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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

where the wide vegetable gardens cover the plain. What is this blue smoke at the corner of the melon patch? Oh, a coffin has been placed there, waiting its appointed number of days for its burial. To-day is the "third seventh day," and the entire family of the dead man is out to burn paper and incense for him. The smoke rises and curls in the still hot noonday air, and as we approach nearer, the sound of wailing reaches us. There they all are—the widow in white sackcloth, with her white cap and long streamers flying, weeping bitterly; the daughter-in-law; the little sons, who hardly know what they are doing, and are not too much engrossed to turn on their knees and gaze at us as we pass. The paper is not burning well. Poke it up again with the long stick. That is better. Now to your wailing again. And as we pass on the mournful sound breaks out afresh.

'How is it that the sky seems darkened, even at this hour of glorious noon, and the air of the plain is all at once hot and stifling?

'Strange land, so full of charm and of contradictions and of brilliant elusive beauty! What is it in you that stirs our hearts, so that sometimes the very sight of the old square mosque standing up against the crimson western sky leaves us shaken in a tremulous gladness? Only one far far other land can move our hearts like this, a little land far away in the Western Sea, where the eternal ocean laps against its shores, the shores of home. But you—you are so beautiful, so old, and so very, very needy—China. We give you our hearts.'

The Cross as Viewed by Dr. Denney.

By the Rev. W. L. Walker, D.D.

Many, no doubt, have been reading with interest Dr. Denney's eagerly awaited book[1] on the Doctrine of Reconciliation. His view of the central fact of the Cross was, of course, well known, and those who shared it with him would naturally hope to find in this latest work confirmation of their view. They will not be disappointed. Scarcely any better work in this respect could have been done. By those who can accept the doctrine this book may well be regarded as final.

Others who were unable to agree with Dr. Denney would read the book, hoping to find, perhaps, some modifications or elucidations which might enable them to come into closer accord with such an able exegete and reasoner. They will note a wider outlook and a more sympathetic treatment of other views—a readiness to acknowledge any elements of truth in them. But they will not find any modification of the central doctrine, rather a stronger and more uncompromising statement of it. It is here set forth as the only faith that can introduce a man to that Christian experience so beautifully described in the opening chapter. But if only the acceptance of the doctrine of the Cross here stated can admit to that experience, it is a serious matter for many of us in this present time and will be so for many more in the time to come. We are, therefore, as we read, stirred to consider matters very seriously and, mayhap, to criticize.

One naturally shrinks from criticizing a writer of such eminence and so justly esteemed as was Dr. Denney. But, at this time especially, when 'Reconstruction,' 'Rededication,' and 'Revival' must mean, first of all, '*Reconsideration*,' the interests of the Truth must be held as supreme—as Dr. Denney himself would hold them to be.

There is much in the book that will call forth cordial agreement from all Christians, and no one can fail to be impressed by the solemn light in which the central subject is placed. We cannot read the Gospels without feeling that the Cross had a very solemn, even a tragic, significance for Christ, and one feels that in approaching this subject one is treading with half-reluctant feet the holiest ground in history. Nor can we doubt that the Cross of Christ had a Divine significance in relation to sin and the experience of salvation. It is the view of it here set forth that raises serious questions and emboldens one to criticize.

Dr. Denney himself does not accept much that was once included in what was deemed the ortho-

[1] *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net).

dox statement of the Atonement. Admitting the measure of truth in the words of Bushnell and M'Leod Campbell, he says (p. 263) that it excludes much 'which revolts both intelligence and conscience in much of what is called orthodox theology,' and farther on he remarks that the presentation of Christ's death, out of relation to His life, produced reactions that led to a view 'more intelligible, more human, and more ethically interesting.' When we see these mistaken conceptions of the past, it makes us the more cautious with respect to current conceptions, and raises the question whether we have yet got to a right understanding of the Cross, if indeed we can ever reach it as long as we allow our minds to be dominated by modes of statement proceeding from ways of thought which are foreign to us.

