

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

the ordinances or not. So all full blown or budding sacramentarianism is to be fought against to the uttermost, because it tends to block the road to the City of Refuge for a poor sinful soul, and the most pressing of all necessities is that that way of life should be kept clear and unimpeded.

We need the profound truth which lies in the threefold form which Paul gives to one of his great watchwords: "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." And how, says my despairing conscience, shall I keep the commandments? The answer lies in the second form of the saying—"In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." And how, replies my saddened heart, can I become a new creature? The answer lies in the final form of the saying—"In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh." Faith brings the life which makes us new men, and then we can keep the commandments. If we have faith, and are new men and do God's will, we need no rites but as helps. Without these all rites are nothing.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

---

*THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD  
TESTAMENT.*

*THE BOOKS OF JUDGES AND RUTH.*

THE aim of these papers is to call attention to some of the more important changes in the Revised Version, to offer some explanation of the reasons for them, and to point out the difference of meaning involved. The limits of space must necessarily make these notes brief and incomplete, but

I hope that they will stimulate rather than supersede further study.

Let me say once for all, that when I venture to dissent from the Revisers' conclusions, it is in no spirit of captious criticism, and with a clear sense that it is somewhat presumptuous for an individual to do so. It only means that he votes with a minority, perhaps a very small one: and possibly, if he had been privileged to hear the arguments, he would have been converted to the view of the majority. Opinions will necessarily differ as to whether the Revisers have done all that might have been expected, but no one can study their work without constant recognition of the unwearied diligence and sober judgment with which they have accomplished their difficult and delicate task.

#### THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

i. 8. The pluperfect rendering of the A. V. "had gone," was doubtless due to the supposition that the preceding verse implies that Jerusalem had already been captured. But it is grammatically untenable (see Prof. Driver's *Tenses*, p. 105), and the natural sense of the passage is that the victorious Israelites carried their prisoner Adoni-bezek with them on their southward march as far as Jerusalem. The narrative of *vv.* 7, 8, 9 is consecutive.

9. Note the improved rendering of geographical terms.

15. The text is preferable to the margin. It is doubtful whether the suffix of *נְתַנִּי* can be taken as a dative; and moreover only Hebron and its neighbourhood, not the whole district of the *Negeb* or South, was Caleb's portion. The *Negeb* was dry and barren, and Achsah makes the very reasonable request that as her father was sending her to dwell there, he should add to her husband's portion the precious gift of springs of water.

16. *Moses' brother in law*, namely Hobab, chap. iv. 11. *חָוִי* signifies a relation by marriage, and may certainly

mean *father in law*, chap. xix. 4, 7, 9: but as Hobab was the son of Reuel (Num. x. 29), Moses' father in law, it is necessary to render *brother in law* here.

24. *The watchers*, i.e. the "spies," who had gone in sufficient numbers to besiege the city, though they would not venture to attack it until the man whom they found stealing out showed them some unguarded entrance.

30. *Tributary*, rather as in marg. *subject to taskwork*. מִסֵּךְ certainly means, (1) taskwork, or (2) the "levy" or corvée of workmen set to such forced labour, though in Aramaic and later Hebrew it also means "tribute." The employment of these Canaanites by Solomon is mentioned in 1 Kings ix. 20, 21.

ii. 1. *The*, not *an*, angel, as in v. 23; vi. 11 ff.; xiii. 3 ff., for the title is used of one who represented Jehovah in a special way. See Oehler's *O. T. Theology*, i. § 59. This is probably right, for the angel speaks as if God were speaking, without any preface of "Thus saith the LORD," but the marg. "messenger" is retained in deference to the opinion of many commentators, and Jewish tradition as old as the Targum, which paraphrases "a prophet sent from Jehovah."

2. *Why have ye done this?* should surely have been altered to "What is this that ye have done?" an expression of astonishment at the baseness of their apostasy, not an inquiry as to the reason for it. Comp. the same phrase in Gen. iii. 13.

3. The text is corrupt. Either as A.V. and R.V. both assume, some such word as *thorns* has been lost (cf. Num. xxxiii. 55; Josh. xxiii. 17), or, as the marg. suggests, for צַדִּים "sides" should be read צַרִּים "adversaries," with Sept., Targ., Vulg.

