of two hearts], and it is true also of heavenly love; the former surpasses all earthly delights (also such as are purely sensuous, Ecc. 2: 8), and the latter is, as the apostle expresses himself in his spiritual “Song of Songs,” 1Co. 13:13, in relation to faith and hope, “greater than these,” greater than both of them, for it is their sacred, eternal aim. In **נְפִיֹתָי** it is indicated that the idea, and in **נְאֻמָּתָי** that the eudaemonistic feature of the human soul attains its satisfaction in love. The LXX, obliterating this so true and beautiful a promotion of love above all other joys, translate **ἐν ταῖς τρυφαῖς σου** (in the enjoyment which thou impartest). The Syr., Jerome, and others also rob the Song of this its point of light and of elevation, by reading **אֶהְבֶּבְךָ** [O beloved!] instead of **אֶהְבֶּבְךָ**. The words then declare (yet contrary to the spirit of the Hebrew language, which knows neither **אֶהְבֶּבְךָ** nor **אֶהְבֶּבְתִּי** as vocat.) what we already read at 4:10; while, according to the traditional form of the text, they are the prelude of the love-song, to love as such, which is continued in 8: 6f.

**Son. 7: 8-10a α.** When Solomon now looks on the wife of his youth, she stands before him like a palm tree with its splendid leaf-branches, which the Arabians call *ucht insân* (the sisters of men); and like a vine which climbs up on the wall of the house, and therefore is an emblem of the housewife, Psa. 128: 3.

*8 Thy stature is like the palm tree;  
And thy breasts clusters.*

*9 I thought: I will climb the palm,  
Grasp its branches;  
And thy breasts shall be to me  
As clusters of the vine,  
And the breath of thy nose like apples,  
10a α And thy palate like the best wine.*

Shulamith stands before him. As he surveys her from head to foot, he finds her stature like the stature of a slender, tall date-palm, and her breasts like the clusters of sweet fruit, into which, in due season its blossoms are ripened. That קַנְמָתָךְ (thy stature) is not thought of as height apart from the person, but as along with the person (cf. Eze. 13:18), scarcely needs to be remarked. The palm derives its name, *tāmār*, from its slender stem rising upwards (vid., under Isa. 17: 9; 61: 6). This name is specially given to the *Phoenix dactylifera*, which is indigenous from Egypt to India, and which is principally cultivated (vid., under Gen. 14: 7), the female flowers of which, set in panicles, develop into large clusters of juicy sweet fruit. These dark-brown or golden-yellow clusters, which crown the summit of the stem and impart a wonderful beauty to the appearance of the palm, especially when seen in the evening twilight, are here called אֲשַׁכְּלוֹת (connecting form at Deu. 32:32), as by the Arabians *’ithkal*, plur. *’ithakyl (botri dactylorum)*. The perf. דָּמְתָה signifies *aequata est = aequa est*, for דָּמָה, R. דָּם, means, to make or to become plain, smooth, even. The perf. אֲמַרְתִּי, on the other hand, will be meant retrospectively. As an expression of that which he just now purposed to do, it would be useless; and thus to notify with emphasis anything beforehand is unnatural and contrary to good taste and custom. But looking back, he can say that in view of this august attractive beauty the one thought filled him, to secure possession of her and of the enjoyment which she promised; as one climbs (עָלָה with ב, as Psa. 24: 3) a palm tree and seizes (אָחַז, fut. אֶחֶז, and אֶחֶז with ב, as at Job. 23:11) its branches (סִנְסַנִּים, so called, as it appears,<sup>f105</sup> after the feather-like pointed leaves proceeding from the mid-rib on both sides), in order to break off the fulness of the sweet fruit under its leaves. As the cypress (*sarwat*), so also the palm is with the Moslem poets the figure of a loved one, and with the mystics, of God;<sup>f106</sup> and accordingly the idea of possession is here particularly intended. אֶחֶז denotes what he then thought and aimed at. Instead of בְּתַמָּר, 9a, the punctuation בְּתַמָּר is undoubtedly to be preferred. The figure of the palm tree terminates with the words, “will grasp its branches.” It was adequate in relation to stature, but less so in relation to the breasts; for dates are of a long oval form, and have a stony kernel. Therefore the figure departs from the date clusters to that of grape clusters, which are more appropriate, as they swell and become round and elastic the more they ripen. The breath of the nose, which is called אָף, from breathing hard, is that of the air breathed, going in and out through it; for, as a rule, a man breathes through his nostrils with closed mouth. Apples present themselves the more naturally for comparison, that the apple has the name תַּפּוּחַ (from נָפַח, after the form תַּמְכוּךְ), from the fragrance which it exhales.

יין הטוב is wine of the good kind, i.e., the best, as אשת רע, Pro. 6:24, a woman of a bad kind, i.e., a bad woman; the neut. thought of as adjct. is both times the gen. of the attribute, as at Pro. 24:25 it is the gen. of the *substratum*. The punctuation בַּיין הטוב (Hitz.) is also possible; it gives, however, the common instead of the delicate poetical expression. By the comparison one may think of the expressions, *jungere salivas oris* (Lucret.) and *oscula per longas jungere pressa moras* (Ovid). But if we have rightly understood 4:11; 5:16, the palate is mentioned much rather with reference to the words of love which she whispers in his ears when embracing her. Only thus is the further continuance of the comparison to be explained, and that it is Shulamith herself who continues it.

**Son. 7:10a β.** The dramatic structure of the Song becomes here more strongly manifest than elsewhere before. Shulamith interrupts the king, and continues his words as if echoing them, but again breaks off.

*10a β Which goes down for my beloved smoothly,  
Which makes the lips of sleepers move.*

The LXX had here לדודי in the text. It might notwithstanding be a spurious reading. Hitzig suggests that it is erroneously repeated, as if from v. 11. Ewald also (*Hohehl.* p. 137) did that before, — Heiligstedt, as usual, following him. But, as Ewald afterwards objected, the line would then be “too short, and not corresponding to that which follows.” But how shall לדודי now connect itself with Solomon’s words? Ginsburg explains: “Her voice is not merely compared to wine, because it is sweet to everybody, but to such wine as would be sweet to a friend, and on that account is more valuable and pleasant.” But that furnishes a thought digressing εἰς ἄλλο γένος; and besides, Ewald rightly remarks that Shulamith always uses the word דודי of her beloved, and that the king never uses it in a similar sense. He contends, however, against the idea that Shulamith here interrupts Solomon; for he replies to me (*Jahrb.* IV 75): “Such interruptions we certainly very frequently find in our ill-formed and dislocated plays; in the Song, however, not a solitary example of this is found, and one ought to hesitate in imagining such a thing.” He prefers the reading לדודים [beloved ones], although possibly לדודי, with ם, abbreviated after the popular style of speech from םm, may be the same word. But is this l<sup>e</sup>dodim not a useless addition? Is excellent wine good to the taste of friends merely; and does it linger longer in the palate of those not beloved than of those loving? And is the circumstance that Shulamith interrupts the king, and carried forward his words, not that which frequently also occurs in the Greek drama, as e.g., Eurip. *Phoenissae*, v. 608? The text as it stands before us requires an interchange of the speakers, and nothing prevents the supposition of such an interchange. In

this idea Hengstenberg for once agrees with us. The *Lamed* in *ℓdodi* is meant in the same sense as when the bride drinks to the bridegroom, using the expression *ℓdodi*. The *Lamed* in לְמִישְׁרֵי is that of the defining norm, as the *Beth* in בְּמִי, Pro. 23:31, is that of the accompanying circumstance: that which tastes badly sticks in the palate, but that which tastes pleasantly glides down directly and smoothly. But what does the phrase דּוֹבֵב שֶׁפֶּ וְגוֹ mean? The LXX translate by ἱκανούμενος χεῖλεσί μου καὶ ὀδοῦσιν, “accommodating itself (Sym. προστιθέμενος) to my lips and teeth.” Similarly Jerome (omitting at least the false μου), *labiisque et dentibus illius ad ruminandum*, in which דְּבָה, *rumor*, for דּוֹבֵב, seems to have led him to *ruminare*. Equally contrary to the text with Luther’s translation: “which to my friend goes smoothly goes, and speaks of the previous year;” a rendering which supposes יְשָׁנִים (as also the Venet.) instead of יְשָׁנִים (good wine which, as it were, tells of former years), and, besides, disregards שֶׁפֶּתִי. The translation: “which comes at unawares upon the lips of the sleepers,” accords with the language (Heiligst., Hitz.). But that gives no meaning, as if one understood by יְשָׁנִים, as Gesen. and Ewald do, *una in eodem toro cubantes*; but in this case the word ought to have been שֶׁכְּבִים. Since, besides, such a thing is known as sleeping through drink or speaking in sleep, but not of drinking in sleep, our earlier translation approves itself: which causes the lips of sleepers to speak. This interpretation is also supported by a proverb in the Talm. *Jebamoth* 97a, *Jer. Moēd Katan*, iii. 7, etc., which, with reference to the passage under review, says that if any one in this world adduces the saying of a righteous man in his name (רוּחַשׁוֹת or מַרְחָשׁוֹת), שֶׁפֶּתוֹתָיו דּוֹבְבוֹת בְּקֶבֶר. But it is an error inherited from Buxtorf, that דּוֹבְבוֹת means there *loquuntur*, and, accordingly, that דּוֹבֵב of this passage before us means *loqui faciens*. It rather means (vid., Aruch), *bullire, stillare, manare* (cogn. זָב, טָף, Syn. רָחַשׁ), since, as that proverb signifies, the deceased experiences an after-taste of his saying, and this experience expresses itself in the smack of the lips; and דּוֹבֵב, whether it be part. *Kal* or *Po.* = מְדוֹבֵב, thus: brought into the condition of the overflowing, the after-experience of drink that has been partaken of, and which returns again, as it were, *ruminando*. The meaning “to speak” is, in spite of Parchon and Kimchi (whom the Venet., with its φθεγγόμενος, follows), foreign to the verb; for דְּבָה also means, not discourse, but sneaking, and particularly sneaking calumny, and, generally, *fama repens*. The calumniator is called in Arab. *dabûb*, as in Heb. רְכִיל.

We now leave it undecided whether in דּוֹבֵב, of this passage before us, that special idea connected with it in the Gemara is contained; but the roots דָּב and

זב are certainly cogn., they have the fundamental idea of a soft, noiseless movement generally, and modify this according as they are referred to that which is solid or fluid. Consequently זבב, as it means in *lente incedere* (whence the bear has the name זב), is also capable of being interpreted *leniter se movere*, and trans. *leniter movere*, according to which the Syr. here translates, *quod commovet labia mea et dentes meos* (this absurd bringing in of the teeth is from the LXX and Aq.), and the Targ. allegorizes, and whatever also in general is the meaning of the Gemara as far as it exchanges דובבות for רוחשות (vid., Levy under רהש). Besides, the translations *qui commovet* and *qui loqui facit* fall together according to the sense. For when it is said of generous wine, that it makes the lips of sleepers move, a movement is meant expressing itself in the sleeper speaking. But generous wine is a figure of the love-responses of the beloved, sipped in, as it were, with pleasing satisfaction, which hover still around the sleepers in delightful dreams, and fill them with hallucinations.

**Son. 7:11.** It is impossible that לדודי in v. 10 has any other reference than it has in v. 11, where it is without doubt Shulamith who speaks.

*11 I am my beloved's  
And to me goeth forth his desire.*

After the words “I am my beloved’s,” we miss the “and my beloved is mine” of 6: 3, cf. 2:16, which perhaps had dropped out. The second line here refers back to Gen. 3:16, for here, as there, תשוקה, from שיק, to impel, move, is the impulse of love as a natural power. When a wife is the object of such passion, it is possible that, on the one side, she feels herself very fortunate therein; and, on the other side, if the love, in its high commendations, becomes excessive, oppressed, and when she perceive that in her love-relation she is the observed of many eyes, troubled. It is these mingled feelings which move Shulamith when she continues the praise so richly lavished on her in words which denote what she might be to the king, but immediately breaks off in order that, as the following verse now shows, she might use this superabundance of his love for the purpose of setting forth her request, and thus of leading into another path; her simple, child-like disposition longs for the quietness and plainness of rural life, away from the bustle and display of city and court life.

*12 Up, my lover, we will go into the country,  
Lodge in the villages.*

**Son. 7:12.** Hitzig here begins a new scene, to which he gives the superscription: “Shulamith making haste to return home with her lover.” The advocate of the shepherd-hypothesis thinks that the faithful Shulamith, after

hearing Solomon's panegyric, shakes her head and says: "I am my beloved's." To him she calls, "Come, my beloved;" for, as Ewald seeks to make this conceivable: the golden confidence of her near triumph lifts her in spirit forthwith above all that is present and all that is actual; only to him may she speak; and as if she were half here and half already there, in the midst of her rural home along with him, she says, "Let us go out into the fields," etc. In fact, there is nothing more incredible than this Shulamitess, whose dialogue with Solomon consists of Solomon's addresses, and of answers which are directed, not to Solomon, but in a monologue to her shepherd; and nothing more cowardly and more shadowy than this lover, who goes about in the moonlight seeking his beloved shepherdess whom he has lost, glancing here and there through the lattices of the windows and again disappearing. How much more justifiable is the drama of the Song by the French Jesuit C. F. Menestrier (born in Sion 1631, died 1705), who, in his two little works on the opera and the ballet, speaks of Solomon as the creator of the opera, and regards the Song as a shepherd-play, in which his love-relation to the daughter of the king of Egypt is set forth under the allegorical figures of the love of a shepherd and a shepherdess! <sup>1107</sup>

For Shulamith is thought of as a רֹעֵה [shepherdess], 1: 8, and she thinks of Solomon as a רֹעֵה [shepherd]. She remains so in her inclination even after her elevation to the rank of a queen. The solitude and glory of external nature are dearer to her than the bustle and splendour of the city and the court. Hence her pressing out of the city to the country. הַשְּׂדֵה is local, without external designation, like *rus* (to the country). בְּכַפְרִים (here and at 1Ch. 27:25) is plur. of the unused form כַּפַּר (constr. כְּפַר, Jos. 18:24) or כַּפַּר, Arab. *kafar* (cf. the Syr. dimin. *kafrûno*, a little town), instead of which it is once pointed כְּפַר, 1Sa. 6:18, of that name of a district of level country with which a multitude of later Palest. names of places, such as כַּפַּר נָחוּם, are connected. Ewald, indeed, understands *k<sup>e</sup>phārim* as at 4:13: we will lodge among the fragrant Al-henna bushes. But yet בְּכַפְּרִי cannot be equivalent to תַּחַת הַכַּפְרִים; and since לֵיָן (probably changed from לֵיל) and הַשְּׂדֵה, 13a, stand together, we must suppose that they wished to find a bed in the henna bushes; which, if it were conceivable, would be too gipsy-like, even for a pair of lovers of the rank of shepherds (vid., Job. 30: 7). No. Shulamith's words express a wish for a journey into the country: they will there be in freedom, and at night find shelter (בְּכַפְּרִי, as 1Ch. 27:25 and Neh. 6: 2, where also the plur. is similarly used), now in this and now in that country place. Spoken to the supposed shepherd, that would be comical, for a shepherd does not wander from village to village; and that, returning to their home, they wished to turn aside into villages and



spend the night there, cannot at all be the meaning. But spoken of a shepherdess, or rather a vine-dresser, who has been raised to the rank of queen, it accords with her relation to Solomon, — they are married, — as well as with the inexpressible impulse of her heart after her earlier homely country-life. The former vine-dresser, the child of the Galilean hills, the lily of the valley, speaks in the verses following.

*13 In the morning we will start for the vineyards,  
See whether the vine is in bloom,  
Whether the vine-blossoms have opened,  
The pomegranates budded —  
There will I give thee my love.*

*14 The mandrakes breathe a pleasant odour,  
And over our doors are all kinds of excellent fruits,  
New, also old,  
Which, my beloved, I have kept for thee.*

**Son. 7:13, 14.** As the rising up early follows the tarrying over night, the description of that which is longed for moves forward. As **הַשְּׂבִים** is denom. of **שָׂבַם**, and properly signifies only to shoulder, i.e., to rise, make oneself ready, when early going forth needs to be designated it has generally **בִּפְקֹר** (cf. Jos. 6:15) along with it; yet this word may also be wanting, 1Sa. 9:26; 17:16. **נִשְׁבַּ לְבָרַ = נִשְׁבַּ לְבָרַ**, an abbreviation of the expression which is also found in hist. prose, Gen. 19:27; cf. 2Ki. 19: 9. They wished in the morning, when the life of nature can best be observed, and its growth and progress and striving upwards best contemplated, to see whether the vine had opened, i.e., unfolded (thus, 6:11), whether the vine-blossom (vid., at 2:13) had expanded (LXX ἤνεθυσεν ὁ κυπρισμός), whether the pomegranate had its flowers or flower-buds (**הַנִּצְוֹ**, as at 6:11); **פִּתְחָה** is here, as at Isa. 48: 8; 60:11, used as internally transitive: to accomplish or to undergo the opening, as also (Arab.) *fattah*<sup>1108</sup> is used of the blooming of flowers, for (Arab.) *tafttah* (to unfold). The vineyards, inasmuch as she does not say **בְּרַמְיֵנוּ**, are not alone those of her family, but generally those of her home, but of *her* home; for these are the object of her desire, which in this pleasant journey with her beloved she at once in imagination reaches, flying, as it were, over the intermediate space. There, in undisturbed quietness, and in a lovely region consecrating love, will she give herself to him in the entire fulness of her love. By **וְדָרַי** she means the evidences of her love (vid., under 4:10; 1: 2), which she will there grant to him as thankful responses to his own. Thus she speaks in the spring-time, in the month Ijjar, corresponding to our *Wonnemond* (pleasure-month, May), and seeks to give emphasis to her promise by this, that she directs him to the fragrant

“mandragoras,” and to the precious fruits of all kinds which she has kept for him on the shelf in her native home.