How does Dr. Denney think of the redemptive work of Christ in His sufferings and death? While acknowledging the heroic or martyr element, there is in the Gospels, he says (p. 272), 'the sense of something dreadful and mysterious, a soul trouble of Jesus, a sorrow under which He is dismayed and ready to die, an agony of prayer, a bitter cup from which His whole being shrinks, an uncomprehended necessity for drinking it, a dark experience of being forsaken by God.' He was to 'bear our sins'; He was to meet in death 'the last reaction of God against sin.' Not that His sufferings were *penal* in the sense of coming to Him through a bad conscience, or that God was angry with Him personally, as if He had been a guilty man; but, he asks, 'Can we say anything else than this: That while the agony and the Passion were not penal in the sense of coming upon Jesus through a bad conscience, or making Him the personal object of Divine wrath, they were penal in the sense that in that dark hour He had to realize to the full the Divine reaction against sin in the race in which He was incorporated, and that without doing so to the uttermost He could not have been the Redeemer of that race from sin, or the Reconciler of sinful men to God' (p. 273). It is emphatically affirmed again and again that the final reaction of God against sin is seen in *death*, and that therefore the Saviour must *die*. 'Sin and death are one.' Christ no doubt bore our sins 'on His heart,' but it was 'supremely in the very act and instant of bearing them in His body on the tree.' If He had not *died* for us He would have done nothing at all. 'The wages of sin is death' (pp. 274, 275). 'He bore our sins.' 'In every sense and to every extent to which He could do so, He made them His own;' above all, 'He took that heaviest burden under which the race was sinking in despair and death.'

God's love is affirmed to have been the source of all that was done in Christ; but, at the same time, the *operation* of the Cross was not to be merely on man but on *God*. This is the very meaning of an objective atonement; it was to meet something in God's relation to sin in order that sin might be forgiven: 'to God the sacrifice is offered, and it is to God it makes a difference' (pp. 30, etc.).

Now, to begin with this last statement—is there not an irreconcilable contradiction in it? If it was all *from* God, how could there be any moving operation *on* God in it? If the whole had its origin in God's love for men, how could the 'atonement' be made *to* God? Any doctrine that is to be effective must be one which is not only credible but simple and easy to be believed. At any rate, it must not, in its very statement, raise questions that puzzle the intellect and that only trained theologians can appear to solve. This is all the more important if, as Dr. Denney says repeatedly, faith in this doctrine is the only way to Christian experience. It was, he says, to meet certain moral sanctions in God (and the universe) as opposed to sin. But this does not meet the difficulty, and it is strongly affirmed that there is no contradiction or strife between Justice and Mercy in God. There cannot be a division in God, nor can one set of attributes provide a satisfaction to another.

The other chief difficulties may be stated as follows:

1. While the Cross was a Divine necessity for Christ and was regarded by Him in the solemn and affecting manner represented in the Gospels, the conception of its necessity as an atonement for sin before God could forgive seems out of harmony with Christ's teaching concerning God's forgiving love and with His own forgiveness of sin apart from the Cross. His teaching concerning the Divine forgiveness was in line with that of the prophets before Him. How strongly *they* declared the readiness of God to forgive, quite apart from all Jewish ritual and any sacrifice yet to come. Take just one sentence from Micah as exemplary: 'Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity and passeth over the transgression of the

remnant of his heritage? he retaineth not his anger for ever because he delighteth in loving-kindness; . . . thou wilt cast all their sins into the depth of the sea;' or this from Isaiah: 'Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.'

'He pardons with o'erflowing love;
For, hear the voice Divine,
My nature is not like to yours,
Nor like your ways are mine.'

Was there no reality in such declarations? Was it not *really* forgiveness? With Jesus, God was the loving *Father* of men; if an earthly father would forgive his penitent child, 'how much more,' etc., as He illustrated it in the case of the returning prodigal. 'Father, *forgive* them,' He prayed on His Cross, not 'because I am atoning for their sin,' but 'because they know not what they do.' The purpose of His death, He said, was to *ransom* men—surely not from *God*, who loved them and sought them for His own, but from all that kept them from God and His salvation. There is no suggestion in anything that Jesus ever said that God could not forgive men unless He died for them.

But Jesus in His teaching of the Divine forgiveness went beyond the prophets and in fulfilment of them. His gospel was that of the drawing nigh of God in the kingdom, which was His coming in forgiving love to the salvation of a sinful people, whose sins He was forgiving. He proclaimed the dawn of 'the acceptable year of the Lord'—the year of Divine acceptance—so long looked for, and forgave sin in God's name in token of its reality. His blood, He said, sealed the new covenant of spiritual salvation which was founded on the Divine forgiveness. God was forgiving men, therefore let them turn to God, was His call.

Paul preached the same gospel of forgiveness. The reign of Law was ended and a new era of Grace had opened for men, in which God was reconciling them to Himself, 'not imputing their trespasses unto them.' It was a message of 'Reconciliation'; 'God is reconciled to you; be ye, in turn, reconciled to God.' It was not one here and there that God was reconciling to Himself, in Christ, but *the world*. A new epoch had opened; old things were done away and all things new begun. Certainly he brought in *the Cross*, as he conceived it, in this connexion. It was the going forth *to the world*, through the Cross, of the forgiveness proclaimed by Jesus. But the above is not the view of the Reconciliation taken by Dr. Denney.

In view of the going forth to the world of such a gospel of forgiveness, we could understand that some sufficient manifestation of the evil of sin and of the holiness of God would be made, and how this, in the wisdom of God, may have made the Cross necessary for Christ. But not as requiring Him to atone for sin before God could forgive it. That God was forgiving sin was implied in the very mission of Christ: it was the presupposition of the Cross. Jesus did not change His view of God. But Dr. Denney says, 'God would not *be* to us what He is,' if Christ had not died (p. 239).

In his insistence on the reality of Law in God and on the need for its moral necessities and reaction against sin being met, Law seems to override Fatherhood. It is really quite a different and much less attractive conception of God than that of Jesus, who knew God best, that is presented to us—one more calculated to create fear than to win men to God in love, as the Cross was meant to do.

2. It is impossible to see how the sinless Christ could in any sense suffer in Himself the penalties of sin, or the final Divine reaction against it. Sin's penalties could only fall on the sinful soul, in the sense in which they are said to have been borne by Christ. They are not chiefly external, but internal—belonging primarily to the soul. A soul that had never sinned could not possibly experience them, however full His sympathy with sinners might be; the deepest depth, the real penalty endured by the sinful soul, could not be reached by one who was sinless. These penalties could not be in any arbitrary or external way laid on Christ, so that He should suffer them for us or in our stead. That would be too artificial—would it not also be unjust, and therefore impossible for God to do? Yet Dr. Denney represents Jesus as suffering the Divine dereliction, which must mean, as part of sin's penalties borne by the sinless, a deliberate hiding of the Father's face. Does not this create a sense of unreality in the whole transaction as it is stated?

In another way, however, we can see in the Cross Christ truly 'bearing our sins,' and the manifestation of the judgment of God on sin.

It was the supreme example of vicarious sacrifice. To see the Cross in the light of the representation of the suffering Servant of God in Isaiah is to see it in its true light and as it was viewed by Christ Himself. He identified Himself with the suffering Servant, and, as He said to His disciples, made His Cross the consummation of His *service*. It was the sins of others that lighted on Him in the orderly sequences of the Divine moral order, not as in any way laid on Him or inflicted by God, but as the culmination of men's sinfulness. He accepted it in view of the *results* of such suffering as these are represented in Is 53 and Ps 22; 'the purpose of the Lord' should then 'prosper in His hand'; 'all the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord'; and, as He said, it should be 'for the ransom of many.' It was in this way only that the sins of the guilty could fall on an innocent person. It was *sin* that nailed Him to the Cross, and it was the consequences of sin, as these had culminated, that He endured.

Dr. Denney accepts Paul's doctrine in Rom. 1 that sin becomes its own punishment in moral degradation and increasing sinfulness. Carry this out and we will get a right conception of the Cross. Here we witness the culmination of sin in its crucifixion of Him who was the Truth of man and God, the only Saviour. Had not Christ been what He was, His death would have been the ruin of Humanity. The awful choice, 'Not this man but Barabbas' (the representative of unscrupulous force), would have proved the fatal, suicidal choice. Christ bore it all that men might be saved *from sin* and a new spiritual life quickened in Humanity. While it was the supreme manifestation of the evil of sin and, in this way, of God's judgment on sin, it was, at the same time, the supreme proof of the forgiving love of God, in giving up His Son so to suffer and die. As has been said elsewhere, 'It was the ever-increasing sinfulness of men (represented in those who had enjoyed the fullest light) that made such an act as His rejection and crucifixion possible.' And it was only in *this* way that God's righteous judgment on sin could be revealed. 'Not by speech from heaven, but by the *deed*, sinners were left to do in the natural sequence of the moral order. Therefore, although He saved others, Himself He could not save' (*The Gospel of Reconciliation or At-one-ment*, pp. 119, 121). It was not in the way of atoning for sin before God could forgive the returning sinner; but such a manifestation of the evil of sin may have been necessary to the going forth of that Forgiveness and Grace to the sinful world which was implied in the drawing nigh of God in the kingdom and in the message of Reconciliation as proclaimed by St. Paul.