7. *The great work of the Lord*. All the separate *works* (Deut. xi. 3) of the Lord for Israel are regarded as forming one great whole, a connected scheme:

11, 13. *The Baalim . . . the Ashtaroth.* Baâlîm, the plural of Baal, denotes the various forms or names under which Baal, the supreme deity of the Canaanites and Phœnicians, was worshipped in different localities (Baal Peor, Baal Berith, Baal Zebub, and the like): Ashtârôth, the plural of Ashtôreth, the various forms of the corresponding female deity.

10. *The LORD, the God of their fathers.* Cf. iv. 6, "the LORD, the God of Israel." This slight change helps to remind the reader that LORD represents the proper name JEHOVAH, and is not a mere appellative.

20. *This nation.* There is a touch of rebuke in the use of the phrase, "this nation." Israel had degraded itself from its high position as the Lord's people to the level of an ordinary "nation."

iii. 5. *The Canaanites.* As *the Hittite* follows without the conjunction *and*, *Canaanites* may here be a general term for the inhabitants of the country, who are then specially described by their national names; but the marginal rendering is certainly possible, and in Exod. iii. 8, and elsewhere, the Canaanites seem to be mentioned as a separate nation.

7. *The Asheroth.* On the Ashêrah, and the mistranslation of the A.V. following the LXX. and Vulg., see Dr. Driver's note on Exod. xxxiv. 13.

9, 15. *A saviour.* So A.V. in 2 Kings xiii. 5; Neh. ix. 27. The suggestiveness of the right rendering is obvious.

10. Here and elsewhere the R.V. rightly prints *spirit*, not *Spirit*, as in A.V. "The spirit of the LORD" in the O.T. is a power proceeding from Him, but is not yet revealed as a distinct "Person." The way is prepared in the O.T. for the N.T. revelation of the Trinity, but that revelation is not yet made, and it is a mistake to read N.T. doctrine into the O.T. See Oehler's *O. T. Theology*, i. § 65.

19, 26. *Quarries.* The word פְּסִילִים occurs 20 times

in the O.T., and always in the sense given in the margin, *graven images*. So the LXX. and Vulg.; and it would have been safer to retain the established meaning of the word in the text. The meaning of "quarries," which is noticed by Jerome, and is adopted by most Jewish commentators, comes from the Targum. Can the Meturgemanim have preserved a true tradition of an exceptional meaning of the word, or were they offended by the idea of idols at Gilgal?

22. *And it came out behind.* The meaning is very obscure, and the text is possibly corrupt, the words **וַיֵּצֵא** **הַפְּרָשָׁנָה**, being an alternative for the first clause of ver. 23. If the text is sound, it is most natural to take Ehud to be the subject of **וַיֵּצֵא** here, as in the next verse (the words for "came out" and "went forth" are the same); and the marginal rendering appears to be preferable.

25, 26. *Tarried. . . tarried.* Why not represent the distinction of words in the original? The second (**הַתְּמַהְמָה**) seems to express the lingering delay of irresolution. Cf. Gen. xix. 16; xliii. 10 (linger); Jud. xix. 8 (tarry).

iv. 11. *The oak in Zaanannim.* On "oak" for "plain" see Dr. Driver's note on Gen. xii. 6. "Zaanaim" (A.V.) is the C'thib, "Zaanannim" the K'ri, agreeing with Josh. xix. 33.

21. *So he swooned and died.* The construction points to this connexion of the words. But on the other hand **וַיֵּעֵף** elsewhere means "to be faint" or "weary" (1 Sam. xiv. 28, 31; 2 Sam. xxi. 15), not "to swoon away," and the accents connect it with "in a deep sleep." Should we read **וַיֵּעֵף** and render as in the margin?

v. 2. *For that the leaders took the lead.* This is the rendering of the LXX. according to Cod. Alex., and some other MSS., and of Theodotion, from whose version it probably came into the MSS. of the LXX. The meaning "leaders," can be supported from the Arabic, and it suits the only other passage in which the word occurs (Deut.

xxxii. 42). The nobles and the people are contrasted as in *vv.* 9 (?), 10, 13. The A.V. (and before it the Genevan), follows Münster and the Jewish commentators in giving the words *פרעת בפרע*, the sense which the root has in Aramaic. So too the Peshitto. But it destroys the parallelism of the clauses.

