

Just twenty-two years afterwards the first and primary fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy took place. The people did not repent. Though the sentence of the judges had given weight to his words, and the remembrance of Hezekiah's conduct had taught them the right way of averting the evil, and had encouraged them to choose it, they still persisted in their wickedness; and so, because they had religious privileges, and did not use them for the one purpose for which God had given them, namely, to aid them in living holy lives, He took their privileges away. During most of the rest of the reign of Jehoiakim Jeremiah lived in exile. After a short struggle his voice was heard no more in Jerusalem. And when at last he returned, it was for the sake of those who were to be removed to Babylon. In this sermon he had given God's last solemn call to the mass of the people, and they had rejected it. And though God is longsuffering, yet at length the time of justice comes: for it is equally true of Him "that he will by no means clear the guilty" (Exod. xxxiv. 7).

R. PAYNE SMITH.

---

#### BIBLICAL NOTES.

GENESIS ii. 5.—The Authorized Version, following the LXX., renders this verse thus: "And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground." An appearance of logical sense is given to this rendering in our Version by connecting it with the previous verse, so that it reads: "In the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, and every plant of the field before it was in the earth," &c.; as though God first made the plant and the herb of the field, and afterwards set them in the ground—a childish conception, for which certainly the original text is not responsible.

The Bible edited by Cheyne and Driver has this excellent note.

“(The text reads obscurely.) On the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heaven—when no plants of the field were yet in the earth, and no herbs of the field were yet sprouting (because the Lord God had not sent rain upon the earth, and there were no men to till the ground); and a mist used to go up, &c.—then the Lord God formed the man.” The authorities given for this emendation are Ewald, Schrader, and Martineau. It is with some hesitation that I offer a suggestion which does not seem to have occurred to any of the distinguished scholars who have tried to illuminate this obscure passage, for Drs. Gotch and Davies, in the Revised Bible, are substantially agreed with the scholars just named. Why should not the adverb *terem* be rendered *already*? If *beterem* (with the preposition) is properly rendered *before that*, *previously*, and *terem*, followed by a preterite or a future applied to a past action, has the meaning of *not yet* (Gesenius), what objection can there be to translating it *already*, when the connection seems to require this meaning? Certainly it admits of etymological justification more easily than the sense *not yet*.

I have marked in my Hebrew Bible two other passages where our translators seem to have missed the true sense, by failing to perceive that *terem* sometimes means *already*. In Joshua ii. 8, our Version reads (the reference is to Rahab and the spies): “And *before* they were laid down, she came up unto them upon the roof;” as though the historian were careful to point out the delicacy of Rahab’s conduct, an idea surely which could never have entered his head; whereas the fact that she waited until the inmates of her house were all settled down for the night and were fast locked in slumber, before she ventured to have such perilous communication with the Israelitish strangers, was well worth noting, because it adds to the graphicness of the story. The exact rendering of the Hebrew appears to be this: “And they were *already* laid down *and* she went up unto them upon the roof.” It will be observed that our Version drops the copulative. Gesenius renders it *not yet*, which saves the *and*, but is open to the objection, just advanced, of giving a jejune sense. The other passage is 1 Samuel iii. 3: “And ere the lamp of God went out in the temple of the Lord.” This rendering is obtained by taking *terem* as “*not yet*,” but surely it is more probable that He who was known to Israel as “dwelling in the thick darkness,” would choose the silent hour when “the lamp was *already* out in the house of the Lord,” before calling the child Samuel. There are other examples, but these will suffice.

Coming back to Genesis ii 5, and rendering *ki, though*, a meaning which it often has, I would translate thus: "And every plant of the field was *already* in the earth, and every herb of the field had *already* sprouted, though the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth," &c. With this translation the historian's meaning is obvious enough. He is giving a summary of the story of Creation with a view to introduce the history of Jehovah's covenant relations with the man for whom He made special provision in the garden of Eden; and he recalls the fact that the earth was already prepared for the habitation of man, that the materials for a garden, suitable for his first home, were already in existence, even in that region of the earth where, as his readers knew, rain was almost unknown—a mist, which went up from the abundantly watered plains of the Tigris and Euphrates, supplying the place of rain.

Thus read, the discrepancy between the two accounts of Creation disappears; and, if a just reason can be given for the introduction of the covenant name of God into this history of the Adam, there seems no difficulty in supposing that the second chapter is the work of the same author as the first.

E. W. SHALDERS.

EXODUS xxxiii. 15.—What was the special grace desired by Moses in these memorable words? After the apostacy of the children of Israel at the foot of Sinai, God set forth new conditions under which they should continue their journey to the Promised Land. What withdrawal of honour and privilege was there in these conditions that Moses should so strongly deprecate their being carried out? If we had only this chapter, we might infer that the difference in God's future dealings with Israel would be, that He would henceforth commit them to the care of an angel—some messenger of his providence less holy than Himself—and that the honour and privilege which his personal presence implied would be withdrawn. For we read in the opening verses of the chapter, "And the Lord said unto Moses, Depart, and go up hence, thou and the people which *thou hast brought up* out of the land of Egypt, unto the land which I swear unto Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, saying, Unto thy seed will I give it: *and I will send an angel before thee: . . . for I will not go up* in the midst of thee; for thou art a stiffnecked people: lest I consume thee in the way" (Verses 1-3).

Apart, however, from the fact that it is difficult to conceive of any real difference between God's personal and instrumental superintendence, we no sooner turn our attention to the account of his pro-