דִּוּדִי (after the form לִוּלִי), love’s flower, is the *mandragora officinalis*, L., with whitish green flowers and yellow apples of the size of nutmegs, belonging to the Solanaceae; its fruits and roots are used as an aphrodisiac, therefore this plant was called by the Arabs *abd al-sal’m*, the servant of love, *postillon d’amour*; the son of Leah found such mandrakes (LXX Gen. 30:14, *μῆλα μανδραγορῶν*) at the time of the vintage, which falls in the month of Ijjar; they have a strong but pleasant odour. In Jerusalem mandrakes are rare; but so much the more abundantly are they found growing wild in Galilee, whither Shulamith is transported in spirit. Regarding the מַגְדִּים (from מָגַד, occurring in the sing. exclusively in the blessing of Moses, Deu. 33), which in the Old Testament is peculiar to the Song, vid., 4:13, 16. From “over our doors,” down to “I have kept for thee,” is, according to the LXX, Syr., Jerome, and others, one sentence, which in itself is not inadmissible; for the object can precede its verb, 3: 3*b*, and can stand as the subject between the place mentioned and the verb, Isa. 32:13*a*, also as the object, 2Ch. 31: 6, which, as in the passage before us, may be interpunctuated with *Athnach* for the sake of emphasis; in the bibl. Chald. this inverted sequence of the words is natural, e.g., Dan. 2:17*b*. But such a long-winded sentence is at least not in the style of the Song, and one does not rightly see why just “over our doors” has the first place in it. I therefore formerly translated it as did Luther, dividing it into parts: “and over our doors are all kinds of precious fruits; I have,” etc. But with this departure from the traditional division of the verse nothing is gained; for the “keeping” (laying up) refers naturally to the fruits of the preceding year, and in the first instance can by no means refer to fruits of this year, especially as Shulamith, according to the structure of the poem, has not visited her parental home since her home-bringing in marriage, and now for the first time, in the early summer, between the barley harvest and the wheat harvest, is carried away thither in her longing. Therefore the expression, “my beloved, I have kept for thee,” is to be taken by itself, but not as an independent sentence (Böttch.), but is to be rendered, with Ewald, as a relative clause; and this, with Hitz., is to be referred to יְשָׁנִים (old). *Col* refers to the many sorts of precious fruits which, after the time of their ingathering, are divided into “new and old” (Mat. 13:52). The plur. “our doors,” which as amplif. poet. would not be appropriate here, supposes several entrances into her parents’ home; and since “I have kept” refers to a particular preserving of choice fruits, *al* does not (Hitzig) refer to a floor, such as the floor above the family dwelling or above the barn, but to the shelf above the inner doors, a board placed over them, on which certain things are wont to be laid past for some particular object. She speaks to the king like a child; for although highly elevated, she yet remains, without self-elation, a child.

**Son. 8: 1.** If Solomon now complies with her request, yields to her invitation, then she will again see her parental home, where, in the days of her first love, she laid up for him that which was most precious, that she might thereby give him joy. Since she thus places herself with her whole soul back again in her home and amid its associations, the wish expressed in these words that follow rises up within her in the childlike purity of her love:

*8: 1 O that thou wert like a brother to me,  
Who sucked my mother's breasts!  
If I found thee without, I would kiss thee;  
They also could not despise me.*

*2 I would lead thee, bring thee into my mother's house;  
Thou wouldest instruct me —  
I would give thee to drink spiced wine,  
The must of my pomegranates.*

Solomon is not her brother, who, with her, hung upon the same mother's breast; but she wishes, carried away in her dream into the reality of that she wished for, that she had him as her brother, or rather, since she says, not אָחִי, but אָחִיךָ (with אָ, which here has not, as at Psa. 35:14, the meaning of *tanquam*, but of *instar*, as at Job. 24:14), that she had in him what a brother is to a sister. In that case, if she found him without, she would kiss him (hypoth. fut. in the protasis, and fut. without *Vav* in the apodosis, as at Job. 20:24; Hos. 8:12; Psa. 139:18) — she could do this without putting any restraint on herself for the sake of propriety (cf. the kiss of the wanton harlot, Pro. 7:13), and also (אָחִיךָ) without needing to fear that they who saw it would treat it scornfully (אָחִיךָ, as in the reminiscence, Pro. 6:30). The close union which lies in the sisterly relationship thus appeared to her to be higher than the near connection established by the marriage relationship, and her childlike feeling deceived her not: the sisterly relationship is certainly purer, firmer, more enduring than that of marriage, so far as this does not deepen itself into an equality with the sisterly, and attain to friendship, yea, brotherhood (Pro. 17:17), within. That Shulamith thus feels herself happy in the thought that Solomon was to her as a brother, shows, in a characteristic manner, that “the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life,” were foreign to her. If he were her brother, she would take him by the hand,<sup>109</sup> and bring him into her mother's house, and he would then, under the eye of their common mother, become her teacher, and she would become his scholar. The LXX adds, after the words “into my mother's house,” the phrase, καὶ εἰς ταμείον τῆς συλλαβούσης με, cf. 3: 4. In the same manner also the Syr., which has not read the words διδάξεις με following, which are found in some Codd. of the LXX. Regarding the word *t'amm'dēne* (thou wouldest instruct me) as incongruous,

Hitzig asks: What should he then teach her? He refers it to her mother: “who would teach me,” namely, from her own earlier experience, how I might do everything rightly for him. “Were the meaning,” he adds, “*he* should do it, then also it is she who ought to be represented as led home by him into his house, the bride by the bridegroom.” But, correctly, Jerome, the Venet., and Luther: “Thou wouldest (shouldest) instruct me;” also the Targ.: “I would conduct thee, O King Messiah, and bring Thee into the house of my sanctuary; and Thou wouldest teach me (וְתִלְמַדְנִי) to fear God and to walk in His ways.” Not her mother, but Solomon, is in possession of the wisdom which she covets; and if he were her brother, as she wishes, then she would constrain him to devote himself to her as her teacher. The view, favoured by Leo Hebraeus (*Dialog. de amore*, c. III), Joh. Pordage (*Metaphysik*, III 617 ff.), and Rosenmüller, and which commends itself, after the analogy of the *G̃-tagovinda*, Boethius, and Dante, and appears also to show itself in the Syr. title of the book, “Wisdom of the Wise,” that Shulamith is wisdom personified (cf. also 8: 2 with Pro. 9: 2, and 8: 3; 2: 6 with Pro. 4: 8), shatters itself against this תִּלְמַדְנִי; the fact is rather the reverse: Solomon is wisdom in person, and Shulamith is the wisdom-loving soul, <sup>n10</sup> — for Shulamith wishes to participate in Solomon’s wisdom. What a deep view the “Thou wouldest teach me” affords into Shulamith’s heart! She knew how much she yet came short of being to him all that a wife should be. But in Jerusalem the bustle of court life and the burden of his regal duties did not permit him to devote himself to her; but in her mother’s house, if he were once there, he would instruct her, and she would requite him with her spiced wine and with the juice of the pomegranates.

יַיִן הָרֶרֶק, *vinum conditura*, is appos. = genitiv. יַיִן הָרֶרֶק, *vinum conditurae* (ἄρωματίτης in Dioscorides and Pliny), like יַיִן תֵּרֵךְ, Psa. 6: 5, מַיִם לַחֵץ, 1Ki. 22:27, etc., vid., Philippi’s *Stat. Const.* p. 86. אֶשְׁקֶה carries forward אֶשְׁקֶה in a beautiful play upon words. עֵסִים designates the juice as pressed out: the Chald. אַסִּי corresponds to the Heb. דָּרַךְ, used of treading the grapes. It is unnecessary to render רַמְנִי as apoc. plur., like מַנִּי, Psa. 45: 9 (Ewald, § 177a); *rimmoni* is the name she gives to the pomegranate trees belonging to her, — for it is true that this word, *rimmon*, can be used in a collective sense (Deu. 8: 8); but the connection with the possessive suff. excludes this; or by ‘*asis rimmoni* she means the pomegranate must (cf. ποῖτης = *vinum e punicis*, in Dioscorides and Pliny) belonging to her. Pomegranates are not to be thought of as an erotic symbol; <sup>n11</sup> they are named as something beautiful and precious. “O Ali,” says a proverb of Sunna, “eat eagerly only pomegranates (Pers. *anâr*), for their grains are from Paradise.” <sup>n12</sup>

**Son. 8: 3, 4.** Resigning herself now dreamily to the idea that Solomon is her brother, whom she may freely and openly kiss, and her teacher besides, with whom she may sit in confidential intercourse under her mother's eye, she feels herself as if closely embraced by him, and calls from a distance to the daughters of Jerusalem not to disturb this her happy enjoyment:

*3 His left hand is under my head,  
And his right doth embrace me:*

*4 I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem,  
That ye awake not and disturb not love  
Till she please!*

Instead of **תַּחַת לְ**, “underneath,” there is here, as usual, **תַּחַת** (cf. 5b). Instead of **אִם ... וְאִם** in the adjuration, there is here the equivalent **מָה ... וְמָה**; the interrogative **מָה**, which in the Arab. *má* becomes negat., appears here, as at Job. 31: 1, on the way toward this change of meaning. The *per capreas vel per cervas agri* is wanting, perhaps because the natural side of love is here broken, and the **ἔρωσ** strives up into **ἀγάπη**. The daughters of Jerusalem must not break in upon this holy love-festival, but leave it to its own course.

## Sixth Act

### THE RATIFICATION OF THE COVENANT OF LOVE IN SHULAMITH'S NATIVE HOME — CH. 8: 5-14

#### FIRST SCENE OF THE SIXTH ACT, SON. 8: 5-7

Shulamith's longing wish attains its satisfaction. Arm in arm with Solomon, she comes forth and walks with him on her native ground. Sunem (Sulem), at the west end of Little Hermon (*Gebel ed-Duh*), lay something more than 1 1/2 hour<sup>n13</sup> to the north of Jezreel (*Zera ʿn*), which also lay at the foot of a mountain, viz., on a N.-W. spur of Gilboa. Between the two lay the valley of Jezreel in the “great plain,” which was called, 2Ch. 35:22, Zec. 12:11, “the valley of *Megiddo*” [Esdraelon], now *Merj ibn Amir* — an extensive level plain, which, seen from the south Galilean hills in the springtime, appears “like a green sea encompassed by gently sloping banks.” From this we will have to suppose that the loving pair from the town of Jezreel, the highest point of which afforded a wide, pleasant prospect, wandered on foot through the “valley of Jezreel,” a beautiful, well-watered, fruitful valley, which is here called **מְדִבְרָה**, as being uncultivated pasture land. They bend their way toward the little village lying in the valley, from which the dark sloping sides of Little Hermon rise up suddenly. Here in this valley are the countrymen (*populares*) of those

wanderers, as yet unrecognised from a distance, into whose mouth the poet puts these words:

*5a Who is this coming up out of the wilderness,  
Leaning on her beloved?*

**Son. 8: 5.** The third Act, 3: 6, began with a similar question to that with which the sixth here commences. The former closed the description of the growth of the love-relation, the latter closes that of the consummated love-relation. Instead of “out of the wilderness,” the LXX has “clothed in white” (λελευκανθισμένη); the translator has gathered מְתַחַנְנֶת from the illegible consonants of his MS before him. On the contrary, he translates מתרפקת correctly by ἐπιστηριζομένη (Symm. ἐπεριδομένη, Venet. κεκτηκυῖα ἐπί, wearily supporting herself on...), while Jerome renders it unsuitably by *deliciis affluens*, interchanging the word with מְתַפְנֶקֶת. But הִתְרַפֵּק, common to the Heb. with the Arab. and Ethiop., signifies to support oneself, from רָפַק, *sublevare* (French, *soulager*), Arab. *rafaka, rafuka*, to be helpful, serviceable, compliant, 8 *irtafaka*, to support oneself on the elbow, or (with the elbow) on a pillow (cf. *raf-k*, fellow-traveller, *rufka*, a company of fellow-travellers, from the primary idea of mutually supporting or being helpful to each other); Ethiop. *rafaka*, to encamp for the purpose of taking food, ἀνακλίνεσθαι (cf. Joh. 13:23). That Shulamith leant on her beloved, arose not merely from her weariness, with the view of supplementing her own weakness from his fulness of strength, but also from the ardour of the love which gives to the happy and proud Solomon, raised above all fears, the feeling of his having her in absolute possession. The road brings the loving couple near to the apple tree over against Shulamith’s parental home, which had been the witness of the beginning of their love.

*5b Under the apple tree I waked thy love:  
There thy mother travailed with thee;  
There travailed she that bare thee.*

The words, “under the apple tree I waked thee,” עוֹרְרָתִיךָ, might be regarded as those of Shulamith to Solomon: here, under this apple tree, where Solomon met with her, she won his first love; for the words cannot mean that she wakened him from sleep under the apple tree, since עוֹרֵר has nowhere the meaning of הִקְיִן and הִעִיר here given to it by Hitzig, but only that of “to stir, to stir up, to arouse;” and only when sleep or a sleepy condition is the subject, does it mean “to shake out of sleep, to rouse up” (vid., under 2: 7). But it is impossible that “there” can be used by Shulamith even in the sense of the shepherd hypothesis; for the pair of lovers do not wander to the parental home of the lover, but of his beloved. We must then here altogether change the

punctuation of the text, and throughout restore the fem. suffix forms as those originally used: עֹרְרִיתִיךָ, חֲבֵלֶתְךָ אֶמֶד, <sup>¶14</sup> and יִלְדֶתְךָ (cf. שׁוֹׁ, Isa. 47:10), in which we follow the example of the Syr. The allegorizing interpreters also meet only with trouble in regarding the words as those of Shulamith to Solomon. If הַתְּפוּחַ were an emblem of the Mount of Olives, which, being wonderfully divided, gives back Israel's dead (Targ.), or an emblem of Sinai (Rashi), in both cases the words are more appropriately regarded as spoken to Shulamith than by her. Aben-Ezra correctly reads them as the words of Shulamith to Solomon, for he thinks on prayers, which are like golden apples in silver bowls; Hahn, for he understands by the apple tree, Canaan, where with sorrow his people brought him forth as their king; Hengstenberg, rising up to a remote-lying comparison, says, "the mother of the heavenly Solomon is at the same time the mother of Shulamith." Hoelemann thinks on Sur. 19:32 f., according to which 'Isa, Miriam's son, was born under a palm tree; but he is not able to answer the question, What now is the meaning here of the apple tree as Solomon's birthplace? If it were indeed to be interpreted allegorically, then by the apple tree we would rather understand the "tree of knowledge" of Paradise, of which Aquila, followed by Jerome, with his *ἐκαὶ διεφθάρη*, appears to think, — a view which recently Godet approves of; <sup>¶15</sup> there Shulamith, i.e., poor humanity, awakened the compassionate love of the heavenly Solomon, who then gave her, as a pledge of this love, the *Protevangelium*, and in the neighbourhood of this apple tree, i.e., on the ground and soil of humanity fallen, but yet destined to be saved, Shulamith's mother, i.e., the pre-Christian O.T. church, brought forth the Saviour from itself, who in love raised Shulamith from the depths to regal honour. But the Song of Songs does not anywhere set before us the task of extracting from it by an allegorizing process such far-fetched thoughts. If the masc. suff. is changed into the fem., we have a conversation perfectly corresponding to the situation. Solomon reminds Shulamith by that memorable apple tree of the time when he kindled within her the fire of first love; עֹרְרִי elsewhere signifies energy (Psa. 80: 3), or passion (Pro. 10:12), put into a state of violent commotion; connected with the accus. of the person, it signifies, Zec. 9:13, excited in a warlike manner; here, placed in a state of pleasant excitement of love that has not yet attained its object. Of how many references to contrasted affections the reflex. הַתְּעִׁ is capable, is seen from Job. 17: 8; 31:29; why not thus also עֹרְרִי?

With שְׁמָה Solomon's words are continued, but not in such a way as that what follows also took place under the apple tree. For Shulamith is not the child of Beduins, who in that case might even have been born under an apple tree. Among the Beduins, a maiden accidentally born at the watering-place (*menh<sup>l</sup>*),



on the way (*rah<sup>2</sup>l*), in the dew (*tall*) or snow (*thelg*), is called from that circumstance *Munêhil*, *Ruhêla*, *Talla*, or *Thelga*.<sup>f16</sup>

The birthplace of her love is not also the birthplace of her life. As **הַתְּפוּחַ** points to the apple tree to which their way led them, so **שְׂמָחָה** points to the end of their way, the parental home lying near by (Hitzig). The LXX translates well: **ἐκεῖ ὠδίνησέ σε ἡ μήτηρ σου**, for while the Arab. *ḥabida* means *concipere*, and its *Pi*, *ḥabbada*, is the usual word for *gravidam facere*, **חָבַל** in the passage before us certainly appears to be<sup>f17</sup> a denom. *Pi*. in the sense of “to bring forth with sorrow” (**חָבַל יְלִדָהּ**). The LXX further translates: **ἐκεῖ ὠδίνησέ σε ἡ τεκοῦσά σε**, in which the **σε** is inserted, and is thus, as also by the Syr., Jerome, and Venet., translated, with the obliteration of the finite **יְלִדָהּ**, as if the reading were **יְלִדָהּ**. But not merely is the name of the mother intentionally changed, it is also carried forward from the labour, *eniti*, to the completed act of birth.

**Son. 8: 6, 7.** After Solomon has thus called to remembrance the commencement of their love-relation, which receives again a special consecration by the reference to Shulamith’s parental home, and to her mother, Shulamith answers with a request to preserve for her this love.

*6 Place me as a signet-ring on thy heart,  
As a signet-ring on thine arm!  
For strong as death is love;  
Inexorable as hell is jealousy:  
Its flames are flames of fire,  
A flame of Jah.*

*7 Mighty waters are unable to quench such love,  
And rivers cannot overflow it.  
If a man would give  
All the wealth of his house for love, —  
He would only be contemned.*

The signet-ring, which is called **חֶתֶם** (**חָתַם**, to impress), was carried either by a string on the breast, Gen. 38:18, or also, as that which is called **טַבַּאת** denotes (from **טָבַע**, to sink into), on the hand, Jer. 22:24, cf. Gen. 41:42, Est. 3:12, but not on the arm, like a bracelet, 2Sa. 1:10; and since it is certainly permissible to say “hand” for “finger,” but not “arm” for “hand,” so we may not refer “on thine arm” to the figure if the signet-ring, as if Shulamith had said, as the poet might also introduce her as saying: Make me like a signet-ring (**כַּחֲתָם**) on thy breast; make me like a signet-ring “on thy hand,” or “on thy right hand.” The words, “set me on thy heart,” and “(set me) on thine arm,”

must thus also, without regard to “as a signet-ring,” express independent thoughts, although **שִׁמְנִי** is chosen (vid., Hag. 2:23) instead of **קָחֵנִי**, in view of the comparison. <sup>f118</sup>

Thus, with right, Hitzig finds the thought therein expressed: “Press me close to thy breast, enclose me in thine arms.” But it is the first request, and not the second, which is in the form **עַל-זְרוּעֶךָ**, and not **עַל-זְרוּעֶתֶיךָ** (**שִׁמְנִי**), which refers to embracing, since the subject is not the relation of person and thing, but of person and person. The signet-ring comes into view as a jewel, which one does not separate from himself; and the first request is to this effect, that he would bear her thus inalienably (the art. is that of the specific idea) on his heart (Exo. 28:29); the meaning of the second, that he would take her thus inseparably as a signet-ring on his arm (cf. Hos. 11: 3: “I have taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms”), so that she might lie always on his heart, and have him always at her side (cf. Psa. 110: 5): she wishes to be united and bound to him indissolubly in the affection of love and in the community of life’s experience.