*Bless for praise as in v. 9.*

7. *The rulers ceased.* The A.V. (again following Münster's *habitatores villarum*), agrees with the Targum in regarding *פְּרִוּוֹן*, as equivalent to *פְּרִוּוֹת*, *villages*. But this meaning will not suit *v.* 11, the only other passage in which the word occurs. The marginal rendering "toward his villages," given there, can hardly stand. If the text is sound *פְּרִוּוֹן* is best rendered "rule" in *v.* 11, and here regarded as abstract for concrete "rulers." The same sense suits the cognate *פְּרִוּוֹים* (Hab. iii. 14), and is supported by LXX. *δυνατοί*, Vulg. *fortes*. In spite of such judges as Shamgar, the general condition of the country was one of anarchy until Deborah arose. Studer however points out, (1) that this rendering involves a contradiction to *v.* 6; "when Shamgar and Jael were judges, there was no judge;" (2) that *הדלו* must be taken in a different sense from that which it has in *v.* 6; and perhaps we should follow him in reading *פְּרִוּוֹת*, and render as in R.V. marg. The words then forcibly describe the desolate state of the country, when no one dared to live in unfortified villages for fear of plunderers. But the text as it stands can hardly, in view of *v.* 11, be rendered otherwise than in R.V.

9. A third translation deserves consideration.

"My heart is towards the governors of Israel,

Towards them that offered themselves."

The verse would then be exactly parallel to *v.* 2.

10. *Ye that sit on rich carpets.* The A.V. follows LXX., Vulg., Targ.; but *מְדִינִין* can hardly be *רִי*, with prep. *בְּנו*, or a subst. with preformative *בְּ*. It is an Aramaic plur. of *מֵד*.

which means "garment" or "carpet," such as rich men sit upon. Three classes of men, poetically representing the whole people, are summoned to celebrate Israel's deliverance: wealthy nobles, who now ride fearlessly along the highways; rich men, who enjoy the comforts of their homes in undisturbed peace; the ordinary folk, who go afoot, and can now travel from place to place without fear of molestation.

11. Very obscure. The text of the R.V. leaves the sense of the first two clauses substantially unchanged. The people who had formerly stolen out to draw water at the risk of their lives from the archers of the enemy, now congregate undisturbed round the wells to celebrate the Lord's righteousness manifested in His deliverance of Israel. This is probably right. In the marginal alternative "the archers" are those of Israel, who are represented as encamped by the wells and celebrating their victory; and in gratitude for this all are bidden to join in praising the Lord.

*His rule.* See on v. 7.

*Went down, not shall go down,* is the correct translation. So already the Genevan, "did . . . go down." The meaning is either that the Israelites came down from their mountain fastnesses to attack the cities of their enemies, or that after the defeat of the Canaanites they returned to dwell peaceably in their own cities. As "then" in vv. 13, 19, 22 refers to the time of the war of independence, the first explanation is perhaps best. The mention of thanksgiving for deliverance in the first part of the verse carries the poet's mind back to the course of the war which freed Israel, and she proceeds to describe it in the second part of the song, vv. 12-31.

13. The Massoretic division and punctuation of this verse, which the A.V. follows, bristle with difficulties. יִר is pointed as imperf. Piel of רָרַח, which does not occur elsewhere, and rendered in the A.V., after the Jewish

commentators, "made to have dominion." This, as the traditional Jewish interpretation, has been thought still to deserve a place in the margin. . But in the text the Revisers have rightly treated ירד as the perfect of ירד, "went down." Whether the anomalous pointing is to be retained or altered to the usual ירד, they had not to decide. "Among the people" (A.V.) is an impossible rendering, and if we retain the Massoretic accentuation, the only course is to supply *and* as the R.V. does. The construction is a somewhat harsh asyndeton. But it seems much better to desert the Massoretic accents, and connecting עם with יהוה, render as in the margin, "the people of the Lord." There is then a contrast between the nobles and the people, as in *v.* 2. The nobles were but a remnant, for some cowardly remained at home. Cf. the LXX. : τότε κατέβη κατάλειμμα τοῖς ἰσχυροῖς· λαὸς κυρίου κατέβη αὐτῷ ἐν τοῖς κραταιοῖς. But I cannot help thinking that Studer's rendering is the right one :

"Then came down a remnant to meet the strong :

The people of the LORD came down for me against the mighty."

There is then an exact parallelism between "remnant" and "people," "strong" and "mighty" : the latter terms both refer to the Canaanites : and Deborah extols the heroism of the ten thousand, who, a mere handful or remnant compared with Sisera's host, dared to come down and face them in the field.<sup>1</sup>

14. *They whose root is in Amalek.* The Ephraimites who had settled (Isa. xxvii. 6) in the part of their territory known, probably from some ancient colony of Amalekites there, as "the hill country of the Amalekites" (chap. xii. 15).

14. *Staff of office, not pen,* is the meaning of שֵׁבֶט,

<sup>1</sup> The American Revisers would place another alternative in the margin, taking ירד as an anomalous form of the imperative. "Then go down, O remnant, for the nobles. . . . O Jehovah, go down for me against the mighty."

and סִפֵּר, lit. "scribe" or "enumerator," denoting the officer who counted and mustered the troops, is happily translated *marshal*. Cf. 2 Kings xxv. 19; Isa. xxxiii. 18; Jer. xxxvii. 15.

15, 16. *Watercourses* or "streams" is the meaning of the word פְּלִגִּיֹת in Job xx. 17, the only other place in which it occurs. Reuben heard the great news of the bold enterprise of his brethren as he fed his flocks beside the streams of the *Belka*; conscience pricked him, and he made unanimous resolves to go to their help, but courage failed him to translate words into action.

17. *Shore* (marg.), not *haven*, is the best attested meaning of חוּף. See Gen. xlix. 13. *Creeks*, lit. places where the sea *breaks* into the coast: hence the rendering of the A. V.

26. *Nail*, i.e. as in marg., *tent-pin*, which the American Revisers would place in the text. Cf. chap. iv. 21, 22.

26. *Smote off* in A. V. is a mistranslation, and necessitated the further ungrammatical rendering *when she had pierced, etc.* It is a pity that the Revisers did not see their way to a more exact rendering of the tenses, which give a vivid picture of Jael in the act of stretching out her hand. "See! she putteth her hand . . . she smiteth through his head, yea, she pierceth and striketh through his temples." Cf. Dr. Driver's *Tenses*, § 27. But poetry cannot be translated any more than Raphael's pictures can be copied.

27. *Dead*. Why not as A. V. marg. *destroyed*, which is what the word means? Cf. Ps. cxxxvii. 8.

29. *Her wise ladies*. Lit. "The wisest of her princesses." The tense is again pictorial, "answer." The marginal rendering, "Yet she repeateth her words unto herself," is very attractive. It describes very forcibly the anxious disquietude of Sisera's mother, still foreboding ill, in spite of her ladies' endeavours to console her. But, (1) אַף adds; it does not contrast: it means *yea*, not *yet*: (2) הַשִּׁיב אִמְרֵים

is the poetical equivalent of *השיב דברים*, which regularly means "to answer," not "to repeat"; and it has this meaning in the only other place where it occurs, Prov. xxii. 21.

vi. 3. The Revisers should have made it clear that invasions repeated year after year are described. Would "used to come up" (as in chap. xiv. 10), have been too clumsy?

11. *The* not *an* angel. See on ii. 1.

13. *Wondrous works*. "Miracle" occurs in the A.V. of the O.T. six times only: (1) twice for *אֵיֹת* (Num. xiv. 22; Deut. xi. 3), commonly and rightly rendered "sign," which the R.V. gives in these places also; (2) twice in the text, and once in the margin, for *מוֹפֵת* (Exod. vii. 9; Deut. xxix. 3; 2 Chron. xxxii. 24 marg.), usually rendered "wonder," and so the R.V. in Exod. and Deut.; in Chron. "sign," marg. "wonder"; (3) here only for *נִפְלְאוֹת*, elsewhere rendered in A.V. "wonders," "marvels," "wondrous works" or "things," "wonderful works," "marvellous works" or "things," all of which various renderings are still to be found in the R.V., though a few changes have been made for the sake of uniformity in the same chapter. Opinions will differ as to whether this is not a case in which the principle of "assimilation" of renderings should have been more thoroughly carried out. Some readers may object to the elimination of the word "miracles" from the O.T. Clearly, however, the word could not have been retained for *אֵיֹת* or *מוֹפֵת*, for which "sign" and "wonder" are the proper renderings; nor as an isolated rendering in the present passage. The application of the same term to exceptional works of Providence (as here; Exod. iii. 20; xxxiv. 10), and to the regular operations of nature (Job xxxvii. 14; cf. v. 9; ix. 10), is exceedingly instructive. Both alike excite the wonder and reverent awe of the beholder, and reveal God to him.

vii. 8. The Hebrew text is almost certainly corrupt.

