grinding at the mill; one shall be taken and the other left’’ (Matt. xxiv 21) = “if there be two women grinding ...” The apodosis, I submit, states the legal consequences of an uxorilocal marriage, if and when this took place.

“Flesh” in this context can only, it seems to me, be a legal term for clan membership: to say therefore that a man who abandons his parental clan thereby becomes “one flesh” with his wife implies entry into membership of the wife’s clan, with all its attendant rights and obligations—particularly, no doubt, in the domains of inheritance and the blood-feud system.

A striking linguistic parallel for this is furnished by the mediaeval Arab historian Ibn Khaldun (Muqaddimah, ch.2 §§ 8, 10). He declares that tribal identity is not founded diachronically on the pedigrees (ansāb), so much prized by the Arabs, but on a synchronic solidarity feeling, expressed in the sharing of common rights and common obligations. He notes that there have been known cases of a man changing his tribal identity and attaching himself to a tribe with which he has no genealogical link; such a person is at first treated by his new group as an “outsider and clinger-on” (dakhil wa laṣiq), but with lapse of time this inferior status may be forgotten or disregarded, and then the newcomer or his descendants, by participation in the full rights and obligations of the tribe, becomes wholly integrated into the new group; and this process Ibn Khaldun describes as ‘‘donning the skin’’ of his new fellow-tribesmen (yalbasu jildatum)

Oxford

A. F. L. Beeston

ROYAL WORDS IN PSALM LXXXIV 11

It is believed on good grounds that in Ps. lxxxiv 11 the form bāharti is due to an erroneous text tradition. Assuming that v. 11 consists of two distichs, one must state that in the traditional version the first distich is too short, the second too long. The sentence structure of the first line is surprising too; it would seem that an element is lacking after mālāp. On the other hand, after tōb in v. 11a bāharti is not quite necessary in v. 11b. The Septuagint presupposes a text agreeing with the Massoretic text at the point in question; the same is true of the other ancient versions.

Vetus Testamentum XXXVI, 1 (1986)
In substitution for bāḥarti several emendations have been proposed: bāḥādāry, "in my rooms"; bēḥedri "in my room"; bāḥūs, "outside"; bēbāmōt ḥāwen, "on the high places of iniquity";
or, retaining the consonantal text, bēḥārātī (from a supposed Hebrew noun hārā), "in my home"; bēḥērūtī, "in my estate"; bēḥūrōtāy, "in my youth".

As may be noticed, in these proposals the Beth of bhrty is generally taken as denoting the preposition be, and the Yodh is mostly considered to denote the first person singular pronominal suffix. In my opinion, both views are arguable and logical; for apparently the part of text under consideration is the counterpart of bāḥāsērekā. On the other hand, as the beginning of the second line ("to linger by the threshold...") presents quite another conception than the beginning of the first does ("a day in thy courts..."), the element to be emended is not, in my opinion, necessarily parallel to the "tents of wickedness".

It is striking that, beside the Beth and, supposedly, the suffix morpheme, bhrty also has two consonants in common with the noun in bḥṣrk, viz. h and r, in the same order. I think one common consonant has dropped out, namely, the second radical of hāṣēr. So I propose to read bḥṣrty (bāḥāṣērōtāy) instead of bhrty. We may translate: "For better is one day in thy courts than a thousand in my own".

The plausibility of the suggested statement is examined below from different points of view.

1. First the linguistic aspects. The defective spelling ḥṣrt (ḥāṣērōtay) in uncommon in biblical tradition, but can be accounted for by supposing that the text corruption slipped in early, possibly about the sixth century BCE. The emended form may be modernized to bḥṣrute (bāḥāṣērōtay, or bḥhasrōtay).—Looked at syntactically, the emended text appears to be correct. While in English an anaphoric possessive pronoun may be used in the type of sentence under discussion, Biblical Hebrew repeats the noun; see e.g. 1 Kings i 47; Isa. lv 9; Amos vi 2.

2. From a logical point of view the statement, with its repetition of the "courts", has a simplicity and fluency which somehow are wanting in proposals balancing the temple courts with "my room(s)", "my estate", or "my youth".

3. Is the statement acceptable as an element of Hebrew poetry? In distichs the Hebrew parallelismus membrorum can go with repetitions. An element at the beginning of the first stich may return at