The reason for the double request following **כִּי**, abstracted from the individual case, rises to the universality of the fact realized by experience, which specializes itself herein, and celebrates the praise of love; for, assigning a reason for her “set me,” she does not say, “my love,” nor “thy love,” but **אַהֲבָה**, “love” (as also in the address at 7: 7). She means love undivided, unfeigned, entire, and not transient, but enduring; thus true and genuine love, such as is real, what the word denotes, which exhausts the conception corresponding to the idea of love.

**קִנְיָאָה**, which is here parallel to “love,” is the jealousy of love asserting its possession and right of property; the reaction of love against any diminution of its possession, against any reserve in its response, the “self-vindication of angry love.” <sup>f119</sup>

Love is a passion, i.e., a human affection, powerful and lasting, as it comes to light in “jealousy.” *Zelus*, as defined by Dav. Chyträus, *est affectus mixtus ex amore et ira, cum videlicet amans aliquid irascitur illi, a quo laeditur res amata*, wherefore here the adjectives **אַהֲבָה** (strong) and **קָשָׁה** (hard, inexorable, firm, severe) are respectively assigned to “love” and “jealousy,” as at Gen. 49: 7 to “anger” and “wrath.” It is much more remarkable that the energy of love, which, so to say, is the life of life, is compared to the energy of death and Hades; with at least equal right **מִמּוֹת** and **מִמְשָׁאֹל** (might be used, for love scorns both, outlasts both, triumphs over both (Rom. 8:38f.; 1Co. 15:54f.). But the text does not speak of surpassing, but of equality; not of love and jealousy

that they surpass death and Hades, but that they are equal to it. The point of comparison in both cases is to be obtained from the predicates. **אִס**, powerful, designates the person who, being assailed, cannot be overcome (Num. 13:28), and, assailing, cannot be withstood (Jud. 14:18). Death is obviously thought of as the assailer (Jer. 9:20), against which nothing can hold its ground, from which nothing can escape, to whose sceptre all must finally yield (vid., Psa. 49). Love is like it in this, that it also seizes upon men with irresistible force (Böttcher: "He whom Death assails must die, whom Love assails must love"); and when she has once assailed him, she rests not till she has him wholly under her power; she kills him, as it were, in regard to everything else that is not the object of his love. **קָשָׁה**, hard (opposed to **רַךְ**, 2Sa. 3:39), **σκληρός**, designates one on whom no impression is made, who will not yield (Psa. 48: 4; 19: 4), or one whom stern fate has made inwardly stubborn and obtuse (1Sa. 1:15). Here the point of comparison is inflexibility; for *Sheol*, thought of with **שֹׁאֵל**, to ask (vid., under Isa. 5:14), is the God-ordained messenger of wrath, who inexorably gathers in all that are on the earth, and holds them fast when once they are swallowed up by him. So the jealousy of love wholly takes possession of the beloved object not only in arrest, but also in safe keeping; she holds her possession firmly, that it cannot be taken from her (Wisd. 2: 1), and burns relentlessly and inexorably against any one who does injury to her possession (Pro. 6:34 f.). But when Shulamith wishes, in the words, "set me," etc., to be bound to the heart and to the arm of Solomon, has she in the clause assigning a reason the love in view with which she loves, or that with which she is loved? Certainly not the one to the exclusion of the other; but as certainly, first of all, the love with which she wishes to fill, and believes that she does fill, her beloved. If this is so, then with "for strong as death is love," she gives herself up to this love on the condition that it confesses itself willing to live only for her, and to be as if dead for all others; and with "inexorable as hell is jealousy," in such a manner that she takes shelter in the jealousy of this love against the occurrence of any fit of infidelity, since she consents therein to be wholly and completely absorbed by it.

To **קָנָה**, which proceeds from the primary idea of a red glow, there is connected the further description of this love to the sheltering and protecting power of which she gives herself up: "its flames, **רִשְׁפֵיהָ**, are flames of fire;" its sparkling is the sparkling of fire. The verb **רָשַׁף** signifies, in Syr. and Arab., to creep along, to make short steps; in Heb. and Chald., to sparkle, to flame, which in Samar. is referred to impetuosity. Symmachus translates, after the Samar. (which Hitzig approves of): *αἱ ὀρμαὶ αὐτοῦ ὀρμαὶ πύρινοι*; the Venet., after Kimchi, *ἄνθρακες*, for he exchanges **רִשְׁפֵיהָ** with the probably non.-cogn. **רִצְפֵיהָ**; others render it all with words which denote the bright glancings of fire.

רְשָׁפִי (so here, according to the Masora; on the contrary, at Psa. 76: 4, רְשָׁפִי) are effulgurations; the pred. says that these are not only of a bright shining, but of a fiery nature, which, as they proceed from fire, so also produce fire, for they set on fire and kindle. <sup>n20</sup>

Love, in its flashings up, is like fiery flashes of lightning; in short, it is שְׁלֵהֶבְתָּה, <sup>n21</sup> which is thus to be written as one word with הֵּ raphatum, according to the Masora; but in this form of the word הֵּ is also the name of God, and more than a meaningless superlative strengthening of the idea. As לְהֶבֶה is formed from the Kal לָהֵב to flame (R. לָב, to lick, like לָהֵט, R. לָט, to twist), so is שְׁלֵהֶבְתָּה, from the Shafel שָׁלַהֵב, to cause to flame; this active stem is frequently found, especially in the Aram., and has in the Assy. almost wholly supplanted the Afel (vid., Schrader in *Deu. Morg. Zeit.* xxvi. 275). שְׁלֵהֶבְתָּה is thus related primarily to לָהֵב, as *inflammatio* to (Ger.) *Flamme*; הֵּ thus presents itself the more naturally to be interpreted as *gen. subjecti*. Love of a right kind is a flame not kindled and inflamed by man (Job. 20:26), but by God — the divinely-influenced free inclination of two souls to each other, and at the same time, as is now further said, 7a, 7b, a situation supporting all adversities and assaults, and a pure personal relation conditioned by nothing material. It is a fire-flame which mighty waters (רַבִּים, great and many, as at Hab. 3:15; cf. אֵזִים, wild, Isa. 43:16) cannot extinguish, and streams cannot overflow it (cf. Psa. 69: 3; 124: 4) or sweep it away (cf. Job. 14:19; Isa. 28:17). Hitzig adopts the latter signification, but the figure of the fire makes the former more natural; no heaping up of adverse circumstances can extinguish true love, as many waters extinguish elemental fire; no earthly power can suppress it by the strength of its assault, as streams drench all they sweep over in their flow — the flame of Jah is inextinguishable.

Nor can this love be bought; any attempt to buy it would be scorned and counted madness. The expressions is like Pro. 6:30 f., cf. Num. 22:18; 1Co. 13: 3. Regarding הוֹן (from הוֹן, (Arab.) *han*, *levem esse*), convenience, and that by which life is made comfortable, vid., at Pro. 1:13. According to the shepherd-hypothesis, here occurs the expression of the peculiar point of the story of the intercourse between Solomon and Shulamith; she scorns the offers of Solomon; her love is not to be bought, and it already belongs to another. But of offers we read nothing beyond 1:11, where, as in the following v. 12, it is manifest that Shulamith is in reality excited in love. Hitzig also remarks under 1:12: “When the speaker says the fragrance of her nard is connected with the presence of the king, she means that only then does she smell the fragrance of nard, i.e., only his presence awakens in her heart pleasant sensations or sweet feelings.” Shulamith manifestly thus speaks, also emphasizing 6:12, the

spontaneousness of her relation to Solomon; but Hitzig adds: “These words, 1:12, are certainly spoken by a court lady.” But the Song knows only a chorus of the “Daughters of Jerusalem” — that court lady is only a phantom, by means of which Hitzig’s ingenuity seeks to prop up the shepherd-hypothesis, the weakness of which his penetration has discerned. As we understand the Song, v. 7 refers to the love with which Shulamith loves, as decidedly as 6*b* to the love with which she is loved. Nothing in all the world is able to separate her from loving the king; it is love to his person, not love called forth by a desire for riches which he disposes of, not even by the splendour of the position which awaited her, but free, responsive love with which she answered free love making its approach to her. The poet here represents Shulamith herself as expressing the idea of love embodied in her. That apple tree, where he awaked first love in her, is a witness of the renewal of their mutual covenant of love; and it is significant that only here, just directly here, where the idea of the whole is expressed more fully, and in a richer manner than at 7: 7, is God denoted by His name, and that by His name as revealed in the history of redemption. Hitzig, Ewald, Olshausen, Böttcher, expand this concluding word, for the sake of rhythmic symmetry, to **שְׁלֵהֲבַתֶּיהָ שְׁלֵהֲבַת יָהּ** [its flames are flames of Jah]; but a similar conclusion is found at Psa. 24: 6; 48: 7, and elsewhere.

“I would almost close the book,” says Herder in his *Lied der Lieder* (Song of Songs), 1778, “with this divine seal. It is even as good as closed, for what follows appears only as an appended echo.” Daniel Sanders (1845) closes it with v. 7, places v. 12 after 1: 6, and cuts off vv. 8-11, 13, 14, as not original. Anthologists, like Döpke and Magnus, who treat the Song as the Fragmentists do the Pentateuch, find here their confused medley sanctioned. Umbreit also, 1820, although as for the rest recognising the Song as a compact whole, explains Son. 8: 8-12, 13, 14 as a fragment, not belonging to the work itself. Hoelemann, however, in his *Krone des Hohenliedes* [Crown of the Song], 1856 (thus he names the “concluding Act,” 8: 5-14), believes that there is here represented, not only in vv. 6, 7, but further also in vv. 8-12, the essence of true love — what it is, and how it is won; and then in Son. 8:13 f. he hears the Song come to an end in pure idyllic tones. We see in v. 8 ff. the continuation of the love story practically idealized and set forth in dramatic figures. There is no inner necessity for this continuance. It shapes itself after that which has happened; and although in all history divine reason and moral ideas realize themselves, yet the material by means of which this is done consists of accidental circumstances and free actions passing thereby into reciprocal action. But v. 8 ff. is the actual continuance of the story on to the completed conclusion, not a mere appendix, which might be wanting without anything being thereby missed. For after the poet has set before us the loving pair as they wander arm in arm through the green pasture-land between Jezreel and Sunem

till they reach the environs of the parental home, which reminds them of the commencement of their love relations, he cannot represent them as there turning back, but must present to us still a glimpse of what transpired on the occasion of their visit there. After that first Act of the concluding scene, there is yet wanting a second, to which the first points.

## SECOND SCENE OF THE FIFTH ACT, SON. 8: 8-14

**Son. 8: 8.** The locality of this scene is Shulamith's parental home. It is she herself who speaks in these words:

*8 We have a sister, a little one,  
And she has no breasts:  
What shall we do with our sister  
In the day when she will be sued for?*

Between vv. 8 and 7 is a blank. The figure of the wanderers is followed by the figure of the visitors. But who speaks here? The interchange of the scene permits that Shulamith conclude the one scene and begin the other, as in the first Act; or also that at the same time with the change of scene there is an interchange of persons, as e.g., in the third Act. But if Shulamith speaks, all her words are not by any means included in what is said from v. 8 to v. 10. Since, without doubt, she also speaks in v. 11 f., this whole second figure consists of Shulamith's words, as does also the second of the second Act, Son. 3: 1-5. But there Shulamith's address presents itself as the narrative of an experience, and the narrative dramatically framed in itself is thoroughly penetrated by the *I* of the speaker; but here, as e.g., Ewald, Heiligst., and Böttch. explain, she would begin with a dialogue with her brothers referable to herself, one that had formerly taken place — that little sister, Ewald remarks under v. 10, stands here now grown up she took notice of that severe word formerly spoken by her brothers, and can now joyfully before all exclaim, taking up the same flowery language, that she is a wall, etc. But that a monologue should begin with a dialogue without any introduction, is an impossibility; in this case the poet ought to have left the expression, "of old my mother's sons said," to be supplemented by the reader or hearer. It is true, at Son. 3: 2; 5: 3, we have a former address introduced without any formal indication of the fact; but it is the address of the narrator herself. With v. 8 there will thus begin a colloquy arising out of present circumstances. That in this conversation v. 8 appertains to the brothers, is evident. This harsh *entweder oder (aut...aut)* is not appropriate as coming from Shulamith's mouth; it is her brothers alone, as Hoelemann rightly remarks, who utter these words, as might have been expected from them in view of Son. 1: 6. But does v. 8 belong also to them? There may be two of them, says Hitzig, and the one may in v. 9 reply to the question of the other in

v. 8; Shulamith, who has heard their conversation, suddenly interposes with v. 10. But the transition from the first to the second scene is more easily explained if Shulamith proposes the question of v. 8 for consideration. This is not set aside by Hitzig's questions: "Has she to determine in regard to her sister? and has she now for the first time come to do nothing in haste?" For (1) the dramatic figures of the Song follow each other chronologically, but not without blanks; and the poet does not at all require us to regard v. 8 as Shulamith's first words after her entrance into her parental home; (2) but it is altogether seeming for Shulamith, who has now become independent, and who has been raised so high, to throw out this question of loving care for her sister. Besides, from the fact that with v. 8 there commences the representation of a present occurrence, it is proved that the sister here spoken of is not Shulamith herself. If it were Shulamith herself, the words of vv. 8, 9 would look back to what had previously taken place, which, as we have shown, is impossible. Or does 6: 9 require that we should think of Shulamith as having no sister? Certainly not, for so understood, these words would be purposeless. The "only one," then, does not mean the only one numerically, but, as at Pro. 4: 3, it is emphatic (Hitzig); she is called by Solomon the "only one" of her mother in this sense, that she had not one her equal.

Thus it is Shulamith who here speaks, and she is not the "sister" referred to. The words, "we have a sister...," spoken in the family circle, whether regarded as uttered by Shulamith or not, have something strange in them, for one member of a family does not need thus to speak to another. We expect: With regard to our sister, who is as yet little and not of full age, the question arises, What will be done when she has grown to maturity to guard her innocence? Thus the expression would have stood, but the poet separates it into little symmetrical sentences; for poetry present facts in a different style from prose. Hoelem. has on this remarked that the words are not to be translated: we have a little sister, which the order of the words **וְגַדְתִּי לָךְ אֶת־אֵתְּ** would presuppose, Gen. 40:20; cf. 2Sa. 4: 4; 12: 2 f.; Isa. 26: 1; 33:21. "Little" is not immediately connected with "sister," but follows it as an apposition; and this appositional description lays the ground for the question: We may be now without concern; but when she is grown up and will be courted, what then? "Little" refers to age, as at 2Ki. 5: 2; cf. Gen. 44:20. The description of the child in the words, "she has no breasts," has neither in itself nor particularly for Oriental feeling anything indecent in it (cf. *mammae sororiarunt*, Eze. 16: 7). The **ל** following **מַה־נַּעֲשֶׂה** is here not thus purely the *dat. commodi*, as e.g., Isa. 64: 3 (to act for some one), but *indiff. dat.* (what shall we do for her?); but **מַה** is, according to the connection, as at Gen. 27:37, 1Sa. 10: 2, Isa. 5: 4, equivalent to: What conducing to her advantage? Instead of **בַּיּוֹם**, the form **בַּיּוֹם** lay syntactically



nearer (cf. Exo. 6:28); the art. in **בַּיּוֹם** is, as at Ecc. 12: 3, understood demonstr.: that day when she will be spoken for, i.e., will attract the attention of a suitor. **בַּ** after **דַּבֵּר** may have manifold significations (vid., under Psa. 87: 3); thus the general signification of “concerning,” 1Sa. 19: 3, is modified in the sense of courting a wife, 1Sa. 25:39. The brothers now take speech in hand, and answer Shulamith’s question as to what will have to be done for the future safety of their little sister when the time comes that she shall be sought for:

*9 If she be a wall,  
We will build upon her a pinnacle of silver;  
And if she be a door,  
We will block her up with a board of cedar-wood.*

**Son. 8: 9.** The brothers are the nearest guardians and counsellors of the sister, and, particularly in the matter of marriage, have the precedence even of the father and mother, Gen. 24:50, 55; 34: 6-8.. They suppose two cases which stand in contrast to each other, and announce their purpose with reference to each case. Hoelēm. here affects a synonymous instead of the antithetic parallelism; for he maintains that **וְאִם** (**וְאִם**)...**וְאִם** nowhere denotes a contrast, but, like *sive...sive*, essential indifference. But examples such as Deu. 18: 3 (*sive bovem, sive ovem*) are not applicable here; for this correl. **וְאִם** ... **וְאִם**, denoting essential equality, never begins the antecedents of two principal sentences, but always stands in the component parts of one principal sentence. Wherever **וְאִם** ... **וְאִם** commences two parallel conditional clauses, the parallelism is always, according to the contents of these clauses, either synonymous, Gen. 31:50, Amo. 9: 2-4, Ecc. 11: 3 (where the first **וְאִם** signifies *ac si*, and the second *sive*), or antithetic, Num. 16:29 f.; Job. 36:11 f.; Isa. 1:19 f. The contrast between **חֲזָמָה** (from **חָמַח**, Arab. *ḥaman*, Modern Syr. *chamo*, to preserve, protect) and **דָּלְתָה** (from **דָּלַל**, to hang loose, of doors, Pro. 26:14, which move hither and thither on their hinges) is obvious. A wall stands firm and withstands every assault if it serves its purpose (which is here presupposed, where it is used as a figure of firmness of character). A door, on the contrary, is moveable; and though it be for the present closed (**דָּלְתָה** is intentionally used, and not **פְּתָח**, vid., Gen. 19: 6), yet it is so formed that it can be opened again. A maiden inaccessible to seduction is like a wall, and one accessible to it is like a door. In the apodosis, 9a, the LXX correctly renders **טִירָתָה** by *ἐπάλξεις*; Jerome, by *propugnacula*. But it is not necessary to read **טִירָתָה**. The verb **טוּר**, cogn. **דוּר**, signifies to surround, whence *tirah* (= Arab. *duâr*), a round encampment, Gen. 25:16, and, generally, a habitation, Psa. 69:25; and then also, to range together, whence **טוּר**, a rank, row (cf. Arab. *thur* and *daur*, which, in the manifoldness of their meanings, are parallel with the French *tour*), or also *tirah*,

which, Eze. 46:23 (vid., Keil), denotes the row or layer of masonry, — in the passage before us, a row of battlements (Ew.), or a crown of the wall (Hitz.), i.e., battlements as a wreath on the summit of a wall. Is she a wall, — i.e., does she firmly and successfully withstand all immoral approaches? — then they will adorn this wall with silver pinnacles (cf. Isa. 54:12), i.e., will bestow upon her the high honour which is due to her maidenly purity and firmness; silver is the symbol of holiness, as gold is the symbol of nobility. In the apodosis 9b, אֶל צוּר is not otherwise meant than when used in a military sense of enclosing by means of besieging, but, like Isa. 29: 3, with the obj.-accus., of that which is pressed against that which is to be excluded; צוּר here means, forcibly to press against, as סָגַר, Gen. 2:21, to unite by closing up.