“People” in *v.* 7 means the army in general; but the subject to “took” in *v.* 8 must be the three hundred. The marginal rendering is that of the Sept. and Targ., but it is not quite satisfactory. The sense would be that the three hundred took store of provisions and trumpets from the people; as Jerome paraphrases, “sumptis itaque pro numero cibariis et tubis.”<sup>1</sup>

23. *Were gathered together.* The verb means literally “were cried together.” See A.V. marg., chap. x. 17. Might not this have been retained? The “Land-Fyrd” was literally “called out.”

viii. 13. *From the ascent of Heres.* הָרֶס (Heres) may mean *sun* (xiv. 18), but מִלְמַעְלָה cannot mean either “before the rising” (Vulg. and Jewish commentators), or “setting” (Targ.) “of the sun.” The R.V. is certainly right; compare LXX. (Cod. Alex.), ἀπὸ ἀναβάσεως ἁπῆς. Gideon pursued the Midianites as far as (ל) the pass known as the ascent of Heres, and returned from thence (ב). The spot has not been identified, but for Heres in proper names, see i. 35; ii. 9; and for “ascent,” i. 36.

16. *Taught.* וַיִּדַע is probably a corruption for וַיִּדְשׁ, “threshed,” as in *v.* 7. So the LXX. ἠλόγησεν (Cod. Vat.), κατέξανε (Cod. Alex.), Vulg. *contrivit*. Textual probabilities are very evenly balanced. On the one hand we should expect the same word as in *v.* 7; on the other hand this very fact would dispose the ancient versions to introduce it, if a different word was used.

21, 26. *Crescents.* Cf. Isa. iii. 18.

ix. 2. *The men of Shechem.* Literally “the lords” or “masters”: בְּעֵלֵי שָׁכֶם. So throughout this chapter, including *vv.* 46, 47, “men of the tower,” and 51, “they of

<sup>1</sup> Is it too bold to conjecture בְּנֵי for צָרָה? The letters are not unlike in some of the archaic types of alphabet. “They took the pitchers of the people . . . and their trumpets” would mean that in readiness for his stratagem (*v.* 16), Gideon, before dismissing his army, made the three hundred provide themselves with pitchers and trumpets.

the city"; also in Josh. xxiv. 11, "men of Jericho"; Jud. xx. 5, "men of Gibeah"; 1 Sam. xxiii. 11, 12, "men of Keilah"; 2 Sam. xxi. 12, "men of Jabesh-Gilead." Whether the term denotes the governing body of the citizens, as distinguished from the mass of the inhabitants, as *v.* 51, and 1 Sam. xxiii. 11 compared with *v.* 5, appear to show; or the citizens in general, may be doubtful; but the distinction between this word and the ordinary word for "men," *e.g.* "men of Israel," *v.* 55; "men of Jabesh-Gilead," 2 Sam. ii. 4, 5, ought to have been marked in the R.V.

9. *Wherewith by me they honour God and man.* Can this sense be got out of the Hebrew? The margin is certainly preferable, and is parallel to *v.* 13. Cf. LXX. (Cod. Alex.), τὴν πιότητά μου ἦν ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐδόξασεν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωποι, and Vulg. "pinguedinem meam qua et dii utuntur et homines." So Coverdale, "My fatnesse which both God and men commende in me."

44. *The companies.* The correct translation introduces a difficulty. Abimelech divided his men into three companies; two were in the field, only one can have been with him. The Authorised Translators felt the difficulty, and boldly substituted "company" for "companies." Probably the text is corrupt; perhaps אֲנָשִׁים, "the men," should be read for אֲנָשִׁים, "the companies."

52. *Went hard,* i.e. near. Is not this a "misleading archaism"? It is the only place in which the word, which simply means "approach," is so translated in the A.V.

53. *Brake.* The archæologist's pet word, "all to," disappears. It has no equivalent in the Hebrew.

xi. 37. *Go down upon the mountains.* The A.V. avoids the apparent difficulty by an unjustifiable translation. But the construction is a pregnant one. Mizpah was on a hill; she would descend from it first, and then go up again upon the surrounding mountains.

