lignes d’autre part, il y a parallélisme des éléments sémantiques correspondants et chiasme des éléments syntaxiques par rapport à leur position dans chacune des lignes. Proposons un tableau récapitulatif:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ni'kābit (verbe)</th>
<th>kē (comparaison) mēt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>millēb</td>
<td>bāyīsī (verbe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki (comparaison)</td>
<td>kēlī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) Toute traduction est trahison. Nous avons tenté ici de sauver quelques-usn des effets du TM: Est-ce là / la cité (z.l.l.z); autrefois / tribut (qāṃ / qāmḥi); tribut / bonne distance (yōhā'ilāḥ / lägūr).

10) Dans son article de la ZAW. (cf note 1), p. 250, Watson constate: „The ‘pivot’ may or may not be essential to the meaning of the verse (soit: e, ou: n), while the second outer line may simply repeat (soit: R) the first, or be parallel (soit: P) to it”, d’où quatre types de „Pivotal word”: RēR, RnR, PeP, MnP. Nous n’avons pas cité d’exemples des deux premiers dans cet article, mais il nous semble qu’en Jon. ii 10 nous avons PeP dans le Ps. xxxi 13 successivement MnP (pivot kēlī pour les 1° et 2° lignes de notre proposition) et PeP (pivot millēb bāyīsī entre les deux comparaisons, donc en faisant abstraction du premier mot). En Is. xxiii 7 nous avons alternativement MnP pour les lignes (1) à (3) (en faisant abstraction des deux premiers mots; ici le parallélisme est explicatif), PnP pour les lignes (2) à (4) (ici le parallélisme est à entendre au sens large; on pourrait le dire complémentaire: temps + lieu), et de nouveau MnP pour les lignes (3) à (5) (ici le parallélisme est à la fois progressif — tribut + respect — et antithétique — approche et distance —, le pivot permettant le passage d’un terme à l’autre).

**A NEW PROPOSAL FOR THE CRUX IN PSALM II 12**

The phrase *naṣṣeqâ-bar* at the beginning of Ps. ii 12 has gained no sure solution. The traditional translation “kiss the son” (Luther, King James Version, and often) is clearly impossible—the Aramaic *bar* is excluded, given the Hebrew *bēnî*, “my son,” in verse 7. The Ancient Versions shed no further light on the problem. Many recent translations (Revised Standard Version, Zürcher Bibel, Bible de Jérusalem) have followed the suggestion offered by Alfred Bertholet 1), emending the MT *weqēlū birādā naṣṣeqâ-bar* into *naṣṣeqâ *bērāglāyw birādā*, “kiss his feet with trembling,” but not many will be comfortable with so massive an emendation. The literature on the question is well known, and there is no need to review it here: it is clear that no suggestion has won general acceptance.

Mitchell Dahood has moved us a step forward by his proposal 2) to see in the last consonants of *naṣṣeqâ-bar* the word *qeber*, “grave.” This suggestion is altogether likely, given the phrase, “lest he be angry, and you perish” in the next colon. But Dahood proposed to
read the previous word as nēšē, translating it "men of": in this proposal, "men of the grave" means "O mortal men." He assumes thereby that the Hebrew nāšîm can mean "men" as nîm does in Ugaritic. But I find the reading nēšē, "men of," here dubious, dubious linguistically for Hebrew and dubious poetically given the context.

I propose instead nōšē "[you who are] forgetful of". The root nūḇh is quite well attested with the meaning "forget". The verb does not occur in the Psalms, but the noun nēšīyyā, "oblivion," does, in Ps. lxxxviii 13, and, interestingly enough, in a series of synonyms for the grave:

lxxxviii 12: "Is thy steadfast love declared in the grave (baqqeber),
or thy faithfulness in Abaddon?

13: Are thy wonders known in the darkness,
or thy saving help in the land of forgetfulness
(be'eres nēšīyyā)?"

If the grave is the land of forgetfulness, then (if my proposal is valid) it is ironic that the foreign kings should be mocked as "oblivious of oblivion," forgetful of the land of forgetfulness when they should be conscious that the grave threatens them through Yahweh’s anointed king.

When I made this suggestion to Dahood, he replied that it gains in plausibility by the phrase ṣōkēhē ṣōlāḥ, "[you who are] forgetful of God," in Ps. 1 22. What he did not point out to me, but what becomes clear as soon as the two sequences are laid side by side, is their remarkable congruence:

ii 11b-12a ṣẃgīlā bir’ādâ *nōšē *geber pen-yēn̂nap wesō♭b’dû derek
1 22 binū-nā tōt ṣōkēhē ṣōlāḥ pen-.vert̂p nō’en massil;

The second passage may be translated, “Mark this, then, you who forget God, lest I rend, and there be none to deliver!” (Revised Standard Version). In both we would have a plural imperative (and of similar hollow verbs, gīlū and binū) with complement, followed by a vocative phrase meaning “forgetful of” plus object, followed by a pen-clause giving the consequence of Yahweh’s anger if the command is not obeyed. This congruence, I suggest, gives indirect reinforcement to the plausibility of my suggestion.

Now there is one more passage which ṣōkēhē appears; this passage is not quite so congruent as are the other two, but is still relevant to the discussion: