

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD  
TESTAMENT.

I.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

OUR readers will have ere now familiarized themselves with many of the changes made in the Revised Version of the Old Testament. Some of the most striking or interesting of these were pointed out in the numerous reviews which appeared when the Revised Version was published; others will have been noticed by readers themselves. The object of this and the following papers is to explain somewhat more fully the nature and grounds of the more important alterations made by the Revisers.<sup>1</sup>

i. 2. For “*without form, and void*” (cf. Seb. Münster<sup>2</sup> [1534] : *informis et inanis*) has been substituted the less special “*waste and void*”; the same word *תהו* is applied elsewhere to a wild and desolate expanse, e.g. Deut. xxxii. 10; Ps. cvii. 40.

On *moved*, the explanatory margin, *was brooding upon*,

<sup>1</sup> The writer of the notes on the Pentateuch and Joshua, being a member of the Old Testament Revision Company, desires it to be understood that the opinions expressed by him are simply his own, and that he in no way speaks as representing the Company. Indeed, the revision of the books in question was virtually completed before he became a member of the Company; so that in many cases he is only able to explain the grounds of a change from his general knowledge of the subject.

<sup>2</sup> Pupil of the celebrated Jewish scholar, Elias Levita, and author of a Latin translation of the Old Testament, with notes (derived largely from Jewish sources), which exercised an important influence upon the English versions of the 16th century, especially upon the “Great Bible” (1539).

should be noted. The word occurs again, Deut. xxxii. 11 ("fluttereth"). Milton paraphrases excellently:—

"Darkness profound  
Covered the abyss : but on the watery calm  
His brooding wings the Spirit of God outspread,  
And vital virtue infused, and vital warmth  
Throughout the fluid mass."—(P.L., vii. 233-7).

5. *And there was evening and there was morning, one day.* Similarly *vv.* 8, 13, etc. The intention of the writer is to mark the progress of time, not to state merely (as A.V.) that the evening and the morning constituted the first day. Hence, after the work of each day, he notes the arrival of evening, and then of the morning following, the two together marking the completion of the first (second, third, etc.) day.

12. *Fruit, wherein is the seed thereof, i.e.* fruit containing the seed necessary for the propagation of the species.

21. *Sea-monsters* (cf. Job vii. 12). The term *whale* being (in modern English) too special.

30. Margin: *living soul*. The Hebrew *nepesh* is a wider term than the English "soul," denoting the sentient principle possessed by all animals generally. See Oehler, *Theol. of O. T.*, § 70. In *v.* 20 the Hebrew is literally "swarms of living souls." The Hebrew words are the same in *i.* 21, 24; *ii.* 7, 19; *ix.* 10, 12, 15, 16.

31. *The sixth day.* The Hebrew has here the article, with the intention, apparently, of marking the sixth day as definitely the last.

*ii.* 1. *And for thus.* The verse is not a summary of chap. *i.*, but introduces the seventh day. The act of completion, marking as it does the commencement of the period of rest, is assigned by the Hebrew writer to a special day. The old correction (LXX., Sam., Pesh.), *sixth* for the first *seventh* in *v.* 2, obliterates this distinctive point of view.

4. Here begins the second account of the beginnings of man upon earth, extending to iv. 26, and evidently by a different hand from i. 1-ii. 3.

5. *And no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up.* Modern commentators are generally agreed in treating *plant* and *herb* not (as A.V.) as the objects of *made* in v. 1, but as the subjects of *was* and *had sprung up* in v. 2. The intention of the writer is to describe the condition of the earth before man was formed and placed upon it (v. 7).

14. *In front of.* From the point of view of the author, resident in Western Asia. The Tigris runs on the East, not of Assyria, but of Mesopotamia. LXX. *κατέναντι*, and similarly the Syriac.

iv. 1. *With the help of the Lord.* *From* (A.V.) is an old paraphrase (Onkelos), but no translation of the existing Hebrew text. *אִתּוֹ* does not occur elsewhere in the sense of the Greek *σὺν* (in *σὺν Θεῷ*); but the similar preposition *אִתּוֹ* is so used in 1 Sam. xiv. 45.

7. *Coucheth* for *lieth*, bringing out the figure more distinctly. Sin is figured as a beast of prey, couching at the door, and ready to spring upon the man who allows it the opportunity.

Margins. These are the renderings adopted generally by modern commentators, the meaning being, *If thou doest well*, i.e. if thy thoughts are set on good, *will not it* (i.e. thy countenance, v. 6) *be lifted up?* (cf. Job xi. 15.) A fallen, sullen countenance, on the other hand, is an indication that evil is brooding within, which, upon the first temptation of sin, will break out in some overt act. This is expressed in the clause which follows. And (the verse continues) the desire of sin is directed towards thee; but thy duty is to cast away thy sullen looks, and overcome it.

8. *Told.* The Hebrew means regularly *said to*, not *told*, and we expect the words spoken to follow. Hence

the margin (as in Sam., LXX., Pesh., Vulg., and the two Jerusalem Targums).

23. *For wounding me, and for bruising me*, instead of, *to my wounding and to my hurt*. Lamech, in a song of triumph, celebrates the invention (v. 22) of his son. Provided with weapons of brass and iron, he has slain the man who had assailed him: if Cain was to be avenged sevenfold (v. 15), Lamech, armed as he is, may avenge himself seventy and sevenfold. The spirit of Cain appears intensified in his descendant Lamech. The margin (*will slay*) makes Lamech's words a threat only.

25. The margin, like the similar one on v. 1, is intended to explain the connexion between Eve's words and the name *Seth*. The old margins on *Cain*, "i.e. Gotten or Acquired," and on *Seth*, "i.e. Put or Appointed," are not justifiable philologically; קַיִן cannot be derived from קָנָה *to get*, and נָשָׂא by analogy would mean *Appointer* rather than *Appointed*. In these and similar cases all that the text implies is an *assonance*, not an etymology. *Cain* is connected with *kanah*, not because it is derived from it, but because it resembles it in sound. The form of margin adopted here and elsewhere, while affirming nothing respecting the etymology of the proper name (which is sometimes quite uncertain), makes this connexion clear to the reader. So v. 29, Noah cannot be *derived* from *naham* to comfort, but one word resembles, and suggests, the other.

vi. 4. *The Nephilim*, mentioned again, Num. xiii. 33, among the pre-Israelitish populations of Canaan, "the Nephilim, the sons of Anak [located, v. 22, at Hebron], of the Nephilim." The derivation of the word is obscure; but from the passage in Numbers it is clear that it must have been the name of a race of giant stature. Apparently there was a popular belief that the earth was at one time peopled by a race of giants, supposed to have sprung from the union of angels with the daughters of men, the last remnants of

whom were reputed to be the ancient giant inhabitants of Hebron. See, for a fuller account of opinions respecting the Nephilim, Lenormant, *Les Origines de l'histoire d'après la Bible et les traditions des peuples Orientaux* (1880), I. chap. vii. (where, however, the etymologies suggested have only the value of conjectures).

ix. 5. The improved punctuation (agreeing with the Hebrew), has the effect of bringing out the sense more distinct.

27. *Enlarge*. The Hebrew expresses a wish or prayer, not a prediction.

x. 11. The oldest seat of civilization in the plain of the two rivers was (as the monuments also show) Babylon, not Nineveh. The R.V. represents Nimrod as founding the colony of Assyria. By this construction the required contrast is gained with v. 10, which mentions Babylon as the *beginning* of his kingdom. Assyria is called, in Micah v. 6, the "land of Nimrod."

xii. 6. *Oak* for *plain*: so xiii. 18; xviii. 1. A.V. followed Jerome and Jewish authorities; but there is no doubt that *oak*, which is already the rendering of LXX. and Syriac, is right.