39. *And she had not known man.* So already the Geneva, "shee had knowen no man." This, which is unquestionably the correct translation, makes it clear that Jephthah sacrificed his daughter in accordance with his vow. The rendering of the A.V. seems intended to favour the old interpretation that he compromised the matter by devoting her to perpetual virginity.

40. *To celebrate.* This, and not the margin, is right. In chap. v. 11, the only other passage where the word occurs, it is rendered *rehearse*. Thought is directed, not to Jephthah's rash vow, but to the maiden's heroism; and the best commentary on the passage is to be found in Tennyson's noble lines in *A Dream of Fair Women*:—

"My words leapt forth: 'Heaven heads the count of crimes  
With that wild oath.' She rendered answer high:  
'Not so, nor once alone; a thousand times  
I would be born and die.'"

The whole passage (stanzas xlv.-lxi.) should be read.

xii. 14. *Sons' sons.* The A.V. *nephews* is an archaism for grandsons.

xiii. 12. *What shall be, etc.* Manoah's question refers to the angel's message in *vv.* 4, 5. He asks for repeated direction and assurance. "The manner of the child" refers to the command to bring him up as a Nazirite: "his work" to the promise that he should be the deliverer of Israel. The margin, "how shall we do unto him," makes מַעֲשֵׂהוּ the equivalent of מַה-נַּעֲשֶׂה לְנֶעֱר in *v.* 8, but it is questionable whether the words can mean this, and the sense given in the text is preferable.

18, 19. *Wonderful . . . wondrously.* Cf. Isa. ix. 6; Exod. xv. 11, etc., and the note on vi. 13.

xiv. 15. *On the seventh day.* It is no doubt possible to explain this reading. The guests puzzled over the riddle for three days, and then gave it up until the seventh day, when they became desperate, and threatened Samson's wife.

Meanwhile she had all the time been trying to persuade him to tell her (*v.* 16), though she did not succeed until the seventh day (*v.* 17). But *fourth*, the reading of the LXX. and Syriac, is certainly probable, and it only requires the change of a single letter. (השביעי for הרביעי). The guests naturally applied to Samson's wife as soon as they gave up trying to guess the riddle themselves. The chief objection to this reading is its obviousness, but the canon *preferatur lectio ardua* may be overstrained. And there is another almost certain error in the text of the verse. The word הלא "is it not so," stands most awkwardly at the end of the verse, and with some MSS. and the Targum we should probably read הלאם, "hither," and render "called us hither to impoverish us." There is a note in Cod. 154, to the effect that the scholars of Sora read הלאם in the text and הלא in the margin, while those of Nahardea read הלא in the text, and הלאם in the margin. See De Rossi, *Var. Lect.*, ii. 125.

xv. 13. *Ropes for cords*: the same word as in chapter xvi. 11.

17. *Ramath-Lehi*. Etymologically, the name as pointed in the Massoretic text can only mean "the hill of the jawbone;" but the writer may intend to suggest an allusion to רמה, *râmâh*, to throw (Exod. xv. 1, 21), with reference to the casting away of the jawbone. True the word he uses for "cast away" is different—וישליך—but the Targum in rendering it by רמא distinctly suggests the connexion. Cf. Prof. Driver's note on Gen. iv. 25.

19. *The hollow place that is in Lehi*. מִכְתֵּשׁ, *maktesh*, means literally "a mortar" (Prov. xxvii. 22). It was the name of some hollow or valley in or near Jerusalem (Zeph. i. 11); and here denotes a mortar-shaped hollow or basin in Lehi. The Jewish interpreters explain it to mean *the socket of a tooth* or *a tooth*, and so the Vulg. *molarem dentem*; but against this explanation are: (1) the definite article,

(2) the form of expression *which is in*, not simply *of*, (3) the fact that the spring was permanent.

xvi. 2. *And it was told.* No ingenuity can defend the integrity of the Hebrew text here. Some such word as **וַיִּנְד** has fallen out. All the ancient versions express it.

5. *Wherein*, etc. Lit. "Wherein" or "whereby his strength is great."

*Afflict.* Vulg. *affligere*: but "humble" or "subdue" expresses the sense.