3. The prominence given to *Death* as the final penalty of sin seems quite unjustifiable. The place Dr. Denney gives to death and the view of it he insists on are remarkable. He speaks of its 'dreadful' character; 'it is the greatest thought of which we are capable, except the thought of God, and it is the extreme opposite of the thought of God' (p. 278). In it we have the final reaction of God against sin expressed. He admits that from the biological point of view death is natural, as much so as life: it is the natural end of life in the body. But it has also a solemn moral significance for a moral being. No doubt it has; but that does not make it the less natural and inevitable for men, constituted as we are. It was not endurance of death as it must come to all men that Paul had in view when he said, 'the wages of sin is death'; or, 'if ye live after the flesh ye shall *die*.' All must 'die' whether they live after the flesh or not. It was hopeless death—death without the prospect of resurrection. When we read, 'The end of these things is death,' it cannot be death as it comes to us all that is meant; for we may truly say the end of *all* things in this world is death. Dr. Denney says, 'We ought to *die* rather than do wrong.' Are we paying a penalty then in this? Young children who have not sinned die—are they paying the penalty of sin? To say so would carry us back to the old awful belief that we are all born under the curse of our Creator.

Soldiers on the battlefield and sailors on the main are dying to-day in their thousands, many of them in noble devotion to a righteous cause and for others' sake. In laying down their lives are they paying the supreme penalty of sin? How such a view of death would darken the world! Dr. Denney puts a dark and 'dreadful' meaning into death which does not belong to it, whether viewed physically or morally. He says truly that the natural, the moral, and the spiritual are all connected; but that does not make death a penalty, unless it be inflicted as a punishment. He says that in death for a good cause the victory over sin

is gained; but this is not always the case. It is *possible* to say that death was made the inevitable fate of men, because God foresaw that all would be sinners. But Dr. Denney cannot say this, because he holds that sin 'creates what for us can never be anything but an unanticipated situation.' As a matter of fact, death is simply the natural and necessary end of finite embodied life. When the Apostles spoke of Christ's *dying* for them, it was the same thing as His 'laying down His life' for their sakes. There was no darker meaning in it. But according to our author, death, as the final reaction of God against sin, is a fatal reaction; it means 'destruction' (pp. 212, etc.). Was it *this* that Jesus suffered in the judgment of God when He died on the Cross? If He did not do so, 'the final reaction of God against sin' was not met by Him.

Supposing we grant all that is said, the question arises, How do the benefits of Christ's death come to us? Death is still here; it comes to every one; the penalties of sin are still falling on men; the Divine reaction against sin neither slumbers nor sleeps—although it is true that by reconciliation with God the worst consequence is removed and new saving reactions are set up. We come at length to the question, asked and answered by Dr. Denney, 'What, then, is it which we are spared or saved from by the death of Jesus? What is it that we do not experience because He died? The answer is that He saves us from dying in our sins' (p. 283). Taking this answer in what seems its natural meaning, we have in it the truth of the matter. But this implies that there is something *more* than death as it comes to men included in the penalties of sin, or the judgment of God on sin—something into the experience of which death may usher the sinful soul—something that Christ in His death could not experience. When it is added that, 'but for His death we should have died in our sins, we should have passed into the blackness of darkness, with the condemnation of God abiding on us,' it is possible that 'destruction' is meant. Did Christ in His death suffer *this* at the hand of His Father? In any case, the real evil to fear is not death, but 'dying in our sins,' and Christ suffered and died to save us from this, if we will but respond to His love.

4. Once more, and, perhaps, the most serious difficulty of all, the crucifixion of Christ is admitted to have been a monstrous *crime*. It was a crime committed *against* God—how then does the suffering of Christ become an act of God in which the sin of the world was laid upon and borne by Him? It was doubtless permitted by God; its acceptance by Jesus was according to the will of God; it was to be overruled by God to the highest ends; but this does not support the idea that in bearing what was inflicted on Him by His enemies Christ was suffering in His person the judgment of God on sin in the way represented. As already said, there is another way in which the relation of Christ to the penalties of sin may be viewed, but in no way can we see Christ suffering as He is said to have done. How could God join in, as it were, with that criminal act so as to make those evil men, in some part at least, the executors of His judgment? Always when Jesus spoke of His Cross it was as what *men* should do to Him; they should 'kill' Him, set Him at naught, 'crucify' Him. Never did He suggest that He should suffer at the hand of God. He should be delivered up, He said, 'into the hands of *sinners*.'