9. *The South* (with the capital letter). So always in the R.V., where the word represents the Heb. *Negeb*, which is the technical geographical name for the southern tract of Judah. See Jer. xiii. 19; xvii. 26, etc. Particular parts of the Negeb were designated from the clan which inhabited them: thus we read of the "Negeb" of the Jerahmeelite, or of the Kenite (1 Sam. xxvii. 10; cf. xxx. 1, 14, 27).

xiii. 10. *Plain*, with margin: *Or*, Circle. Another technical term, applied especially to the central part of the valley through which the Jordan flows. So xix. 17. See Dean Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, Appendix, § 12.

xv. 2. Of the last words in this verse no entirely satis-

factory explanation is possible. It is true, *Damméseek* is the Hebrew name of the city which we call Damascus; but *רמשק אליעזר* cannot be rendered (as A.V.) "Eliezer of Damascus," and even the rendering noticed on the margin of R.V. implies an inversion of the two words as well as an alteration in one (*אליעזר הרמשקי*). If the text be sound, either *Dammeseek Eliezer* must be a compound proper name of very unusual type, or the words should be rendered, "Damascus of Eliezer," the meaning in this case being that Damascus, the home, or perhaps the clan, of Eliezer, would be, Abram feared, the ultimate possessor of his property. The contemptuous *this* of A.V. is quite gratuitous. *הוּא* merely resumes the subject before the predicate, as ii. 14, 19; ix. 18, and often. *This* would be *זֶה*, as Exod. xxxii. 1. But it is not improbable that the text is corrupt. Hitzig in Germany, and (if the writer is not mistaken) Mr. Aldis Wright in this country, have conjectured independently that *הוּא רמשק* is a marginal gloss upon the obscure *רמשק*, which afterwards crept into the text. For the marginal *go hence*, see Ps. xxxix. 13 [14, in Heb.].

xvi. 13. *Thou art a God that seeth*, Heb. *A God of vision*, *i.e.* as the sequel shows, an all-seeing God. The sense is not very different from that of the familiar *Thou God seest me*; but the latter is no translation of the Hebrew text as we have it; it would require *אֵל רָאִי אֵל רָאִי* not *אֵל רָאִי*. What follows is obscure, but is generally understood to mean: Have I here also (in the desert, where I might not have expected it) looked after him that seeth me? (*i.e.* not seen God, when He saw her, but only when He had gone perceived that He had been with her, and then *looked after Him*). So Delitzsch (1872), Dillmann (1875, 1882), and Keil (ed. 3, 1878). But it is quite possible that there is some error in the text; *הִלֵּם*, for instance, means *hither* elsewhere, not *here*. Wellhausen's suggestion<sup>1</sup> is worth mentioning *הִגַּם [אֵלֶיךָ]*

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte Israels* (1878), p. 329 (Eng. Tr. p. 326).

רָאִיתִי אֱלֹהִים [וְאָרָאִי] “Have I even seen God, and am I alive after [my] seeing?” (see Jud. vi. 12; xiii. 22; Exod. xxxiii. 20). The expression *God of vision* will then signify “God who art seen,” and the name of the well will mean, *He that seeth me liveth*. In the existing text, there is nothing in Hagar’s words with which the epithet *living* in the name of the well can be connected.

xvii. 5. The meaning of the name *Abraham* is quite unknown. No root *raham* is in use in Hebrew; and nothing satisfactory is offered by any of the cognate languages. Probably all that underlies the text is the assonance of *Abraham* with *hamon*, multitude. The name *Sarai* is equally obscure.

xvii. 16. *Peoples* for *people*; here and often. A small but important change; see the Preface.

xviii. 19. *I have known him, to the end that*, etc. “Known” = noticed, entered into personal relations with, as in Amos iii. 2, referred to in the margin. An important correction. Abraham is *known* of God, in order that he may be the founder of a community perpetuating and preserving the same principles of religion owned by himself. The error in A.V. (which is patent) is remarkable; but it is as old as the LXX., and is repeated in most versions.