7. *Green withes.* **וְתָר** means elsewhere: (1) tent-cord, (2) bowstring, (3) bridle-rein. The rendering *withes* is suggested by the description "green" (elsewhere applied to vegetable products, Gen. xxx. 37; Num. vi. 3), "fresh," "that were never dried;" but the marg. "bowstrings," i.e. cords of sinew or catgut, is certainly possible. LXX. *νευπαί*; Vulg. *nervicei funes*.

18. *Me.* **לִי** K'ri: and so LXX., Vulg., Targ., Syr.: *her*, **כִּי הִגִּיד לָהּ אֵת** C'thib, due to a careless scribe repeating **אֵת** **לָהּ** **כִּי הִגִּיד לָהּ**, "that he had told her all his heart," from the line above.

28. *Be at once avenged*: i.e. not *immediately*, but *once for all*. So LXX., Vulg., Targ., treating **אָחַת** as if it agreed with **נָקָם**: and this certainly gives the best sense. But **נָקָם** is masc., and **נָקָם אָחַת**, "a vengeance of one," for "one final vengeance" is very questionable. If the text is sound, **אָחַת** must, it would seem, refer to **עֵין**, and the words must be translated as in the margin. Rashi and Kimchi refer to the Talmudic explanation: "Reserve the revenge for the other eye in the world to come, but grant the revenge here for one of the twain;" which at any rate shows how it was understood by the ancient Rabbis. In either case the reflexive force of the Niphal, "avenge myself," should have been retained.

xviii. 7. *For there was none in the land, possessing authority, that might put them to shame in anything.* The

text is very obscure and perhaps corrupt. But a place should certainly have been found in the margin for an alternative rendering, which is grammatically and philologically possible, and better suited to the context. "They saw the people . . . how they dwelt in security . . . no man in the land doing any hurt: possessing wealth." ואין מכלים דבר בארץ is a circumstantial clause, and must be treated as a parenthesis. For הכלים, to injure, cf. 1 Sam. xxv. 7. עזר agrees with העם; and עזר, which occurs here only, is to be explained with Gesenius, Studer, and Bertheau, by the corresponding Arabic word meaning "abundance of possessions." Cf. the Vulg. *magnarum opum*. The meaning "authority" is derived from the use of the verb in 1 Sam. ix. 17, and is by no means certain. The text would be easier if עזר ויש and בארץ . . . ואין might be transposed. Possibly a marginal gloss has made its way into the text: or, as is suggested in the *Speaker's Commentary* the words from "quiet" to "anything" are a quotation from another writer.

30. *The son of Moses*. The reading of the Massoretic text is מִנְשֵׁה (M<sup>N</sup>SH), with the note תלויה ג', "Nun suspended" or written above the line. Without the *Nun*, the name would be מִשֵּׁה (MSH), *Moses*, and there can be no doubt that this is the true reading. Gershom was Moses' firstborn (Exod. ii. 22), and Jonathan is expressly described as a Levite, not a Manassite. Why then was the change in the text made? The reason is given in the Talmud, *Baba Bathra*, fol. 109 b (quoted by Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, p. 171), as follows: "Gershom is called the son of Manasseh: was he not the son of Moses? for it is written, 'The sons of Moses were Gershom and Eliezer.' But because he did the works of Manasseh [the idolatrous and apostate king of Judah], the Scripture hangs him on [תלאו] to the family of Manasseh." The *Nun* must have been interpolated in very early times, for the LXX., Targ. and Syr.

read *Manasseh*; though the Vulg. has *Moses*. But there was no intention of falsifying the text. As *bosheth* was substituted for *baal* in proper names (*Ish-bosheth*, etc.), to avoid pronouncing the hated word, so *Manasseh* was read in place of *Moses*, to avoid what seemed like a disgrace to the great lawgiver.

xix. 1. *On the farther side*, from the house of the narrator, or from Bethlehem. But יִרְכָתַי may mean simply the "recesses" of the hill country.

22. *Sons of Belial*. It is a great pity that the Revisers, after translating correctly *base fellows* (with marg. "Heb. sons of worthlessness") in Deut. xiii. 13, should have gone back in the historical books to the erroneous rendering of the A.V., which follows the Vulg. Elsewhere they have treated the word rightly, rendering *ungodliness* (marg. Heb. *Belial*) in Ps. xviii. 4 (2 Sam. xxii. 5); *an evil disease*, as A.V., (with marg. *some wicked thing*), Ps. xli. 8; *base thing* (no marg.) Ps. ci. 3; *worthless* in Prov. vi. 12; xvi. 27; xix. 28 (with no margin); *wickedness* and *wicked*, with marg. (*worthlessness*, Heb. *Belial*), in Nah. i. 11, 15. No doubt by the help of the A.V. and Milton (*Par. Lost*, i. 490 ff.) *Belial* has come to be to the English reader an impersonation of subtle and malicious wickedness; but this hardly seems to be a justification for perpetuating him, and the American Revisers are certainly right in wishing that he should be banished altogether.