לֹחַ אֶרֶז is a board or plank (cf. Eze. 27: 5, of the double planks of a ship's side) of cedar wood (cf. Zep. 2:14, אֶרְזָה, cedar wainscot). Cedar wood comes here into view not on account of the beautiful polish which it takes on, but merely because of its hardness and durability. Is she a door, i.e., accessible to seduction? They will enclose this door around with a cedar plank, i.e., watch her in such a manner that no seducer or lover will be able to approach her. By this morally stern but faithful answer, Shulamith is carried back to the period of her own maidenhood, when her brothers, with good intention, dealt severely with her. Looking back to this time, she could joyfully confess:

*10 I was a wall,  
And my breasts like towers;  
Then I became in his eyes  
Like one who findeth peace.*

**Son. 8:10.** In the language of prose, the statement would be: Your conduct is good and wise, as my own example shows; of me also ye thus faithfully took care; and that I met this your solicitude with strenuous self-preservation, has become, to my joy and yours, the happiness of my life. That in this connection not חוּמָה אֲנִי, but אֲנִי חוּמָה has to be used, is clear: she compares herself with her sister, and the praise she takes to herself she takes to the honour of her brothers. The comparison of her breasts to towers is suggested by the comparison of her person to a wall; Kleuker rightly remarks that here the comparison is not of thing with thing, but of relation with relation: the breasts were those of her person, as the towers were of the wall, which, by virtue of the power of defence which they conceal within themselves, never permit the enemy, whose attention they attract, to approach them. The two substantival clauses, *murus et ubera mea instar turrium*, have not naturally a retrospective signification, as they would in a historical connection (vid., under Gen. 2:10); but they become retrospective by the following “then I became,” like

Deu. 26: 5, by the historical tense following, where, however, it is to be remarked that the expression, having in itself no relation to time, which is incapable of being expressed in German, mentions the past not in a way that excludes the present, but as including it. She was a wall, and her breasts like the towers, i.e., all seductions rebounded from her, and ventured not near her awe-inspiring attractions; then (אָ, temporal, but at the same time consequent; thereupon, and for this reason, as at Psa. 40: 8, Jer. 22:15, etc.) she became in his (Solomon's) eyes as one who findeth peace. According to the shepherd-hypothesis, she says here: he deemed it good to forbear any further attempts, and to let me remain in peace (Ewald, Hitz., and others). But how is that possible? מִצָּא שְׁלוֹם בְּעֵינַי is a variation of the frequently occurring חָן בְּעֵינַי מִצָּא, which is used especially of a woman gaining the affections of a man, Est. 2:17, Deu. 24: 1, Jer. 31: 2 f.; and the expression here used, "thus I was in his eyes as one who findeth peace" is only the more circumstantial expression for, "then I found (אָ מִצָּאתָּי) in his eyes peace," which doubtless means more than: I brought it to this, that he left me further unmolested; שְׁלוֹם in this case, as syn. of חָן, means inward agreement, confidence, friendship, as at Psa. 41:10; there it means, as in the salutation of peace and in a hundred other cases, a positive good. And why should she use שְׁלוֹם instead of חָן, but that she might form a play upon the name which she immediately, 11a, thereafter utters, שְׁלֹמֵה, which signifies, 1Ch. 22: 9, "The man of peace." That *Shulamith* had found *shalom* (peace) with *Sh<sup>l</sup>omoh* (Solomon), cannot be intended to mean that uninjured she escaped from him, but that she had entered into a relation to him which seemed to her a state of blessed peace. The delicate description, "in his eyes," is designed to indicate that she appeared to him in the time of her youthful discipline as one finding peace. The כּ is כּ *veritatis*, i.e., the comparison of the fact with its idea, Isa. 29: 2, or of the individual with the general and common, Isa. 13: 6; Eze. 26:10; Zec. 14: 3. Here the meaning is, that Shulamith appeared to him corresponding to the idea of one finding peace, and thus as worthy to find peace with him. One "finding peace" is one who gains the heart of a man, so that he enters into a relation of esteem and affection for her. This generalization of the idea also opposes the notion of a history of seduction. מוֹצֵאת is from the ground-form *matsiat*, the parallel form to מוֹצֵאת, 2Sa. 18:22. Solomon has won her, not by persuasion or violence; but because she could be no other man's, he entered with her into the marriage covenant of peace (cf. Pro. 2:17 with Isa. 54:10).

**Son. 8:11, 12.** It now lies near, at least rather so than remote, that Shulamith, thinking of her brothers, presents her request before her royal husband:

***11 Solomon had a vineyard in Baal-hamon;  
He committed the vineyard to the keepers,  
That each should bring for its fruit  
A thousand in silver.***

***12 I myself disposed of my own vineyard:  
The thousand is thine, Solomon,  
And two hundred for the keepers of its fruit!***

The words **כָּרַם הָיָה לְשׁוֹ** are to be translated after **כָּרַם וּגְוִי**, 1Ki. 21: 1, and **לְיָדָיו**..., Isa. 5: 1, “Solomon had a vineyard” (cf. 1Sa. 9: 2; 2Sa. 6:23; 12: 2; 2Ki. 1:17; 1Ch. 23:17; 26:10), not “Solomon has a vineyard,” which would have required the words **כָּרַם לְשׁוֹ**, with the omission of **הָיָה**. I formerly explained, as also Böttcher: a vineyard became his, thus at present is his possession; and thus explaining, one could suppose that it fell to him, on his taking possession of his government, as a component part of his domain; but although in itself **לְיָהּ** can mean, “this or that has become one’s own” (e.g., Lev. 21: 3), as well as “it became his own,” yet here the historical sense is necessarily connected by **הָיָה** with the **נָתַן** foll.: Solomon has had..., he has given; and since Solomon, after possession the vineyard, would probably also preserve it, Hitzig draws from this the conclusion, that the poet thereby betrays the fact that he lived after the time of Solomon. But these are certainly words which he puts into Shulamith’s mouth, and he cannot at least have forgotten that the heroine of his drama is a contemporary of Solomon; and supposing that he had forgotten this for a moment, he must have at least once read over what he had written, and could not have been so blind as to have allowed this **הָיָה** which had escaped him to stand. We must thus assume that he did not in reality retain the vineyard, which, as Hitzig supposes, if he possessed it, he also “probably” retained, whether he gave it away or exchanged it, or sold it, we know not; but the poet might suppose that Shulamith knew it, since it refers to a piece of land lying not far from her home. For **בְּאֵל הַמֶּזֶן**, LXX **Βελαμών**, is certainly the same as that mentioned in Judith 8: 3, according to which Judith’s husband died from sunstroke in Bethulia, and was buried beside his fathers “between *Dothaim* and *Balamōn*”<sup>f122</sup> (probably, as the sound of the word denotes, *Belmen*, or, more accurately, *Belmaïn*, as it is also called in Judith 4: 4, with which Kleuker in Schenkel’s *Bibl. Lex.*, de Bruyn in his *Karte*, and others, interchange it; and **הַמֶּזֶן**, Jos. 19:28, lying in the tribe of Asher). This *Balamōn* lay not far from Dothan, and thus not far from *Esdräelon*; for Dothan lay (cf. Judith 3:10) south of the plain of Jezreel, where it has been discovered, under the name of *Tell Dotan*, in the midst of a smaller plain which lies embosomed in the hills of the south.<sup>f123</sup>

The ancients, since Aquila, Symm., Targ., Syr., and Jerome, make the name of the place Baal-hamon subservient to their allegorizing interpretation, but only by the aid of soap-bubble-like fancies; e.g., Hengst. makes *Baal-hamon* designate the world; *nothrim* [keepers], the nations; the 1000 pieces in silver, the duties comprehended in the ten commandments. *Hamon* is there understood of a large, noisy crowd. The place may, indeed, have its name from the multitude of its inhabitants, or from an annual market held there, or otherwise from revelry and riot; for, according to Hitzig,<sup>†24</sup> there is no ground for coordinating it with names such as *Baal-Gad* and *Baal-Zephon*, in which *Baal* is the general, and what follows the special name of God. *Amon*, the Sun-God, specially worshipped in Egyptian Thebes, has the bibl. name אֲמוֹן, with which, after the sound of the word, accords the name of a place lying, according to *Jer. Demai* ii. 1, in the region of Tyrus, but no הַמוֹן. The reference to the Egypt. *Amon Ra*, which would direct rather to Baalbec, the Coele-Syrian Heliopolis, is improbable; because the poet would certainly not have introduced into his poem the name of the place where the vineyard lay, if this name did not call forth an idea corresponding to the connection. The Shulamitess, now become Solomon's, in order to support the request she makes to the king, relates an incident of no historical value in itself of the near-lying Sunem (Sulem), situated not far from Baal-hamon to the north, on the farther side of the plain of Jezreel. She belongs to a family whose inheritance consisted in vineyards, and she herself had acted in the capacity of the keeper of a vineyard, 1: 6, — so much the less therefore is it to be wondered at that she takes an interest in the vineyard of Baal-hamon, which Solomon had let out to keepers on the condition that they should pay to him for its fruit-harvest the sum of 1000 shekels of silver (*shekel* is, according to Ges. § 120. 4, Anm. 2, to be supplied).

בָּא, since we have interpreted הִיהָ retrospectively, might also indeed be rendered imperfect. as equivalent to *afferebat*, or, according to Ewald, § 136c, *afferre solebat*, but since בָּא = ἐξέδοτο, Mat. 21:33, denotes a gift laying the recipients under an obligation, בָּא is used in the sense of לָמַעַן (אֲשֶׁר) לָמַעַן; however, לָמַעַן is not to be supplied (Symm. ἐνέγκη), but בָּא in itself signifies *afferre debebat* (he ought to bring), like אֵל, Dan. 1: 5, they should stand (wait upon), Ewald, § 136g. Certainly נֹטְרִים does not mean tenants, but watchers, — the post-bibl. language has חָכַר, to lease, קָבַל, to take on lease, חֲכוּר, rent, e.g., *Mez'a* ix. 2, — but the subject here is a *locatio conductio*; for the vine-plants of that region are entrusted to the “keepers” for a rent, which they have to pay, not in fruits but in money, as the equivalent of a share of the produce (the ב in בִּפְרֵךְ is the ב *pretii*). Isa. 7:23 is usually compared; but there

the money value of a particularly valuable portion of a vineyard, consisting of 1000 vines, is given at “1000 silverlings” (1 shekel); while, on the other hand, the 1000 shekels here are the rent for a portion of a vineyard, the extent of which is not mentioned. But that passage in Isaiah contains something explanatory of the one before us, inasmuch as we see from it that a vineyard was divided into portions of a definite number of vines in each. Such a division into *m<sup>e</sup>komoth* is also here supposed. For if each “keeper” to whom the vineyard was entrusted had to count 1000 shekels for its produce, then the vineyard was at the same time committed to several keepers, and thus was divided into small sections (Hitzig). It is self-evident that the gain of the produce that remained over after paying the rent fell to the “keepers;” but since the produce varied, and also the price of wine, this gain was not the same every year, and only in general are we to suppose from 12*b*, that it yielded on an average about 20 per cent. For the vineyard which Shulamith means in 12*b* is altogether different from that of Baal-hamon. It is of herself she says, 1: 6, that as the keeper of a vineyard, exposed to the heat of the day, she was not in a position to take care of her own vineyard. This her own vineyard is not her beloved (Hoelem.), which not only does not harmonize with 1: 6 (for she there looks back to the time prior to her elevation), but her own person, as comprehending everything pleasant and lovely which constitutes her personality (Son. 4:12-5: 1), as *kerem* is the sum-total of the vines which together form a vineyard.

Of this figurative vineyard she says: **בְּרַמִּי שְׁלִי לְפָנָי**. This must mean, according to Hitzig, Hoelem., and others, that it was under her protection; but although the idea of affectionate care may, in certain circumstances, be connected with **לְפָנָי**, Gen. 17:18, Pro. 4: 3, yet the phrase: this or that is **לְפָנָי**, wherever it has not merely a local or temporal, but an ethical signification, can mean nothing else than: it stands under my direction, Gen. 13: 9; 20:15; 47: 6; 2Ch. 14: 6; Gen. 24:51; 1Sa. 16:16. Rightly Heiligst., after Ewald: *in potestate mea est*. Shulamith also has a vineyard, which she is as free to dispose of as Solomon of his at Baal-hamon. It is the totality of her personal and mental endowments. This vineyard has been given over with free and joyful cordiality into Solomon’s possession. This vineyard also has keepers (one here sees with what intention the poet has chosen in 11*a* just that word **נֹטְרִים**) — to whom Shulamith herself and to whom Solomon also owes it that as a chaste and virtuous maiden she became his possession. These are her brothers, the true keepers and protectors of her innocence. Must these be unrewarded? The full thousands, she says, turning to the king, which like the annual produce of the vineyard of Baal-hamon will thus also be the fruit of my own personal worth, shall belong to none else, O Solomon, than to thee, and two hundred to the keepers of its fruit! If the keepers in Baal-hamon do not unrewarded watch the

vineyard, so the king owes thanks to those who so faithfully guarded his Shulamith. The poetry would be reduced to prose if there were found in Shulamith's words a hint that the king should reward her brothers with a gratification of 200 shekels. She makes the case of the vineyard in Baal-hamon a parable of her relation to Solomon on the one hand, and of her relation to her brothers on the other. From **מֵאֲתָיִם**, one may conclude that there were two brothers, thus that the rendering of thanks is thought of as **מֵעֶשֶׂר** (a tenth part); but so that the 200 are meant not as a tax on the thousand, but as a reward for the faithful rendering up of the thousand.

**Son. 8:13.** The king who seems to this point to have silently looked on in inmost sympathy, now, on being addressed by Shulamith, takes speech in hand; he does not expressly refer to her request, but one perceives from his words that he heard it with pleasure. He expresses to her the wish that she would gratify the companions of her youth who were assembled around her, as well as himself, with a song, such as in former times she was wont to sing in these mountains and valleys.

*13 O thou (who art) at home in the gardens,  
Companions are listening for thy voice;  
Let me hear!*

We observe that in the rural paradise with which she is surrounded, she finds herself in her element. It is a primary feature of her character which herein comes to view: her longing after quietness and peace, her love for collectedness of mind and for contemplation; her delight in thoughts of the Creator suggested by the vegetable world, and particularly by the manifold soft beauty of flowers; she is again once more in the gardens of her home, but the address, "O thou at home in the gardens!" denotes that wherever she is, these gardens are her home as a fundamental feature of her nature. The **חֲבֵרִים** are not Solomon's companions, for she has come hither with Solomon alone, leaning on his arm. Also it is indicated in the expression: "are listening for thy voice," that they are such as have not for a long time heard the dear voice which was wont to cheer their hearts. The **חֲבֵר** are the companions of the former shepherdess and keeper of a vineyard, Son. 1: 6 f., the playmates of her youth, the friends of her home. With a fine tact the poet does not represent Solomon as saying **חֲבֵרֶיךָ** nor **חֲבֵרַי**: the former would be contrary to the closeness of his relation to Shulamith, the latter contrary to the dignity of the king. By **חֲבֵרִים** there is neither expressed a one-sided reference, nor is a double-sided excluded. That "for thy voice" refers not to her voice as speaking, but as the old good friends wish, as singing, is evident from **הַשְּׂמִיעָנִי** in connection with Son. 2:14, where



also קוֹלֵךְ is to be supplied, and the voice of song is meant. She complies with the request, and thus begins:

*14 Flee, my beloved,  
And be thou like a gazelle,  
Or a young one of the harts,  
Upon spicy mountains.*

**Son. 8:14.** Hitzig supposes that with these words of refusal she bids him away from her, without, however, as “my beloved” shows, meaning them in a bad sense. They would thus, as Renan says, be bantering coquetry. If it is Solomon who makes the request, and thus also he who is addressed here, not the imaginary shepherd violently introduced into this closing scene in spite of the words “(the thousand) is thine, Solomon” (v. 12), then Shulamith’s ignoring of his request is scornful, for it would be as unseemly if she sang of her own accord to please her friends, as it would be wilful if she kept silent when requested by her royal husband. So far the Spanish author, Soto Major, is right (1599): *jussa et rogata id non debuit nec potuit recusare*. Thus with “flee” she begins a song which she sings, as at Son. 2:15 she commences one, in response to a similar request, with “catch us.” Hoelem. finds in her present happiness, which fills her more than ever, the thought here expressed that her beloved, if he again went from her for a moment, would yet very speedily return to his longing, waiting bride. <sup>f125</sup>

But apart from the circumstance that Shulamith is no longer a bride, but is married, and that the wedding festival is long past, there is not a syllable of that thought in the text; the words must at least have been בָּרַח אֵלַי, if בָּרַח signified generally to hasten hither, and not to hasten forth. Thus, at least as little as סָב, Son. 2:17, without אֵלַי, signifies “turn thyself hither,” can this בָּרַח mean “flee hither.” The words of the song thus invite Solomon to disport himself, i.e., give way to frolicsome and aimless mirth on these spicy mountains. As *sov l<sup>e</sup>cha* is enlarged to *sov d<sup>e</sup>meh-l<sup>e</sup>cha*, Son. 2:17, for the sake of the added figures (vid., under 2: 9), so here *b<sup>e</sup>rahh-l<sup>e</sup>cha* (Gen. 27:43) is enlarged to *b<sup>e</sup>rahh ud<sup>e</sup>meh (udāmeḥ) l<sup>e</sup>cha*. That “mountains of spices” occurs here instead of “cleft mountains,” 2:17b, has its reason, as has already been there remarked, and as Hitzig, Hoelem., and others have discovered, in the aim of the poet to conclude the pleasant song of love that has reached perfection and refinement with an absolutely pleasant word.