Dr. Denney recognizes the difficulty here: 'that the death of Christ should be at the same time the consummation of human sin and the final revelation of the love of God, a cruel, unscrupulous murder, and a voluntary atoning sacrifice; . . . there is the one difficulty of the Christian religion, in which all others are summed up' (p. 129). But he does not attempt to meet it. 'The New Testament, curiously enough,' he says, 'is aware of the contrasts here stated, but does not seem perplexed by them;' 'faith rather gloried in the paradox than wrestled with it . . . it was the Lord's doing and wonderful in believers' eyes;' 'what God does in it completely overshadows the antecedent or historical causes by which it was produced.' But the difficulty is, how God could do *anything* in it, save for wise reasons and in His love for men permit it to be done. How could Christ in submitting to a death inflicted on Him by men acting against all Divine Law be at the same time doing homage to it, or enduring the penalty of death, in that darker sense which death is said to have for men, as an atonement to God for man's sin?

5. The purpose of the Cross as stated by Christ was, we have seen, to ransom men, to bring them to God, to bring in the kingdom in the fulness of its spiritual truth and power. It was the results of the suffering of the Servant of God that filled His mind and made Him certain that after His death

He should come again in the power and glory of the Father.

If, therefore, we view the Cross, primarily, simply as the crime it undoubtedly was, but, as being in Christ's voluntary acceptance of it for the sake of completing His work as the Lord and Saviour of men, the supreme manifestation of the evil of sin and of the love of God in Him toward us, ought it not, even so viewed, to do for us all that it did for the first Christians?

And if we see in His acceptance of that Cross, from which He naturally shrank for the moment in Gethsemane, that obedience to the will of God to the uttermost in which the human will, as represented in Him, was wholly *one* with the will of God, may we not recognize in this that complete at-one-ment (the original meaning of 'atonement') of God with man and of man with God which St. Paul saw in it? To Paul, Christ not only died '*for* sin' but also *to* sin, and rose into a new spiritual life beyond the possibility of sin. And, before God, all men died in Christ, representatively, to the old life of sin, and rose with Him into a new spiritual life. The 'old man was crucified with Christ.' 'If one died for all, all died,' said Paul. Before God the old world *died* and a new world arose. To men, as represented in Christ's death and resurrection, His forgiving love could go forth freely. He could even do what Dr. Chalmers felt to be so needful, 'justify the ungodly' who were united in faith with Christ. The days of man's minority were ended; he was no longer a servant under 'Law,' but a son under 'Grace.' And in the living Christ, in whose life and death we are thus reconciled to God, there is the power that can nourish, support, and perfect the new life thus quickened in us, conforming us even to Himself.

But now it will be said, and is said by Dr. Denney, that to fail to view the death of Christ as a death for sin, in the very same forms in which it was apprehended by the Apostles, is to place ourselves outside of the New Testament, and, indeed, beyond the possibility of the Christian experience of salvation. But may it not be that, while the *essence* of the Cross was apprehended by the Apostles so as to bring them to God, with a deep sense of the evil of sin, of the love of God in Christ, with confidence in the Divine forgiveness, and into union with the Christ who so loved them as to give Himself up to death for their sakes—the *forms* in which they apprehended the Cross were those that were natural to them with their Jewish upbringing and familiarity with propitiations, sacrifices, and atonements. Indeed, was it not impossible that they could have apprehended it otherwise than in the actual forms of thought they possessed? The new wine may have been to some extent put into the old bottles.