18. *To Beth-el* (cf. vv. 26, 31; xxi. 2). The A.V. follows the Vulg. (*in domum Dei, hoc est in Silo*) in a rendering based on the assumption that the ark must have been at Shiloh. But, (1) "the house of God" is בֵּית־הָאֱלֹהִים (*bêth hâelôhîm*), as in xviii. 31, not בֵּית־אֵל, which always denotes the place Beth-el; (2) *there* in v. 27 implies the mention of a place in the preceding verse; (3) the place was no great distance from Gibeah, for the people could go and return in the day, vv. 19, 23, 26, which suits Beth-el but

not the more distant Shiloh. There was a sanctuary at Beth-el (1 Sam. x. 3), but why the ark was there at this time can only be conjectured.

28. *Or shall I cease.* Why not, as in 1 Kings xxii. 6, 15, "shall I forbear?"

48. *Both the entire city.* The Massoretic reading is *מְעִיר מְתָם*, but *מְתָם* elsewhere means "soundness," and it is very doubtful whether it can mean "the entire city." The pointing should be changed to *מְתָם*, which is found in some MSS., and the words rendered *the inhabited city*, as in the margin.

xxi. 5. *Assembly for congregation*, as in v. 8 and xx. 2.

#### THE BOOK OF RUTH.

i. 15. *Her god.* Chemosh, the tutelary god of Moab (Num. xxi. 29; 1 Kings xi. 33).

19. *The women said.* A touch of naturalness not to be missed. The verb is feminine.

ii. 3. *The portion of the field.* The share of the communal land held by Boaz. See an article on Land Tenure among the Hebrews, in the *Church Quarterly Review* for July, 1880.

iii. 16. *Who art thou.* The paraphrase in the margin, and the literal rendering in the text, might change places with advantage.

iv. 3. *The parcel of land.* The phrase is identical with that in ii. 3, and should be rendered in the same way; "the portion of the field."

*Selleth.* The verb is in the perfect tense, and though this may mean "has determined to sell," or "selleth," it is by no means clear that it does. The law of Redemption (Lev. xxv. 25 ff.) applied to land which had been actually sold by its owner under stress of poverty. Ruth's going to glean in the field of Boaz does not look as if Naomi still owned any

land, and she may have sold it while she was settled in Moab. It is true that *vv.* 5 and 9 speak of the transaction as a purchase direct from Naomi, and no third party who had purchased the land is mentioned; but redemption seems to imply that the land had been previously alienated.

5. *Thou must buy it also of Ruth.* The LXX. and Targ. attest the antiquity of this reading; but a comparison of *v.* 10 makes it very probable that the Vulg. and Syriac are right in reading "thou must buy also Ruth," *i.e.* נָסָא רֹחַל for נָסָא, the change of a single letter.

15. *A restorer of life.* The same phrase is better rendered, "refresh the soul," in Prov. xxv. 13; Lam. i. 16.

A. F. KIRKPATRICK.

## CHRISTUS CONSUMMATOR:

### LESSONS FROM THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

#### II. THE DESTINY OF MAN FULFILLED BY CHRIST THROUGH SUFFERING.

"Not unto angels did He subject the world to come, whereof we speak. But one hath somewhere testified, saying,

What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?  
 Or the Son of man, that Thou visitest Him?  
 Thou madest Him a little lower than the angels;  
 Thou crownedst Him with glory and honour,  
 And didst set Him over the works of Thy hands:  
 Thou didst put all things in subjection under His feet.

. . . . But now we see not yet all things subjected to Him. But we behold Him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God He should taste death for every man. For it became Him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the author of their salvation perfect through sufferings."—HEB. ii. 5-10 (Rev. Vers.).

IN these pregnant words we have a view of the destiny, the position, the hope of man, which answers alike to the noblest aspiration and to the saddest experience. We see