But with what intention does he call on Shulamith to sing to her beloved this בָּרַח, which obviously has here not the meaning of escaping away (according to the fundamental meaning, *transversum currere*), but only, as where it is used of fleeting time, Job. 9:25; 14: 2, the sense of hastening? One might suppose that

she whom he has addressed as at home in gardens replied to his request with the invitation to hasten forth among the mountains, — an exercise which gives pleasure to a man. But (1) Solomon, according to Son. 2:16; 6: 2 f., is also fond of gardens and flowers; and (2) if he took pleasure in ascending mountains, it doubled his joy, according to 4: 8, to share this joy with Shulamith; and (3) we ask, would this closing scene, and along with it the entire series of dramatic pictures, find a satisfactory conclusion, if either Solomon remained and gave no response to Shulamith's call, or if he, as directed, disappeared alone, and left Shulamith by herself among the men who surrounded her? Neither of these two things can have been intended by the poet, who shows himself elsewhere a master in the art of composition. In Son. 2:17 the matter lies otherwise. There the love-relation is as yet in progress, and the abandonment of love to uninterrupted fellowship places a limit to itself. Now, however, Shulamith is married, and the summons is unlimited. It reconciles itself neither with the strength of her love nor with the tenderness of the relation, that she should with so cheerful a spirit give occasion to her husband to leave her alone for an indefinite time. We will thus have to suppose that, when Shulamith sings the song, "Flee, my beloved," she goes forth leaning on Solomon's arm out into the country, or that she presumes that he will not make this flight into the mountains of her native home without her. With this song breaking forth in the joy of love and of life, the poet represents the loving couple as disappearing over the flowery hills, and at the same time the sweet charm of the Song of Songs, leaping gazelle-like from one fragrant scene to another, vanishes away.

## Appendix

### Remarks on the Song by Dr. J. G. Wetzstein

The following aphoristic elucidations of the Song are partly collected from epistolary communications, but for the most part are taken from my friend's "Treatise on the Syrian thrashing-table" (in Bastian's *Zeitsch. für Ethnographie*, 1873), but not without these extracts having been submitted to him, and here and there enlarged by him.

The thrashing-table (*lô<sup>ah</sup> ed-derâs*) is an agricultural implement in common use from ancient times in the countries round the Mediterranean Sea. It consists of two boards of nut-tree wood or of oak, bound together by two cross timbers. These boards are bent upwards in front, after the manner of a sledge, so as to be able to glide without interruption over the heaps of straw; underneath they are set with stones (of porous basalt) in oblique rows, thus forming a rubbing and cutting apparatus, which serves to thrash out the grain and to chop the straw; for the thrashing-table drawn by one or two animals yoked to it, and driven by their keeper, moves round on the straw-heaps spread on the barn

floor. The thrashing-table may have sometimes been used in ancient times for the purpose of destroying prisoners of war by a horrible death (2Sa. 12:31); at the present day it serves as the seat of honour for the bride and bridegroom, and also as a bier whereon the master of the house is laid when dead. The former of these its two functions is that which has given an opportunity to Wetzstein to sketch in that Treatise, under the title of “The Table in the King’s-week,” a picture of the marriage festival among the Syrian peasantry. This sketch contains not a few things that serve to throw light on the Song, which we here place in order, intermixed with other remarks by Wetzstein with reference to the Song and to our commentary on it.

Son. 1: 6. In August 1861, when on a visit to the hot springs *El-ḥamma*, between *Domeir* and *Roḥeiba* to the north of Damascus, I was the guest of the Sheik *Id*, who was encamped with his tribe, a branch of the *Solêb*, at the sulphurous stream there (*nahar el-mukebret*). Since the language of this people (who inhabited the Syrian desert previous to the Moslem period, were longest confessors of Christianity among the nomads, and therefore kept themselves free from intermingling with the tribes that at a later period had migrated from the peninsula) possesses its own remarkable peculiarities, I embraced the opportunity of having dictated and explained to me, for three whole days, Solebian poems. The introduction to one of these is as follows: “The poet is *Solêb-Ṭuwês*, nephew of (the already mentioned) *Râshid*. The latter had had a dispute with a certain *Bishr*; that *Tuwês* came to know, and now sent the following *kasidah* (poem) to *Bishr*, which begins with praise in regard to his uncle, and finally advises *Bishr* to let that man rest, lest he (*Tuwês*) should become his adversary and that of his party.” The last verse is in these words:

“That say I to you, I shall become the adversary of the disturber of the peace, Bend my right knee before him, and, as a second *Zir*, show myself on the field of battle (the *menâch*).”

*Zir* is a hero celebrated in the *D-wân* of *Ben-Ḥilâl*; and to bend the right knee is to enter into a conflict for life or death: the figure is derived from the sword-dance. <sup>f126</sup>

So much regarding the poem of *Ṣolêb-Ṭuwês*. From this can nothing be gained for the explanation of *נִחַרְנִי* of the Song? This is for the most part interpreted as the *Niph.* of *נִחַר* or *נִחַרְנִי* (to be inflamed, to be angry with one); but why not as the *Pih.* of *נִחַר*? It is certainly most natural to interpret this *נִחַר* in the sense of *nakhar*, to breathe, snort; but the LXX, Symm., Theod., in rendering by *μαχέσσαντο, διεμαχέσσαντο*, appear to have connected with *nihharu* the meaning of that (Arab.) *tanaḥar*, which comes from *tahrn*, the front of the neck. The outstretched neck of the camel, the breast, the head, the face, the brow, the

nose, are, it is well known in the Arab., mere symbols for that which stands forward according to place, time, and rank. Of this *naḥrn*, not only the Old Arab. (vid., *Ḳāmûs* under the word) but also the Modern Arab. has denom. verbal forms. In Damascus they say, *alsyl naḥara min alystan*, “the torrent tore away a part of the garden opposing it;” and according to the *Deutsch. morg. Zeitschr.* xxii. 142, *naḥḥar flana* is “to strive forward after one.” Hence *tanaḥarua*, to step opposite to (in a hostile manner), like *takabalua*, then to contend in words, to dispute; and *naḥir* is, according to a vulgar mode of expression, one who places himself *coram* another, sits down to talk, discourses with him. These *denominativa* do not in themselves and without further addition express in the modern idioms the idea of “to take an opponent by the neck,” or “to fight hand to hand with him.”

Son. 1: 7. For עֲטִיבָה the Arab. عَطِيْبَة presents itself for comparison; with inhabitants of the town, as well as of the desert (*Ḥaḍar* and *Bedu*), *alghadwat*, “the (maiden) languishing with love,” a very favourite designation for a maiden fatally in love; the mas. *alghady* (plur. *alghudat*) is used in the same sense of a young man. According to its proper signification, it denotes a maiden with a languishing eye, the deeply sunk glimmerings of whose eyelids veil the eye. In Damascus such eyes are called ‘*iwan dubbal*, “pressed down eyes;” and in the *Haurân*, ‘*iwan mygharribat*, “broken eyes;” and they are not often wanting in love songs there. Accordingly, she who speaks seeks to avoid the neighbourhood of the shepherds, from fear of the *hatkalsitr*, i.e., for fear lest those who mocked would thus see the secret of her love, in accordance with the verse:

**“By its symptoms love discovers itself to the world,  
As musk which one carries discovers itself by its aroma.”**

Son. 1:17. The cypress never bears the name *ṣnawbar*, which always denotes only the pine, one of the pine tribe. The cypress is only called *serwa*, collect. *seru*. Since it is now very probable that בְּרוֹת (ברוש) is the old Heb. name of the cypress, and since there can at no time have been cypresses on the downs of *Beirût*, the connection of Arab. *b-rût* with בְּרוֹת is to be given up. Instead of the difficult Heb. word *rahhithēnu*, there is perhaps to be read *v<sup>e</sup>hhēthēnu* (from *hhäith* = *hhäits*), “and our walls.” The word-form Arab. *ḥ<sup>‘</sup>ayt* may have come from the idiom of the *Ḥigâz*, or from some other impure source, into the written language; the living language knows only *ḥayt* (חַיִּט), plur. *ḥ-tân* (Syr. Egypt.) and *hijût* (Berbery). The written language itself has only the plur. *ḥ-tân*, and uses חַיִּט as an actual sing. For the transition of the letter *tsade* into *teth* in the Song, cf. נטר.

**2:11 “For lo, the winter is past, the rain is over — is gone.”**

These are the words of the enticing love of the bridegroom to his beloved, whom he seeks to raise to the rank of queen. “The fairest period in the life of a Syrian peasant,” thus Wetzstein’s description begins, “are the first seven days after his marriage, in which, along with his young wife, he plays the part of king (*melik*) and she of queen (*melika*), and both are treated and served as such in their own district and by the neighbouring communities.” The greater part of village weddings take place for the most part in the month of March, the most beautiful month of the Syrian year, called from its loveliness (*sahh<sup>ar</sup>*) *âdâr* = “*prachtmonat*” (magnificent month), to which the proverb refers: “If any one would see Paradise in its flowery splendour (*f- ezhârihâ*), let him contemplate the earth in its month of splendour (*f- âdârihâ*). Since the winter rains are past, and the sun now refreshes and revives, and does not, as in the following months, oppress by its heat, weddings are celebrated in the open air on the village thrashing-floor, which at this time, with few exceptions, is a flowery meadow. March is also suitable as the season for festivals, because at such a time there is little field labour, and, moreover, everything then abounds that is needed for a festival. During the winter the flocks have brought forth their young, — there are now lambs and kids, butter, milk, and cheese, and cattle for the slaughter, which have become fat on the spring pasture; the neighbouring desert yields for it brown, yellow, and white earth-nuts in such abundance, that a few children in one day may gather several camel-loads.” The description passes over the marriage day itself, with its pomp, the sword-dance of the bride, and the great marriage feast, and begins where the newly married, on the morning after the marriage night, — which the young husband, even to this day, like the young Tobiah, spends sometimes in prayer, — appear as king and queen, and in their wedding attire receive the representative of the bride’s-men, now their minister (*mezêr*), who presents them with a morning meal. The the bride’s-men come, fetch the thrashing-table (“corn-drag”) from the straw storehouse (*metben*), and erect a scaffolding on the thrashing-floor, with the table above it, which is spread with a variegated carpet, and with two ostrich-feather cushions studded with gold, which is the seat of honour (*merteba*) for the king and queen during the seven days. This beautiful custom has a good reason for it, and also fulfils a noble end. For the more oppressive, troublesome, and unhappy the condition of the Syro-Palestinian peasant, so much the more reasonable does it appear that he should be honoured for a few days at least, and be celebrated and made happy. Ad considering the facility and wantonness of divorces in the Orient, the recollection of the marriage week, begun so joyfully, serves as a counterpoise to hinder a separation.

Son. 3:11. עֲטָרָה. The custom of crowning the bridegroom no longer exists in Syria. The bride’s crown, called in Damascus *tâg-el’arûs*, is called in the *Haurân* ‘*orga* (עֲרָגָה). This consists of a silver circlet, which is covered with a net of

strings of corals of about three fingers' breadth. Gold coins are fastened in rows to this net, the largest being on the lowest row, those in the other rows upward becoming always smaller. At the wedding feast the hair of the bride is untied, and falls freely down over her neck and breast; and that it might not lose its wavy form, it is only oiled with some fragrant substances. The crowning thus begins: the headband is first bound on her head, — which on this day is not the *Sembar* (vid., *Deu. morg. Zeit.* xxii. 94), but the *Kesmâja*, a long, narrow, silken band, interwoven with dark-red and gold, and adorned at both ends with fringes, between which the *Şumûch*, silver, half-spherical little bells, hang down. The ends of the *Kesmâja* fall on both sides of the head, the one on the breast and the other on the back, so that the sound of the *Sumûch* is distinctly perceptible only during the sword-dance of the bride. Over the *Kesmâja* the crown is now placed in such a way that it rests more on the front of the head, and the front gold pieces of the under row come to lie on the naked brow. In the *Sah̄ka*, partly referred to under Son. 7: 2, the poet addresses the goldsmith:

“And beat (for the bride) little bells, which constantly swing and ring like the tymbals (*nakkârât* <sup>f127</sup>); And (beat) the crown, one of four rows, and let *Gihâd-s* <sup>f128</sup> be on the brow.”

Etymologically considered, I believe that the word ‘*orga* must be regarded as parallel with ‘*argûn* (אָרְגוּן), which in the *Haurân* is the foot-buckle; so that, from the root ‘*arag*, “to be bent,” it is the designation of a bow or circlet, which the word *taj* also certainly means. However, on one occasion in *Korêa* (to the east of *Boşrâ*), while we were looking at a bride’s crown, one said to me: “They call it ‘*orga*, because the coral strings do not hang directly down, but, running oblique (*mu’arwajat*), form a net of an elongated square.”

Son. 4:14. אֶהְלוֹת. Who recognises in the Moorish *nif*, “the nose,” the Heb. אָף? And yet the two words are the same. The word אָף, *enf*, “the nose,” is used by the wandering Arabs, who are fond of the dimin. אָנִיף, “*nêf*, which is changed into אָנִיף; for א in the beginning of a word, particularly before a grave and accented syllable, readily falls away. From *nêf* (*neif*), finally, comes *nif*, because the idiom of the Moorish Arabians rejects the diphthong *ei*.

Thus, also, it fared with the word אֶהְלוֹת, “the little tent,” “the little house,” as the three-cornered capsules of the cardamum are called, — an aromatic plant which is to the present day so ardently loved by the Hadar and the Bedu, on account of its heat, and especially its sweet aroma, that one would have been led to wonder if it were wanting in this passage of the Song. From אֶהְלוֹת there is formed the dimin. אֶהְלוֹתִיל, and this is shortened into *hêl*, which is at the present day the name of the cardamum, while the unabbreviated *o’hel* is retained as the



caritative of the original meaning, — we say, *jâ °hêli*, “my dear tent- (i.e., tribal) companions.” This linguistic process is observable in all the Semitic languages; it has given rise to a mass of new roots. That it began at an early period, is shown by the Phoenician language; for the bibl. names *Hiram* and *Huram* are abbreviated from *Ahi-ram* and *Ahu-ram*; and the Punic stones supply many analogues, e.g., the proper names *Himilcath* (= *Ahhi-Milcath*, *restrictus reginae coeli*) with *Hethmilcath* (= *Ahith-Milcath*) and the like. On one of the stones which I myself brought from Carthage is found the word **דון** instead of **דון**, “sir, master.” In a similar way, the watering-lace which receives so many diverse names by travellers, the *Wêba* (*Weiba*), in the Araba valley, will be an abbreviation of **אוןבה**, and this the dimin. of **אונבות**, the name of an encampment of the Israelites in the wilderness (Num. 21:10). It had the name ‘*ên ovoth*, “the fountain of the water-bottles,” perhaps from the multitude of water-bottles filled here by water-drawers, waiting one after another. This encampment has been sought elsewhere — certainly incorrectly. Of the harbour-town *Elath* (on the Red Sea), it has been said, in the geography of *Ibn el-Bennâ* (MSS of the Royal Lib. in Berlin, Sect. Spr. Nr. 5), published in Jerusalem about the year 1000: “*Weila*, at the north end of the (eastern) arm of the Red Sea; prosperous and distinguished; rich in palms and fishes; the harbour of Palestine, and the granary of *Higâz*; is called *Aila* by the common people; but *Aila* is laid waste, — it lies quite in the neighbourhood.” Thus it will be correct to say, that the name *Weila* is abbreviated from **אוןילה**, “Little-Aila,” and designated a settlement which gradually grew up in the neighbourhood of the old Aila, and to which, when the former was at last destroyed, the name was transferred, so that “Little-Aila” became Aila; therefore it is that the later Arab. geographers know nothing of *Weila*. I have already elsewhere mentioned, that at the root of the name of the well-known Port *Suês* lies the Arab. *îsâs* (= **אשש**), which, among all the Syrian tribes, has lost the initial letter *Elif*, and takes the form of *Sâs*. Hence the name *Suês* (*Suwês*), the diminutive. The place has its name from this, that it was built on the foundations of an older harbour.

Silv. de Sacy already (vid., Gesen. *Thes.* p. 33b) conjectured that **אהלות** means cardamums. But, as it appears, he based his proof less on the identity of the two words *hêl* and *ahalôt*, than on the circumstance that he found the word *kâkula* — the Jemanic, and perhaps originally Indian name of cardamums — in the *hâhula* of the Egyptians of the present day. But the Egyptian does not pronounce the *k* like *h*; he does not utter it at all, or at most like a *Hamza*, so that *kâkula* is sounded by him not *hâhula*, but ‘*â’ula*. And who could presuppose the antiquity of this word, or that of its present pronunciation, in a land which has so radically changed both its language and its inhabitants as Egypt? And why should the Palestinians have received their Indian spices,



together with their names, from Egypt? Why not much rather from *Aila*, to which they were brought from Jemen, either by ships or by the well-organized caravans (vid., Strabo, xvi. 4) which traded in the maritime country *Tihâma*? Or from *Têma*, the chief place in the desert (Job. 6:19; Isa. 21:14), whither they were brought from *‘Akir*, the harbour of *Gerrha*, which, according to Strabo (as above), was the great Arab. spice market? But if Palestine obtained its spices from thence, it would also, with them, receive the foreign name for them unchanged, — *kaḳula*, — since all the Arab tribes express the *ḳ* sound very distinctly. In short, the word **אהלות** has nothing to do with *kaḳula*; it is shown to be a pure Semitic word by the plur. formations *ahaloth* and *ahalim* (Pro. 7:17). The punctuation does not contradict this. The inhabitants of Palestine received the word, with the thing itself, through the medium of the Arabs, among whom the Heb. **אהל** is at the present time, as in ancient times, pronounced **אהל**; thus the Arab vocalization is simply retained to distinguish it from **אהל** in its proper signification, without the name of the spice becoming thereby a meaningless foreign word. That the living language had a sing. for “a cardamum capsule” is self-evident. Interesting is the manner and way in which the modern Arabs help themselves with reference to this sing. Since *hêl* does not discover the mutilated **אהל**, and the Arab. *âhlun*, besides, has modified its meaning (it signifies tent- and house-companions), the *nom. unit. hêla*, “a cardamum capsule,” is no longer formed from *hêl*; the word *geras*, “the little bell,” is therefore adopted, thereby forming a comparison of the firmly closed seed capsules, in which the loose seeds, on being shaken, give forth an audible rustling, with the little bells which are hung round the bell-wether and the leading camel. Thus they say: take three or four little bells (*egrâs*), and not: *telât, arba hêlât* (which at most, as a mercantile expression, would denote, “parcels or kinds” of cardamum); they speak also of *geras-el-hêl* (“*hêl* little bells”) and *geras-eṭ-tib* (“*spice* little bells”). This “little bell” illustrates the ancient **אהל**. Supposing that *kaḳula* might have been the true name of the cardamum, then these would have been called **אהלות קקלה**, “*kaḳula* - capsules,” by the Heb. traders in spicery, who, as a matter of course, knew the foreign name; while, on the contrary, the people, ignoring the foreign name, would use the words **בָּשֵׂם (אֵהֶלִי) אֵהֶלוֹת**, “*spice*-capsules,” or only *ahaloth*. Imported spices the people named from their appearance, without troubling themselves about their native names. An Arabian called the nutmeg *gôz-eṭ-tib*, “*spice*-nut,” which would correspond to a Heb. **אֵגוֹז בָּשֵׂם**. So he called the clove-blossom *mismâr-eṭ-tib*, “*spice*-cloves,” as we do, or merely *mismâr*, “*clove*.” The spice-merchant knows only the foreign word *gurumful*, “*clove*.” It is very probable that *hêl*, divested of its appellative signification by the word *geras*, in process of time disappeared from the living language.