Besides, Paul had a special object in view in much that he said concerning the Cross. We may even say that in almost all that he wrote he had in his mind, either expressly or implicitly, its relation to the Jewish Law and the necessity for maintaining the doctrine of Grace against Jewish legalism. Although he embraces Gentiles as well as Jews in his expositions of the Cross, it is still, primarily, as meeting the penalties of the Jewish Law that he sets forth the death of Christ. God in that Law had, he believed (or at least his opponents did), affixed certain penalties for its breach, especially that of *death*; but He had not exacted them; He had 'passed over sins in the past' (which, by the way, is another proof that *death* did not represent the supreme penalty, since all had *died*); but that now He had set forth 'Christ in His blood'—suffering death—'to show forth His righteousness' in appointing this penalty, seeing that He made His own Son suffer it in the name of man. It is in the same connexion that he says that Christ was 'made a curse for us, since it is written, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree."' Can we believe that Christ was really made 'a curse' by God, or that every one who hangs on a cross is thereby accursed? This is a fair, if extreme, illustration of the peril of letting the Jewish beliefs of the Apostles rule our interpretation of the Cross. It is the requirements of the Jewish Law, believed to have been directly instituted by God, and therefore having a claim on God's veracity, that Paul had in his mind. His object was to show how 'the Law' could be righteously done away with and succeeded by 'Grace.' But that Law, we know, was not directly instituted by God, nor was the penalty of death for its transgression. He says also, indeed, that the Gentile conscience, in view of certain notorious sins, judged those who committed them 'worthy of death.' But, besides that 'death' here is a general term denoting the heaviest doom, it cannot be said that such is the verdict of conscience generally with respect to sin.

Much more might be said on these subjects both for the fuller representation of Dr. Denney's views and in dispute of them. But one other point should be noted, for it seems in itself to refute the doctrine criticized. 'Sin,' says Dr. Denney, 'is only forgiven *as it is borne*.' This, he says, is 'the ultimate truth about forgiveness' (p. 162). Where, in such a case, does the *forgiveness* come in? If the penalties have been *borne*, is it not a strange thing to say to the sinner, 'now you are forgiven'? This is not salvation by Faith, but by works, or at least by suffering, 'of which a man may boast.'

The considerations mentioned above should at least give us pause before setting up a doctrine of the Cross based chiefly on some of the *forms* in which it is interpreted in the New Testament, especially one which is affirmed to be the only doctrine, faith in which can make a man a partaker of the Christian experience in his relation to Christ and God.

There are other matters in Dr. Denney's book which might well be criticized, especially his identification of the Spirit with Faith, which, while it may be practically true in some relations, is far from being an adequate conception of the doctrine of the Spirit. A noteworthy omission in the book is that of any reference to Jesus as *Lord*, although St. Paul expressly says that it was *as Lord* he preached Him to men, and that it was in order that He might be the universal Lord He died.

Contributions and Comments.

The Disciple whom Jesus loved.

THE Rev. G. C. Walker, M.A., Lucknow, is easily satisfied if he thinks he has conclusively found the traditional view of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. If the author of the Gospel was a Judæan disciple, who had not accompanied Jesus during the whole of His ministry, not only would he lack the qualification, but the betrayal by Judas would probably among a company consisting mostly of Galileans excite a prejudice against the Judæan disciples. If the author of the Gospel desired to remain in obscurity, and did not openly attach himself to the Christian community, that would be an additional reason why he should not even be thought of in connexion with the election. All these considerations I have fully discussed in a volume on the Fourth Gospel I have now in preparation, and hope to publish when conditions are more favourable. ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

Psalm xli. 3.

IN the latter half of this verse, the verb-form fixed for us by the Massoretes is so exceptionable as to render the clause, in the estimation of an able and fair-minded Jewish critic, 'inexplicable,' despite expository devices. In its received form, the whole sentence, which describes the comfort administered by the Lord to a good man in sickness, may naturally be rendered thus: 'The Lord will sustain him on his couch;[1] all his bed[2] Thou hast turned in his illness.' When regard is had to the use elsewhere of other verb-forms than הָפַכְתָּ, from the same root, this is seen to signify 'reverse' (turn the other side, Jos 7^{8}, Jg 20^{41}, 1 S 25^{12}, 2 K 5^{26}, Est 9^{1} Is $29^{16ff.}$), 'overthrow' (Gn $19^{21.\ 25.\ 29}$, 2 S 10^{3}, Jer 20^{16}, Am 4^{11}, Hag $2^{22ff.}$), 'change' (or 'convert,' Am $5^{7.\ 8}$ 6^{12} $8^{10ff.}$): of these three shades of meaning, the last ('turn')—probably under the influence of the Septuagint ἔστρεψας—has been placed in the margin of our Authorized and Revised Versions, while the text, in the former, gives 'thou wilt make,' and in the latter 'thou

[1] The noun עֶרֶשׂ properly denotes a 'bedstead' (see Dt 3^{11}), or supporting frame.

[2] The term מִשְׁכָּב here and elsewhere (Lv $15^{4.\ 24.\ 26}$, 2 S $4^{5.\ 7}$ $11^{2.\ 13ff.}$) refers to the woollen rug or mattress on which the body directly rests.