become corrupt and polluted: all flesh and the earth. There is a strong notion of moral actions having consequences for the environment in the Old Testament. Cain’s killing of his brother has an effect on the land in Gen. iv 11-12. Similarly, as the wicked generation have corrupted themselves by grasping at power which was not conferred on man in Gen. i 26-30, so the boundaries between dry land and water are broken down with horrific consequence. It is highly appropriate that the earth is then destroyed, since it has come under the corrupting influence of sin.

Finally, as 'et- is used with the sense of “with” in Gen. ix 9, it seems likely that its use is similar in Gen. vi 13.

Given these points, it seems that the text of Gen. vi 13 makes good sense as it stands. That God “will destroy them with the earth” is the most appropriate rendering of the words, and emendation is unnecessary.

Folkestone P. J. Harland


THE PROBLEMATIC SUFFIXES OF AMOS IX 11

The MT of Amos ix 11 in its present form contains three incongruous suffixes which seemingly defy explanation. These three distinct suffixes used in the second half of the verse refer back to the unique phrase “booth of David”. The MT may be literally translated:

On that day I will raise up the fallen booth of David;
And I will wall up their (feminine plural) breaches (piršēhen),
And I will raise his (masculine singular) ruins (uwaḥāritsōlāyûn),
And I will build it (ūbōnītīhā: feminine singular) as in the days of old.

*Vetus Testamentum* XLIII, 3 (1993)
The problem is clear enough. The use of the feminine plural, masculine singular, and feminine singular suffixes cannot be readily explained grammatically as references to the feminine singular construct “booth of David”. The normal solution follows the LXX and reads all three suffixes in the third feminine singular (τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς; τὰ κατεσχαμένα αὐτῆς; ἀνοιξοδομήσω αὐτήν). The vast majority of commentators have welcomed the LXX as the means of avoiding the problem, either through their unqualified acceptance or with the hesitant admission that no better suggestion has adequately explained the incongruity. In the light of such unanimity it would appear superfluous to suggest an alternative reading were it not for the fact that scholars have generally proceeded from two incorrect assumptions when treating this text. First, most authors implicitly or explicitly presume that the LXX represents the “more original” reading; and second, they presume that the solution must explain away one or more of the problematic suffixes. There are good reasons for rejecting both these presuppositions.

The LXX need not represent the “original reading” of Amos ix 11; rather, it may harmonize the MT. Mays and Rudolph call the LXX reading into question, but offer no grounds for doing so; nor do they offer clarification of the meaning or explanation of the so-called corruption of the MT. In reality, the LXX is no different from the other ancient versions. The LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate all read the same text, but attempt a solution to the suffixes in their own way. Whereas the LXX eliminates the problem by ignoring the change of number and gender in the suffixes, the Syriac and Vulgate offer some help both in the verification of the MT and, more indirectly, toward a solution.

A comparison of the Vulgate with the MT and LXX reveals an attempt to avoid the problem through phraseology, as well as the creation of further problems with the use of an otherwise unattested third-person masculine singular suffix for the feminine suffix in the phrase “I will rebuild it.” The Vulgate may be read: “I will raise the tent of David which is destroyed, and I will rebuild the holes of its walls; and those things which they destroyed I will repair; and I shall rebuild him as in the days of old.” In the first occurrence of the suffix, the word “its” (eius) can be either masculine, neuter, or feminine, but since the antecedent is neuter (tabernaculum), eius must be neuter as well. The Vulgate has been formulated according to