That pounded cardamum is one of the usual ingredients in Arab. coffee, we see from a poem, only a single very defective copy of which could be obtained by Wallin (vid., *Deutsch. morg. Zeit.* vi. 373). The verse alluded to, with a few grammatical and metrical changes which were required, is as follows:

***“With a pot (of coffee) in which must be cardamum and nutmeg,  
And twenty cloves, the right proportion for connoisseurs.”***

The nut is not, as Wallin supposes, the cocoa-nut (*gôz-el-Hind*), but the nutmeg; and *ûd* = “the small piece of wood,” is the clove, as Wallin also, rightly; elsewhere *ûd* and *ûda* is the little stalk of the raisin.

Son. 5: 1. “Eat, friends, drink and be drunken, beloved.” With רעים here is compared מרעים, Jud. 14:11, where thirty companions are brought to Samson when he celebrated for seven days his marriage in Timnath, the so-called bride’s-men, who are called in post-bibl. Heb. שושבנים, and at the present day in Syria, *shebâb el-‘arês*, i.e., the bridegroom’s young men; their chief is called the *Shebân*. “The designation ‘bride’s-men’ (Nymphagogen) is not wholly suitable. Certainly they have also to do service to the bride; and if she is a stranger, they form the essential part of the armed escort on horseback which heads the marriage procession (*el-fârîda*), and with mock fighting, which is enacted before the bride and the bride’s-maids (*el-ferrâdât*), leads it into the bridegroom’s village; but the chief duties of the *shebâb* on the marriage day and during the ‘king’s week’ belong properly to the bridegroom. This escort must be an ancient institution of the country. Perhaps it had its origin in a time of general insecurity in the land, when the ‘young men’ formed a watch-guard, during the festival, against attacks.” The names רא and מרא Wetzstein derives from ריע, “to be closely connected,” which is nearly related to רעה; for he takes ריא, Job. 6:27, as the etymologically closer description of the former, and מרא (= מריא) he places parallel to the Arab. word *mirjâ*, which signifies “the inseparable companion,” and among all the Syrian nomad tribes is the designation of the bell-wether, because it follows closely the steps of the shepherd, carries his bread-pouch, and receives a portion at every meal-time.

***7: 1 What would ye see in Shulamith? —  
“As the dance of Mahanaim.”***

“The sports during the days of the marriage festival are from time to time diversified with dances. The various kinds of dances are comprehended under the general names of *sahka* and *debka*. The *sahka*, pronounced by the Beduin *sahée* (= *sahtsche*), is a graceful solitary dance, danced by a single person, or in itself not involving several persons. The *debka*, “hanging dance,” because the dancers link themselves together by their little fingers; if they were linked

together by their hands, this would give the opportunity of pressing hands, which required to be avoided, because Arab ladies would not permit this from men who were strangers to them. For the most part, the *debka* appears as a circular dance. If it is danced by both sexes, it is called *debka muwadda* <sup>‘a</sup> = ‘the variegated *debka*.<sup>‘</sup> The *sahka* must be of Beduin origin, and is accordingly always danced with a *kasidah* (poem or song) in the nomad idiom; the *debka* is the peculiar national dance of the Syrian peasantry (*Haḍar*ˆ), and the songs with which it is danced are exclusively in the language of the *Haḍar*ˆ. They have the prevailing metre of the so-called Andalusian ode ( — v — — | — v — — | — v — ), and it is peculiar to the *debka*, that its strophes hang together like the links of a chain, or like the fingers of the dancers, while each following strophe begins with the words with which the preceding one closes [similar to the step-like rhythm of the psalms of degrees; vid., *Psalmen*, ii. 257]. For the *sahka* and the *debka* they have a solo singer. Whenever he has sung a verse, the chorus of dancers and spectators takes up the *kehrvers* (*meredd*), which in the *debka* always consists of the two last lines of the first strophe of the poem. Instrumental music is not preferred in dancing; only a little timbrel (*deff*.), used by the solo singer, who is not himself (or herself) dancing, gently accompanies the song to give the proper beat” (cf. Exo. 15:20f., and Psa. 68:26).

To the *sahka*, which is danced after at *kasidah* (for the most part with the metre — — v — | — — v — | — — v — | — — v — ) without the *kehrvers* in 2/4 time, belongs the sword-dance, which the bride dances on her marriage day. Wetzstein thus describes it in *Deutsch. morg. Zeit.* xxii. 106, having twice witnessed it: “The figure of the dancer (*el-hâsh*ˆ, ‘she who fills the ring,’ or *abû h<sup>o</sup>wêsh*, ‘she who is in the ring’), the waving dark hair of her locks cast loose, her serious noble bearing, her downcast eyes, her graceful movements, the quick and secure step of her small naked feet, the lightning-like flashing of the blade, the skilful movements of her left hand, in which the dancer holds a handkerchief, the exact keeping of time, although the song of the *munshid* (the leader) becomes gradually quicker and the dance more animated — this is a scene which has imprinted itself indelibly on my memory. It is completed by the ring (*h<sup>o</sup>wêsh*), the one half of which is composed of men and the other of women. They stand upright, gently move their shoulders, and accompany the beat of the time with a swaying to and fro of the upper part of their bodies, and a gentle beating of their hands stretched upwards before their breasts. The whole scene is brightened by a fire that has been kindled. The constant repetition of the words *jâ ḥalâl- jâ mâl*, O my own, O my possession! [vid. *Psalmen*, ii. 384, Anm.], and the sword with which the husband protects his family and his property in the hand of the maiden, give to the *sahka*, celebrated in the days of domestic happiness, the stamp of an expression of thanks and joy over the possession of that which makes life pleasant — the

family and property; for with the *Ḥaḍar* and the *Bedaw* the word *ḥalâl* includes wife and child.”

“When the *sahka* is danced by a man, it is always a sword-dance. Only the form of this dance (it is called *sahkat el-Gawâfina*), as it is performed in *Gôf*, is after the manner of the *contre* -dance, danced by two rows of men standing opposite each other. The dancers do not move their hands, but only their shoulders; the women form the ring, and sing the refrain of the song led by the *munshid*, who may here be also one of the dancers.”

### 7: 2 “How beautiful are thy steps in the shoes, O prince’s daughter!”

After the maidenhood of the newly married damsel has been established (cf. Deu. 22:13-21) before the tribunal (*d-vân*) of the wedding festival, there begins a great dance; the song sung to it refers only to the young couple, and the inevitable *wasf*, i.e., a description of the personal perfections and beauty of the two, forms its principal contents. Such a *wasf* was sung also yesterday during the sword-dance of the bride; that of to-day (the first of the seven wedding-festival days) is wholly in praise of the queen; and because she is now a wife, commends more those attractions which are visible than those which are veiled. In the Song, only Son. 7: 2-6 <sup>f129</sup> is compared to this *wasf*. As for the rest, it is the lovers themselves who reciprocally sing. Yet this may also have been done under the influence of the custom of the *wasf*. The repetition, 4: 1-5 and 6: 4-7, are wholly after the manner of the *wasf*; in the Syrian wedding songs also, where encomiums are after one pattern.

We quote here by way of example such an encomium. It forms the conclusion of a *sahka*, which had its origin under the following circumstances: When, some forty years ago, the sheik of *Nawâ* gave away his daughter in marriage, she declared on her wedding day that she would dance the usual sword-dance only along with a *kasidah*, composed specially for her by a noted Hauran poet. Otherwise nothing was to be done, for the Hauranian chief admired the pride of his daughter, because it was believed it would guard her from errors, and afford security for her family honour. The most distinguished poet of the district at that time was *Ḳas-m el-Chinn*, who had just shortly before returned from a journey to Mesopotamia to the phylarch of the *Gerbâ* tribe, who had bestowed on him royal gifts. He lived in the district of *Gâsim*, <sup>f130</sup> famed from of old for its poets, a mile (German) to the north of *Nawâ*. A messenger on horseback was sent for him. The poet had no time to lose; he stuck some writing materials and paper into his girdle, mounted his ass, and composed his poem whilst on the way, the messenger going before him to announce his arrival. When *Ḳâsim* came, the fire was already kindled on the ground, the wedding guests were waiting, and the dancer in bridal attire, and with the sword in her hand, stood ready. *Kâsim* kissed her hand and took the place of leader of the song, since

from want of time no one could repeat the poem; moreover, *Ḳâsim* had a fine voice. When the dance was over, the bride took her *kesmâja* from off her head, folded twenty *Gâzi* (about thirty thalers) in it, and threw it to the poet, — a large present considering the circumstances, for the *kesmâja* of a rich bride is costly. On the other hand, she required the poem to be delivered up to her. The plan of the poem shows great skill. *Nawâ*, lying in the midst of the extremely fruitful Batanian plain, is interested in agriculture to an extent unequalled in any other part of Syria and Palestine; its sheik is proud of the fact that formerly Job's 500 yoke ploughed there, and *Nawâ* claims to be Job's town. <sup>f131</sup>

Since the peasant, according to the well-known proverb, *de bobus arator*, has thought and concern for nothing more than for agriculture; so the poet might with certainty reckon on an understanding and an approbation of his poem if he makes it move within the sphere of country life. He does this. He begins with this, that a *shekâra*, i.e., a benefice, is sown for the dancer, which is wont to be sown only to the honour of one of great merit about the place. That the benefice might be worthy of the recipient, four *sauwâmen* (a *sauwâma* consists of six yoke) are required, and the poet has opportunity to present to his audience pleasing pictures of the great *shekâra*, of harvests, thrashings, measuring, loading, selling. Of the produce of the wheat the portion of the dancer is now bought, first the clothes, then the ornaments; both are described. The *wasf* forms the conclusion, which is here given below. In the autumn of 1860, I received the poem from a young man of *Nawâ* at the same time along with other poems of *Ḳâsim*'s, all of which he knew by heart. The rest are much more artistic and complete in form than the *saḥḥa*. Who can say how many of the (particularly metrically) weak points of the latter are to be attributed to the poet, and to the rapidity with which it was composed; and how many are to be laid to the account of those by whom it was preserved?

“Here hast thou thy ornament, O beautiful one! put it on, let nothing be forgotten!

Put it on, and live when the coward and the liar are long dead.

She said: Now shalt thou celebrate me in song, describe me in verse from head to foot!

I say: O fair one, thine attractions I am never able to relate,

And only the few will I describe which my eyes permit me to see:

Her head is like the crystal goblet, her hair like the black night,

Her black hair like the seven nights, the like are not in the whole year; <sup>f132</sup>

In waves it moves hither and thither, like the rope of her who draws water,

And her side locks breathe all manner of fragrance, which kills me.

The new moon beams on her brow, and dimly illuminated are the balances, <sup>f133</sup>

And her eyebrows like the arch of the *Nûn* drawn by an artist's hand. <sup>f134</sup>

The witchery of her eyes makes me groan as if they were the eyes of a Kufic lady; <sup>f135</sup>

Her nose is like the date of Irāk, <sup>f136</sup>

the edge of the Indian sword;

Her face like the full moon, and heart-breaking are her cheeks.

Her mouth is a little crystal ring, and her teeth rows of pearls,

And her tongue scatters pearls; and, ah me, how beautiful her lips!

Her spittle pure virgin honey, and healing for the bite of a viper.

Comparable to elegant writing, the Seijal <sup>f137</sup>

waves downwards on her chin,

Thus black seeds of the fragrant Kezḥa <sup>f138</sup>

show themselves on white bread.

The Māni draws the neck down to itself with the spell written in Syrian letters;

Her neck is like the neck of the roe which drinks out of the fountain of Ḳanawât. <sup>f139</sup>

Her breast like polished marble tablets, as ships bring them to Ṣêdâ (Sidon),

Thereon like apples of the pomegranate two glittering piles of jewels.

Her arms are drawn swords, peeled cucumbers — oh that I had such!

And incomparably beautiful her hands in the rose-red of the Hinnâ -leaf;

Her smooth, fine fingers are like the writing reed not yet cut;

The glance of her nails like the Dura-seeds which have lain overnight in milk; <sup>f140</sup>

Her body is a mass of cotton wool which a master's hand has shaken into down, <sup>f141</sup>

And her legs marble pillars in the sacred house of the Omajads.

There hast thou, fair one, thy attractions, receive this, nothing would be forgotten,

And live and flourish when the coward and the liar are long ago dead!"

### 7: 3 "Thy body a heap of wheat, set round with lilies."

In the fifth Excursus regarding the winnowing shovel and the winnowing fork in my *Comment. on Isaiah*, Wetzstein's illustration of this figure was before me.

The dissertation regarding the thrashing-table contains many instructive supplements thereto. When the grain is thrashed, from that which is thrashed (*der-ṣ*), which consists of corn, chopped straw, and chaff, there is formed a new heap of winnowings, which is called '*arama*. "According to its derivation (from '*aram*, to be uncovered), '*arama* means heaps of rubbish destitute of vegetation; '*arama*, '*oreima*, '*irâm*, are, in the *Haurân* and *Golân*, proper names of several *Puys* (conical hills formed by an eruption) covered with yellow or red volcanic rubbish. In the terminology of the thrashing-floor, the word always and without exception denotes the *der-ṣ* -heaps not yet winnowed; in the Heb., on the contrary, corn-heaps already winnowed. Such a heap serves (Rut. 3: 7) Boaz as a pillow for his head when he lay down and watched his property.

Luther there incorrectly renders by 'behind a *Mandel*,' i.e., a heap of (fifteen) sheaves; on the contrary, correctly at the passage before us (Son. 7: 3), 'like a heap of wheat,' viz., a heap of winnowed wheat. The wheat colour (*el-lôn el-ḥinti*) is in Syria regarded as the most beautiful colour of the human body."



## FOOTNOTES

- <sup>ft1</sup> The *Song*. was read on the 8th day of the Passover; *Ruth*, on the second Shabuoth [Pentecost]; *Lamentations*, on the 9th Ab; *Ecclesiastes*, on the 3rd Succoth [Tabernacles]; *Esther*, between the 11th and 16th Adar [feast of Purim].
- <sup>ft2</sup> Vid., Fernbacher's *Die Reden des. h. Bernhard über das Hohelied*, prefaced by Delitzsch. Leipzig 1862.
- <sup>ft3</sup> Vid., Hammer-Purgstall's *Das hohe Lied der Liebe der Araber*, 1854.
- <sup>ft4</sup> [*Das Hohelied untersucht u. ausg.* Leipzig 1851.]
- <sup>ft5</sup> Cf. *Tosefta Sanhedrin* xii., *Sanhedrin* iii.a, and the commencement of the tract *Kalla*.
- <sup>ft6</sup> Vid., Jahrg. i. No. 22-24 of the Berne *Kirchenfreund*.
- <sup>ft7</sup> And in this Godet stands not alone. The Jewish interpreter Malbim (1850) accepts also this seduction-history: Solomon = the sensual impulse; Shulamith = the spirit-soul; the little sister = the natural soul; and Shulamith's beloved = the heavenly Friend, the Shepherd of the universe.
- <sup>ft8</sup> *Literaturb. der Darmst. Kirchenzeitung*, 1851, pp. 114-146, and 1854, No. 11.
- <sup>ft9</sup> "Shulamith," says E. F. Friedrich (1855 and 1866), "is the oldest theatrical piece in existence." Ewald and Böttcher, who find not fewer than twelve persons mentioned in it, think that it was represented on an actual stage. Then, indeed, it would be the oldest drama — older than *Thespis* and *Kaf-dasa*. For the *Sakuntâla* and the drama *Der Kaufmann und die Bajadere* belong to the first century of our era.
- <sup>ft10</sup> Vid., my *Prolegomena* to Luzzatto's **מגדל עז** (Heb. Paraphrase of the *Pastors fido* of Guarini), 1837, pp. 24-32.
- <sup>ft11</sup> Similar is the relation between Homer, where the speakers are introduced with narrative, and our national epics, the *Nibelungen* and *Gudrun*, which become dramatic when the action and the feeling rise to a higher elevation: the words of the different persons follow each other without introduction, so that here the manner of the singer had to become dramatic.
- <sup>ft12</sup> Vid., *Repert. für bibl. u. morgenl. Lit.* viii. (1781), p. 180. The Archimandrite Porphyrios describes such a MS in his (Russian) *Reisewerk* (1856).



- <sup>ft13</sup> Ephr. Epstein, surgeon in Cincinnati, in a review of Von Grätz' *Comm.* in *The Israelite* (1872), calls the Song quite in our sense, "a dramatic poem, though not a complete scenic drama." But the bridal procession in the third act is not of this character — he sees in it a return from a hunting expedition.
- <sup>ft14</sup> So also, on linguistic grounds, Ant. Theod. Hartmann in Winer's *Zeitschr.* 1829.
- <sup>ft15</sup> Epstein, in true American style, calls him "the bogus shepherd."
- <sup>ft16</sup> *Vid. Gesch. der jud. Poesie*, p. 205ff. Not as Joh. Gott. Lessing (*Eclogae regis Salomonis*, 1777), the brother of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, supposes: through the LXX translation; for the Song was among the books latest in being translated.
- <sup>ft17</sup> *Vid.*, for the explanation of this, my essay, "Das Hohelied verunreinigt die Hände," in the *Luth. Zeitsch.* 1854. [The *Tôra* and the *Theruma* -food, as being both reckoned holy, were usually placed together in the temple. It was discovered that the sacred books were thereby exposed to damage by mice; and hence, to prevent their being brought any longer into contact with the *Theruma*, the Rabbins decided that they were henceforth to be regarded as unclean, and they gave forth the decree, "All Holy Scriptures pollute the hand." This decree was applicable only to *holy* or *inspired* books. *Vid.*, Ginsburg on the Song, p. 3, *note.* ]
- <sup>ft18</sup> *Vid.*, Fürst's *Der Kanon des A. T.* (1868), p. 86.
- <sup>ft19</sup> From this it is supposed that *asher* is a pronom. root-cluster equivalent to אֲשֶׁר. Fleischer, on the contrary, sees in *asher* an original substantive *athar* = (Arab.) *ithr*, Assyr. *asar*, track, place, as when the vulgar expression is used, "The man where (*wo* instead of *welcher*) has said."
- <sup>ft20</sup> We do not take into view here Gen. 6: 3. If בְּשֵׁנִים is then to be read, then there is in it the pronominal שֵׁנִי, as in the old proper name *Mishael* (who is what God is?).
- <sup>ft21</sup> *Vid.*, my *Handsch. Funde*, Heft 2 (1862).
- <sup>ft22</sup> Yet it is a question whether לָדַד, to love, and לָדָד, the breast (Arab. *thady*, with a verb *thadiyi*, to be thoroughly wet), are not after their nearest origin such words of feeling, caressing, prattling, as the Arab. *dad*, sport (also *dadad*, the only Arab. word which consists of the same three letters); cf. Fr. *dada*, hobby-horse.
- <sup>ft23</sup> *Vid.*, Friedr. Delitzsch's *Indo-german.-sem. Studien* (1873), p. 99f.

- <sup>f124</sup> After an improbable etymology of the Arab., from *saḥar*, to turn, to depart, “the departure of the night” (Lane). Magic appears also to be called *sihar*, as *nigromantia* (Mediaev. from *nekromantia*), the black art.
- <sup>f125</sup> The houri (damsel of paradise) is thus called *ḥawaryyt*, *adj. relat.* from *ḥawra*, from the black pupil of the eye in the centre of the white eyeball.
- <sup>f126</sup> Vid., Wetzstein’s *Isaiah* (1869), p. 698.
- <sup>f127</sup> According to the Indian idea, it is the eye of Varuna; the eye (also after Plato: ἡλιοειδέστατον τῶν περὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ὀργάνων) is regarded as taken from the sun, and when men die returning to the sun (Muir in the *Asiatic Journal*, 1865, p. 294, S. 309).
- <sup>f128</sup> Eber’s *Aegypten u. die B. Mose’s*, Bd. I pp. 221f. 226; cf. *Aeg. Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 26f.
- <sup>f129</sup> The art. denoting the idea of species in the second member of the *st. const.* standing in the sing. without a determining reference to the first, occurs in Son. 1:13, “a bundle of (*von*) myrrh;” Son. 1:14, “a cluster of (*von*) the cyprus-flower;” Son. 4: 3, “a thread of (*von*) scarlet,” “a piece of pomegranate;” Son. 5:13, “a bed of balm” (but otherwise, Son. 6: 2), Son. 7: 9, “clusters of the vine;” Son. 7: 3, “a bowl of roundness” (which has this property); Son. 7:10, “wine (of the quality) of goodness;” cf. Son. 8: 2, “wine the (= of the) spicing.” It also, in cases where the defined species to which the first undefined member of the *st. const.* belongs, stands in the pl.: Son. 2: 9, 17; 8:14, “like a young one of the hinds;” Son. 4: 1; 6: 5, “a herd of goats;” Son. 4: 2, “a flock of shorn sheep;” Son. 6: 6, “a flock of lambs,” i.e., consisting of individuals of this kind. Also, when the second member states the place where a thing originates or is found, the first often remains indeterminate, as one of that which is there found, or a part of that which comes from thence: Son. 2: 1, “a meadow-saffron of Sharon,” “a lily of the valleys;” Son. 3: 9, “the wood of Lebanon.” The following are doubtful: Son. 4: 4, “a thousand bucklers;” and Son. 7: 5, “a tower of ivory;” less so Son. 7: 1, “the dance of Mahanaim.” The following are examples of a different kind: Gen. 16: 7, “a well of water;” Deu. 22:19, “a damsel of Israel;” Psa. 113: 9, “a mother of children;” cf. Gen. 21:28.
- <sup>f130</sup> The nard plant grows in Northern and Eastern India; the hairy part of the stem immediately above the root yields the perfume. Vid., Lassen’s *Indische Alterthumskunde*, I 338f., III 41f.
- <sup>f131</sup> In Arab. *ntn* = **نن**, to give an odour, has the specific signification, to give an ill odour (*mintin, foetidus*), which led an Arab. interpreter to understand the expression, “my nard has yielded, etc.,” of the stupifying savour which compels Solomon to go away (*Mittheilung*, Goldziher’s).

<sup>f132</sup> Vid., Schlotmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* (1867), p. 217.

<sup>f133</sup> They came from Arabia and India; the better Arabian was adulterated with Indian myrrh.

<sup>f134</sup> Vid., the literature of this subject in Defrémery's notice of Dozy-Engelmann's work in the *Revue Critique*, III 2 (1868), p. 408.

<sup>f135</sup> Pliny, *H. N.* xxiv. 102, ed. Jan., notes *brathy* as the name of the savin-tree *Juniperus sabina*. Wetstein is inclined to derive the name of Beirut from **ברות**, as the name of the sweet pine, the tree peculiar to the Syrian landscape, and which, growing on the sandy hills, prevents the town from being filled with flying sand. The cypress is now called (Arab.) *sanawbar*; regarding its old names, and their signification in the figurative language of love, vid., under Isa. 41:19.

<sup>f136</sup> Vid., Lagarde, *Onomastica*, p. 296; cf. Neubauer, *Géographic du Talm.* p. 47.

<sup>f137</sup> Vid., Ewald, *Jahrbuch*, IV p. 71; cf. Wüstemann, *Die Rose*, etc., 1854.

<sup>f138</sup> Vid., Fleischer, *Sitzungs-Berichten d. Sächs. Gesell. d. Wissensch.* 1868, p. 305. Among the rich flora on the descent of the Hauran range, Wetstein saw (*Reisebericht*, p. 148) a dark-violet magnificent lily (*susan*) as large as his fist. We note here Rückert's "Bright lily! The flowers worship God in the garden: thou art the priest of the house."

<sup>f139</sup> An Aramaic proverb: "from thorns sprouts the rose" (i.e., bad fathers have often pious children), in Heb. is **קוץ מוציא שושן**; vid., *Jalkut Samuel*, § 134.

<sup>f140</sup> In Heb. **ין** does not denote the vine as a plant, as the Aethiop. *wain*, whence *asada wain*, wine-court = vineyard, which Ewald compares; Dillmann, however, ineptly cites "vine-arbour," and South-Germ. "*kamerte*" = *vinea camerata*; in Heb. **בית היין** is the house in which wine is drunk.

<sup>f141</sup> "*Ro'b* (**ראב**), thus in Damascus), or *ra'b* (thus in the Hauran and among the Beduins), is a state of the soul which with us is found only in a lower degree, but which among the Arabians is psychologically noteworthy. The *wahm*, i.e., the idea of the greatness and irresistibility of a danger or a misfortune, overpowers the Arabian; all power of body and of soul suddenly so departs from him, that he falls down helpless and defenceless. Thus, on the 8th July 1860, in a few hours, about 6000 Christian men were put to death in Damascus, without one lifting his hand in defence, or uttering one word of supplication. That the *ro'b* kills in Arabia, European and native physicians have assured me; and I myself can confirm the fact. Since it frequently produces a stiffening of the limbs, with chronic lameness, every

kind of paralysis is called *ro' b*, and every paralytic *mar'ûb*. It is treated medically by applying the 'terror-cup' (*tâset er-ro' b*), covered over with sentences engraved on it, and hung round with twenty bells; and since, among the Arabians, the influence of the psychical on the physical is stronger and more immediate than with us, the sympathetic cure may have there sometimes positive results." — *Wetstein*.

<sup>ft42</sup> The distinction between these words is well explained by Lewisohn in his *Investigationes Linguae* (Wilna, 1840), p. 21: "The מעיר את־הישן is satisfied that the sleeper wakes, and it is left to him fully to overcome the influence of sleep; the מעורר, however, arouses him at once from sleepiness, and awakes him to such a degree that he is secured against falling asleep again."

<sup>ft43</sup> In this sense: to look sharply toward, is הציץ (Talm.) — for Grätz alone a proof that the Song is of very recent date; but this word belongs, like סמדר, to the old Heb. still preserved in the Talm.

<sup>ft44</sup> Grätz misinterprets this in order by the supplement of similar ones to make the whole poem a chain of narrative which Shulamith declaims to the daughters of Jerusalem. Thereby it certainly ceases to be dramatic, but so much more tedious does it become by these interposed expressions, "I said," "he said," "the sons of my mother said."

<sup>ft45</sup> It is true that besides in this passage *zāmār*, of the singing of birds, is not demonstrable, the Arab. *zamar* is only used of the shrill cry of the ostrich, and particularly the female ostrich.

<sup>ft46</sup> In like manner as (Arab.) *karbsh*, *corrugare*, is formed of *karb*, to string, and *karsh*, to wrinkle, combined; and another extension of *karsh* is *kurnash*, wrinkles, and *mukarnash*, wrinkled. "One day," said Wetstein to me, "I asked an Arab the origin of the word *karnasa*, to wrinkle, and he replied that it was derived from a sheep's stomach that had lain over night, i.e., the stomach of a slaughtered sheep that had lain over night, by which its smooth surface shrinks together and becomes wrinkled. In fact, we say of a wrinkled countenance that it is *mathal alkarash albayt*." With right Wetstein gathers from this curious fact how difficult it is to ascertain by purely etymological considerations the view which guided the Semites in this or that designation. *Samdor* is also a strange word; on the one side it is connected with *sadr*, of the veiling of the eyes, as the effect of terror; and on the other with *samd*, of stretching oneself straight out. E. Meier takes סמדר as the name of the vine-blossom, as changed from סמסר, bristling. Just as unlikely as that סמדר is cogn. to סמדר, *Jesurun*, p. 221.

- <sup>ft47</sup> Wetstein's *Reisebericht*, p. 182: "If the Syrian wood-pigeon does not find a pigeon-tower, **περιστερεῶνα**, it builds its nest in the hollows of rocky precipices, or in the walls of deep and wide fountains." See also his *Nord-arabien*, p. 58: "A number of scarcely accessible mountains in Arabia are called *alkunnat*, a rock-nest."
- <sup>ft48</sup> Vid., Schlottmann in the *Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1867, pp. 209-243. Rejecting the dramatic arrangement of this section, he interprets it throughout as a song of the chorus of the daughters of Jerusalem, which is already contradicted by 10*b*.
- <sup>ft49</sup> Weigand explains the German word *Braut* (bride) after the Sanscr. *prauḍha*, "she who is brought in a carriage;" but this particip. signifies nothing more than (*aetate*) *provetca*.
- <sup>ft50</sup> This deponent use of the *part. pass.* is common in the Mishna; vid., Geiger's *Lehrbuch zur Sprache der Mishna*, § 16. 5.
- <sup>ft51</sup> Vid., Friedr. Delitzsch's *Indogerman.-semit. Studien*, p. 72.
- <sup>ft52</sup> The Turkish *Ḳâmûs* says of *fârfâr*: "it is the name of a vehicle (*merkeb*), like the camel-litter (*haudej*), destined merely for women." This also derives its name from rocking to and fro. So *fârfâr*, for *farfara* is to the present day the usual word for *agiter*, *sécouer les ailes*; *farfarah*, for *lgreté*; *furfûr*, for butterfly (cf. Ital. *farfalla*); generally, the ideas of that which is light and of no value — e.g., a babbler — connect themselves with the root *far* in several derivatives.
- <sup>ft53</sup> Vid., Friedr. Delitzsch's *Indogerm.-sem. Stud.* p. 50. We are now taught by the Assyr. that as **בן** goes back to **בנה**, so **בר** (Assyr. *nibru*) to **ברה** = **ברא**, to bring forth.
- <sup>ft54</sup> Vid., Merx's *Gramm. Syr.* p. 115.
- <sup>ft55</sup> **אִפְּוֹרִיאַ**, quoted by Gesen. in his *Thes.*, *Sanhedrin* 109*b*, is not applicable here, it is contracted from **אִדְּפּוֹרִיאַ** (on the bed).
- <sup>ft56</sup> This derivation explains how it comes that *appiryon* can mean, in the Karaite Heb., a bird-cage or aviary, vid., Gottlob's **ס' בקרת**, p. 208. We have left out of view the phrase **אִפְּרִיוֹן נִמְטִי לִיה**, which, in common use, means: we present to him homage (of approbation or thanks). It occurs first, as uttered by the Sassanidean king, Shabur I, *Mezia* 119*a*, *extr.*; and already Rapoport, in his *Erech Mill-n*, 1852, p. 183, has recognised this word *appiryon* as Pers. It is the Old Pers. *âfr-na* or *âfrivana* (from *fr-*, to love), which signifies blessing or benediction (vid., Justi's *Handb. d. Zendsprache*, p. 51). Rashi is right in glossing it by **הן שלנו** (the testimony of our favour).

- <sup>ft57</sup> *Das Hohelied, Erstlingsdrama, u.s.w.* [The Song, a Primitive Drama from the East; or, Family Sins and Love's Devotion. A Moral Mirror for the Betrothed and Married], 1851.
- <sup>ft58</sup> Without the *Jod* after *Aleph* in the older ed. Thus also in J and H with the note לִית וְחֹסֶר [= *nonnisi h. l. et defectiva* ] agreeing with the MS Masora Parna. Thus also Kimchi, *Michlol* 108b.
- <sup>ft59</sup> The *Resh* has in H *Chatef-Pathach*, with *Metheg* preceding. This, according to Ben-Asher's rule, is correct (cf. *Psa.* 28: 9. וְרִי). In the punctuation of the *Aleph* with *Tsere* or *Segol* the Codd. vary, according to the different views of the punctuation. J has *Segol*; D H, *Tsere*, which latter also Kimchi, *Michlol* 109a.
- <sup>ft60</sup> L. Geiger (*Ursprung der Sprache*, 1869, p. 88) erroneously finds in R. חַת (חַתִּים, etc.) the meaning of binding. The (Arab.) noun *Khatan* means first a married man, and then any relation on the side of the wife (Lane); the fundamental idea must be the same as that of *Khatn*, *circumcidere* (cf. *Exo.* 4:25), viz., that of penetrating, which חַתְתָּ, *percellere*, and נַחַת, *descendere* (cf. e.g., *ferrum descendit haud alte in corpus*, in *Livy*, and *Pro.* 17: 1), also exhibit.
- <sup>ft61</sup> Regarding this verbal stem and its derivatives, see Theé's *Schlafgemach der Phantasie*, pp. 102-105.
- <sup>ft62</sup> Burns, the Scottish poet, thinking that goats are white, transfers the comparison from the hair to the teeth:
- “Her teeth are like a flock of sheep,  
With fleeces newly washen clean,  
That slowly mount the rising steep;  
And she's twa glancin', sparklin' een.”*
- <sup>ft63</sup> *Ḳ̣ad* cannot be used of one who sits on the bed *farash*; in *jalas* lies the direction from beneath to above; in *ḳ̣ad* (properly, to heap together, to cower down), from above to beneath.
- <sup>ft64</sup> The interior of a pomegranate is divided by tough, leather-like white or yellow skins, and the divisions are filled with little berries, in form and size like those of the grape, in the juicy inside of which little, properly, seed-corns, are found. The berries are dark red, or also pale red. The above comparison points to the mixing of these two colours.
- <sup>ft65</sup> The Moslem erotic poets compare the division of the lips to the dividing cleft into a pomegranate.
- <sup>ft66</sup> Cf. regarding such double words belonging to the more modern Semitic language, *Jesurun*, pp. 232-236.

- †67 The Arab. *lafa*, vi., proceeding from the same root-idea, signifies to bring in something again, to bring in again, to seek to make good again.
- †68 Vid., also Lagarde's *Onomastica*, p. 202: Θαλπιδὸθ' ἐπάλξη (read εἶς) ἢ ὕψηλά.
- †69 Vid., Oppert's *Grundzüge der Assyr. Kunst* (1872), p. 11.
- †70 Lassen's *Ind. Alterthumskunde*, I 334.
- †71 L. Geiger's *Ursprung d. Sprach.* p. 227; cf. 88.
- †72 A specimen of Böttcher's interpretation: "What is more natural than to suppose that the keeper of a vineyard showed herself with half of her head and neck exposed at the half-opened window to her shepherd on his first attempt to set her free, when he cried, 'my dove in the clefts of the rocks,' etc., and animated him thereby to this present bold deliverance of her from the midst of robbers?" We pity the Shulamitess, that she put her trust in this moonshiny coward.
- †73 Vid., Zschocke in the *Tübinger Quartalschrift*, 1867, 3.
- †74 Seal, מִוְהַר, pers. *muhr*, is used directly in the sense of maiden-like behaviour; vid., Perles' *etymol. Studien* (1871), p. 67.
- †75 In this general sense of "reed" (Syn. *arundo*) the word is also found in the Gr. and Lat.: κάνναι, κάναι), reed-mats, κάνεον, κάναστρον, a wicker basket, *canna*, *canistrum*, without any reference to an Indo-Germ. verbal stem, and without acquiring the specific signification of an aromatic plant.
- †76 Vid., Lassen's *Ind. Alterthumsk.* I 334f. Furrer, in Schenkel's *Bib. Lex.*, understands לְהֹלֵת of the *liliaceae*, indigenous to Palestine as to Arabia, which is also called *aloë*. But the drastic purgative which the succulent leaves of this plant yield is not aromatic, and the verb לְהֹלֵת "to glisten," whence he seeks to derive the name of this aloe, is not proved. Cf. besides, the Petersburg *Lex.* under *aguru* ("not difficult"), according to which is this name of the *amyris agallocha*, and the *aquilaria agallocha*, but of no *liliaceae*. The name *Adlerholz* ("eagle-wood") rests on a misunderstanding of the name of the Agila tree. It is called "*Paradiesholz*," because it must have been one of the paradise trees (vid., *Bereshith rabba* under Gen. 2: 8). Dioskorides says of this wood: θυμιᾶται ἀντὶ λιβανωτοῦ; the Song therefore places it along with myrrh and frankincense. That which is common to the lily-aloe and the wood-aloe, is the bitter taste of the juice of the former and of the resinous wood of the latter. The Arab. name of the aloe, *sabir*, is also given to the lily-aloe. The proverbs: *amarru min es-sabir*, bitterer than the aloe, and *es-sabr sabir*, patience is the aloe, refer to the aloe-juice.



†77 Vid., Wetstein in the *Zeitsch. für allgem. Erdkunde*, 1859, p. 123.

†78 Among the Slovacs a bride is called *malducha*, “virgin-bride,” before she has a cap placed on her head; and after that, *nevesta*, “bride-spouse.” In England, *bride* does not designate the betrothed as such, but the betrothed when near her marriage.

†79 There is scarcely any other example of the husband calling his spouse “sister” than that found in Est. 5: 9 (Apocr.), where Ahasuerus says to Esther: “What is it, Esther? I am thy brother.” Still more analogous are the words of Tob. 7:12: “From this time forth thou art her brother, and she is thy sister;” but here the relation of affinity blends itself with the marriage relationship. In Lat. *soror* frequently denotes a lover, in contrast to *uxor*. But here in the Song *ahhothi calla* comes in the place of *callathi*, which is ambiguous (“my daughter-in-law”).

†80 דֹּפֵק [is knocking] is not an attribute to the determinate דְּוֹדִי [my beloved] which it follows, but a designation of state or condition, and thus acc., as the Beirut translation renders it: “hear my beloved in the condition of one knocking.” On the other hand, דְּוֹדִי דֹּפֵק signifies “a beloved one knocking.” But “hear a beloved one knocking” would also be expressed acc. In classical language, the designation of state, if the subst. to which it belongs is indeterminate, is placed before it, e.g., “at the gate stood a beloved one knocking.”

†81 According to the primary idea: to break that which is solid or fluid into little pieces, wherefore רִסְסִים means also broken pieces. To this root appertains also the Arab. *rashh*, to trickle through, to sweat through, II to moisten (e.g., the mouth of a suckling with milk), and the Aethiop. *rasēha*, to be stained. Drops scattered with a sprinkling brush the Arabs call *rashahât*; in the mystical writings, *rashahât el-uns* (dew-drops of intimacy) is the designation of sporadic gracious glances of the deity.

†82 That it has the tone on the *penult.*, like פָּכָה, e.g., 5: 9, is in conformity with the paragog. nature of ה. The tone, however, when the following word in close connection begins with א, goes to the *ult.*, Est. 7: 6. That this does not occur in אֵיכֹ אֵל, is explained from the circumstance that the word has the disjunctive *Tifcha*. But why not in אֵיכֹ אַמֵּ? I think it is for the sake of the rhythm. Pinsker, *Einl.* p. 184, seeks to change the accentuation in order that the *penult.* accent might be on the second אֵיכֹ, but that is not necessary. Cf. Ps. 137: 7.

- <sup>†83</sup> Cf. the Arab. *ghawr* (*ghôr*), as a sinking of the earth, and *khawr* (*khôr*), as a breaking through, and, as it were, a piercing. The mouth of a river is also called *khôr*, because there the sea breaks into the river.
- <sup>†84</sup> Hengstenberg finds in this eulogium, on the supposition that Solomon is the author, and is the person who is here described, incomprehensible self-praise. But he does not certainly say all this immediately of himself, but puts it into the mouth of Shulamith, whose love he gained. But love idealizes; she sees him whom she loves, not as others see him, — she sees him in her own transforming light.
- <sup>†85</sup> Ivory is fully designated by the name **שְׁנֵה בַיִם**, Lat. *ebur*, from the Aegypt. *ebu*, the Aegypto-Indian *ibha*, elephant.
- <sup>†86</sup> Hyrtl's *Lehrbuch der Anat. des Menschen*, sec. 155.
- <sup>†87</sup> Dillmann proposes the question, the answer to which he desiderates in Ewald, how the maiden could be so fluent in speaking of the new glories of the Solomonic era (plants and productions of art). Böttcher answers, that she had learned to know these whilst detained at court, and that the whole description has this ground-thought, that she possessed in her beloved all the splendour which the women of the harem value and enjoy. But already the first words of the description, “white and ruddy,” exclude the sunburnt shepherd. To refer the gold, in the figurative description of the uncovered parts of the body, to this bronze colour is insipid.
- <sup>†88</sup> According to *Sebachim 54b*, one of the highest points of the Holy Land.
- <sup>†89</sup> Vid., Friedh. Delitzsch, *Indo-Germ. Sem. Studien*, p. 72.
- <sup>†90</sup> Cf. my *Jesurun*, p. 149.
- <sup>†91</sup> An old Chald. king is called *Rim-Sin*; *rammu* is common in proper names, as *Ab-rammu*.
- <sup>†92</sup> The name scarcely harmonizes with **רָמָה**, worm, although the pomegranate suffers from worm-holes; the worm which pierces it bears the strange name (**דְּרִימוֹנִי**) **הָהָה**, *Shabbath 90a*.
- <sup>†93</sup> **אֲמִי־נָדִיב**, thus in D F: **אֲמִי**, without the accent and connected with **נָדִיב** by *Makkeph*. On the contrary, P has **אֲמִי־נָדִיב** as one word, as also the Masora *parva* has here noted **חַדְהָ מְלָה**. Our Masora, however, notes **לִית וְתַרְתִּין כְּתִיבִין**, and thus Rashi and Aben Ezra testify.
- <sup>†94</sup> Böttcher explains *Mahanā<sup>m</sup>* as a plur.; but the plur. of **מַחְנֵה** is **מַחְנֵהוֹת** and **מַחְנֵי**; the plur. termination *ajim* is limited to **מֵיִם** and **שְׂמֵיִם**.

- †95 Vid., *Walther von der Vogelweide*, 173. 28. The Indian mythology goes farther, and transfers not only the original of the dance, but also of the drama, to heaven; vid., *Götting. Anzeigen*, 1874, p. 106.
- †96 *Alma* is the Arab. ‘*ualmah* (one skilled, viz., in dancing and *jonglerie*), and *Bajadere* is the Portug. softening of *baladera*, a dancer, from *balare* (*ballare*), mediaev. Lat., and then Romanic: to move in a circle, to dance.
- †97 Vid., Ryssel’s *Die Syn. d. Wahren u. Guten in d. Sem. Spr.* (1873), p. 12.
- †98 Vid., *Tebr̂zi*, in my work entitled *Jud.-Arab. Poesien, u.s.w.* (1874), p. 24.
- †99 See my *Gesch. d. Jüd. Poesie*, p. 30 f. Hoch (the German Solomon) reminds us of the Jewish marriage custom of throwing over the newly-married pair the contents of a vessel wreathed with flowers, and filled with wheat or corn (with money underneath), accompanied with the cry, פֶּרּוּ וְרַבּוּ [be fruitful and multiply].
- †100 In Merx’ *Archiv*. III 355.
- †101 Vid., Robinson’s *Phys. Geogr.* p. 51.
- †102 *Zeitschr. für allgem. Erdkunde*, 1859, p. 157 f.
- †103 Compare from the same poet: “Alas! thy braided hair, a heart is in every curl, and a dilemma in every ring” (*Deu. Morg. Zeit.* xxiv. 581).
- †104 Samaschshari, *Mufaṣṣal*, p. 8.
- †105 Also that סַנְסַן is perhaps equivalent to סַלְסַל (זֹלַל, תִּלְתַּל), to wave hither and thither, comes here to view.
- †106 Vid., *Hâfiz*, ed. Brockhaus, II p. 46.
- †107 Vid., Eugène Despris in the *Revue politique et litteraire* 1873. The idea was not new. This also was the sentiment of Fray Luis de Leon; vid., his *Biographie* by Wilkens (1866), p. 209.
- †108 Vid., Fleischer, *Makkari*, 1868, p. 271.
- †109 Ben-Asher punctuates אֲנִי־הִנֵּנִי. Thus also P. rightly. Ben-Naphtali, on the contrary, punctuates אֲנִי־הִנֵּנִי. Cf. *Genesis* (1869), p. 85, note 3.
- †110 Cf. my *Das Hohelied unter. u. ausg.* (1851), pp. 65-73.
- †111 Vid., Porphyrius, *de Abstin.* iv. 16, and Inman in his smutty book, *Ancient Faiths*, vol. I 1868, according to which the pomegranate is an emblem of “a full womb.”
- †112 Vid., Fleischer’s *Catal. Codd. Lips.* p. 428.
- †113 Vid., “Jisreel” in Schenkel’s *Bibl. Lex.*

- †114 חבל־תֵּד, penult. accented, and *Lamed* with *Pathach* in P. This is certainly right. *Michlol* 33a adduces merely יִלְדֵתֵךְ of the verse as having Kametz, on account of the pause, and had thus in view חֶבֶן, with the *Pathach* under *Lamed*. But P. has also יִלְ, with *Pathach* under *Daleth*, and so also has H, with the remark בִּפְתַחֵיךְ (viz., here and Jer. 22:26). The *Biblia Rabbinica* 1526 and 1615 have also the same pointing, *Pathach* under *Daleth*. In the printed list of words having *Pathach* in pause, this word is certainly not found. But it is found in the MS list of the *Ochla veochla*, at Halle.
- †115 Others, e.g., Bruno von Asti (†1123) and the Waldensian Exposition, edited by Herzog in the *Zeit. für hist. Theol.* 1861: *malum = crux dominica*. Th. Harms (1870) quotes 2: 3, and remarks: The church brings forth her children under the apple tree, Christ. Into such absurdities, in violation of the meaning of the words, do the allegorizing interpreters wander.
- †116 Vid., Wetstein's *Inschriften* (1864), p. 336.
- †117 The Arab. *ḥabilat*, she has conceived, and is in consequence pregnant, accords in the latter sense with *ḥamilat*, she bears, i.e., is pregnant, without, however, being, as Hitzig thinks, of a cognate root with it. For *ḥamal* signifies to carry; *ḥabal*, on the contrary, to comprehend and to receive (whence also the cord, figuratively, the tie of love, *liaison*, as enclosing, embracing, is called *ḥabl*, חַבֵּל), and like the Lat. *concipere* and *suscipere*, is used not only in a sexual, but also in an ethical sense, to conceive anger, to take up and cherish sorrow. The Assyr. *habal*, corresponding to the Heb. בָּן, is explained from this Arab. *ḥabl*, *concipere*. On the supposition that the Heb. had a word, חַבֵּל, of the same meaning as the Arab. *ḥabl*, then חַבֵּל might mean *concipiendo generare*; but the Heb. sentence lying before us leads to the interpretation *eniti*.
- †118 Of the copy of the *Tôra*, which was to be the king's *vade-mecum*, it is said, *Sanhedrin* 21b: עושה אותה כמין קמיע ותולה בזרוע, but also there the amulet is thought of not as fastened to the finger, but as wound round the arm.
- †119 Vid., my *Prolegomena* to Weber's *Vom Zorne Gottes* (1862), p. 35 ss.
- †120 The Phoen. Inscriptions, *Citens.* xxxvii., xxxviii., show a name for God, חִין רִשְׁפִי, or merely רִשְׁף, which appears to correspond to Ζεύς Κεραύνιος on the Inscriptions of Larnax (vid., Vogué's *Mélanges Archéologiques*, p. 19). רִשְׁפִי are thus not the arrows themselves (Grätz), but these are, as it were, lightnings from His bow (Psa. 76: 4).

<sup>ft121</sup> Thus in the *Biblia Rabbinica* and P. H. with the note מלהחדא ולא מפיך. Thus by Ben-Asher, who follows the Masora. Cf. *Liber Psalmorum Hebr. atque Lat.* p. 155, under Psa. 118: 5; and Kimchi, *Wörterb.*, under אפל and שלהב. Ben-Naphtali, on the other hand, reads as two words, שלֹהֶבֶת יָהּ. [Except in this word, the recensions of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali differ only “*de punctis vocalibus et accentibus.*” Strack’s *Prolegomena*, p. 28.]

<sup>ft122</sup> This is certainly not the *Baal-Meon* (now *Main*) lying half an hour to the south of Heshbon; there is also, however, a *Meon* (now *Main*) on this [the west] side of Jordan, Nabal’s Maon, near to Carmel. Vid., art. “Maon,” by Kleuker in Schenkel’s *Bibl. Lex.*

<sup>ft123</sup> Vid., Robinson’s *Physical Geogr. of the Holy Land*, p. 113; Morrison’s *Recovery of Jerusalem* (1871), p. 463, etc.

<sup>ft124</sup> Cf. also Schwarz’ *Das heilige Land*, p. 37.

<sup>ft125</sup> Similarly Godet: The earth during the present time belongs to the earthly power; only at the end shall the bridegroom fetch the bride, and appear as the heavenly Solomon to thrust out the false and fleshly, and to celebrate the heavenly marriage festival.

<sup>ft126</sup> If this dance, e.g., is danced to celebrate a victory, it not seldom happens that the spectators call out to a young man particularly struck by the dancer: Kneel to her. He who is thus challenged steps into the circle, sinks down on his right knee, in which inconvenient attitude he endeavours to approach the dancer, who on her part falls down on both her knees; sliding and fencing according to the beat of the music, she retreats, and at the same time seeks with all her might to keep her assailant back with a sword. He parries the strokes with his left arm, while he attempts to gain his object. viz., with his right hand to touch the head of the dancer. If he succeeds in this, he cries out, “Dancer, I touch!” With that the play ends, and the victor leaves the arena amid the approving shouts of the throng, often bleeding from many wounds. Many a one has forfeited his life in his attempt to touch a celebrated beauty. Since such death was self-chosen, the maiden goes unpunished. If the assailant, as often happens is the brother or father’s brother’s son of the dancer, in which case the venture is less perilous, he has the right to kiss the vanquished damsel, which is always for the spectator a great amusement.

<sup>ft127</sup> By *nakkârât* are meant those little tymbals (kettledrums) which are used to keep time with the dancing-song, when that is not done by the tambourine. The ladies of Damascus take them with them to every country party, where frequently, without any singing, they are the only accompaniment of the dance. They are thus used: a damsel seats herself on the bare ground, places

the two (scarcely is there ever only one) saucers — large copper hemispheres — before her breast, and beats against them with two wooden mallets. Their strings are made of the skins of goats or gazelles, while, for the tambourine, preference is given to the throat-bag of the pelican. These tymbals, like our own, have an unequal sound; when out of tune, they are rectified by being heated over a brazier.

<sup>ft128</sup> *The Gihâd*- is a rare Turkish gold piece of money, of old and beautiful coinage, thin but very large, and of the finest gold. It was carried as a charm against the evil eye. On a bride's crown it forms the lowermost row of coins.

<sup>ft129</sup> According to Wetzstein's opinion, 5: 2ff. is also a *waşf*, to which the narrative, vv. 5-7, aims at giving only an agreeable commencement; the songs of the Song which he does not regard as Solomonic, nor as a dramatic united whole, particularly the *Waşf*-portions, appear to him to have been received into the Canon in order to preserve for the people some beautiful hallowed marriage songs, and to give good examples for imitation to the occasional poets whose productions may in ancient times, among the Hebrews, as in our own day among ourselves, have overstepped the limits of propriety and good taste. The allegorical or mystical interpretation appeared later, and was in this case something lying far nearer than e.g., with those love-songs which were sung by the singers of the mosque of the Omajads at the festival *thalilat*, at the grave of Joh. the Baptist. "Place, time, and circumstance," says the Damascene, "give to a song its meaning."

<sup>ft130</sup> *Abû-Temmâm*, the collector of the *Hamâsa*, was also a native of *Gâsim*. [Vid., Delitzsch's *Jud.-Arab. Poesien* of the pre-Muhammed period, p. 1.]

<sup>ft131</sup> It is not improbable that *Nawâ* is an abbreviation of **نَوَّاحِي**, as *Medina* is of *Med-nat-en-Neb*. Regarding the supposed grave of Job in the neighbourhood of *Nawâ*, vid., *Comment. on Job* by Fr. Delitzsch.

<sup>ft132</sup> These seven nights are the last four of February and the first three of March (of the old calendar). They are very cloudy, rainy, and dark, and are called *el-mustakriđât*, "the borrowing nights," either because they have a share of the clouds, rain, and darkness of all the other nights of the year, as if borrowed from them, or because the seven reciprocally dispose of their shares, so that, e.g., the darkness of each of these nights is sevenfold. The frequent hail which falls during these cold disagreeable days is called "old wives' teeth" (*asnân-el-agâiz*), because many old people die during these days.


<sup>ft133</sup> While sometimes the light of the new moon is weak and that of the balances is very strong; the contrary is the case here. The balances are two constellations: the one is called the right balance (*m-nzân-el-ħaḳḳ*), and

consists of three very bright stars; the other is called the false balance (m. el-butl), and consists of two bright and one dimmer star.

<sup>ft134</sup> The eyebrows are compared to the arch of the Arab. letter nûn inverted; this comparison, in which the rural poets imitate the insipid city poets, is only admissible when one has before him a Nûn written by a calligraphic hand.

<sup>ft135</sup> The eyes of the Kufic or Babylonian lady (bâbil-ja) are perfectly black, which for the Arabians are particularly dangerous. Also with the Babylonian sorceress Zuhara, who led astray the two angels Hârût and Mârût (vid., *Ḳorân* ii. 26), her charms lay in her black eyes.

<sup>ft136</sup> The date of ʿIrâḳ is white and small, not too long and very sweet.

<sup>ft137</sup> The Seijal is a daḳḳa, i.e., a tattooed arabesque in the form of final Mim's standing over one another. The Mân<sup>^</sup> (v. 20), another daḳḳa, is applied to the top of the windpipe. It consists for the most part of a ring, in which is engraved as a talisman a Syrian, i.e., a feigned angel's name ending in .

<sup>ft138</sup> The *Ḳezah*, n. unit. *Ḳezḥa*, is the *nigella sativa* with which fine pastry is sprinkled.

<sup>ft139</sup> Here it is not the well of the Wâdy Kanawât on the Haurân range that is meant, but the Kanawât stream, an arm of the Baradâ, which fills the tanks of the Damascus houses, so that the thought would be that the neck of the bride is white like that of a lady of the city, not brown like that of a peasant.

<sup>ft140</sup> The Dura of the Haurân is the millet, which, when laid in milk, receives a white glance, and enlarges, so that it may be compared to a finger-nail.

<sup>ft141</sup> The upholsterer (neddâf, usually called ḥallâg) has a bow above one fathom long, the string of which, consisting of a very thick gut-string, he places in contact with the wool or cotton-wool which is to be shaken loose, and then strikes it with a short wooden mallet. By the violent and rapid vibration of the string, the wool, however closely it may have been pressed together and entangled, is changed with surprising quickness into the finest down.