xxii. 14. The meaning of the proverbial phrase (cf. x. 9) here cited is uncertain; we do not possess the clue which an example of the proverb as actually used would have afforded. The R.V. gives the rendering which is on the whole best supported; the meaning being that to those who seek God in His temple, He will be present with His providence and aid. Substantially the same sense is expressed in the margin by a different construction: *He shall be seen*, or appear, viz. with His help and succour. The chief ancient versions, though pronouncing the Hebrew consonants differently, arrive also at a similar sense: LXX. ἐν τῷ ὄρει κύριος ὤφθη [rather ὀφθήσεται]; Vulg. “In

monte Dominus videbit"; Syriac, "In this mountain the Lord will see (or, provide)." There is doubtless also a play on the name *Moriah*; but the opinion which is sometimes expressed, that this word means "Shown of Jehovah," is untenable upon philological grounds (מְרִיאָה could not give rise to מִרְיָה).

xxv. 31. *This day.* Margin: *first of all.* The original has the same force, 1 Sam. ii. 16; 1 Kings xxii. 5.

xxvii. 39. In spite of the amount of modern authority in support of the rendering *away from*, the position and connexion in which מִן here stands, make it extremely questionable. At most a place in the margin is all that it deserves.

40. *Break loose.* Here, and elsewhere (Jer. ii. 31), A. V. follows the Jews in identifying יוֹר with יִרְה. But the sense *room at large* is sufficiently established from the Arabic (hence Ps. lv. 2, *to be restless*, used similarly in Arabic of a sick man's pillow: see Lane's *Arabic Lexicon*, p. 1184). The meaning is, that Edom after a time will become restless, and exert himself to gain his freedom, being in the end successful.

xxix. 32, 33, etc. The margins explain the several names as before (iv. 25), by pointing to the words which they resemble in sound.

xxx. 11. *Fortunate!* In xlix. 19 the resemblance of the name Gad to *gedud*, a troop, suggests the form of the blessing; but here the meaning is certainly *fortune*, as is already given by LXX. (ἐν τύχῃ, Vulg. *Feliciter*), and most of the other ancient versions.<sup>1</sup> The word here used by Leah, *gad*, is not the usual one denoting *troop* (*gedud*), whereas the meaning *fortune* is well established, both from other allusions in the O.T., and from the cognate languages, in

<sup>1</sup> The Syriac, *My fortune cometh*; Onkelos, *Fortune cometh*; Pseudo-Jonathan, אַחַת מְזוּלָה טוֹבָה, *the good star cometh*—following the reading given on the margin, (קָא גָד)

which it regularly bears that sense; Gad was in fact the name of an old Phœnician and Canaanitish god, of which several proper names preserve the traces (Josh. xi. 7; xii. 7; and in Phœnician, Gad'ath, Gad-naam, etc.),<sup>1</sup> and which is actually named in Isa. lxv. 11 (see R.V.).

xxxi. 19. *Teraphim*. A particular kind of image, several times mentioned (see marg.), apparently a kind of household god. Other cases will meet us in which, by the use of a general term, like *image* here, a real and sometimes important distinction has been obscured in the A.V.

21. *The River*, (with a capital). So always in R.V. where the Euphrates is meant (e.g. Ps. lxxii. 8; Isa. viii. 7, xi. 15), which was the *the river* κατ' ἑξοχὴν (elsewhere called *the great river*, chap. xv. 18, etc.), to the Hebrews.

42, 53. *The Fear*, etc. *i.e.* the object of Isaac's reverence; cf. Isa. viii. 13 (though the Hebrew word is different).

xxxvi. 15. The old *duke*, representing the Vulg. *dux*, which in its turn represents the LXX. ἡγεμῶν, has been retained, with explanatory margin, *chief*. The word (הַגִּבּוֹרִים) appears to denote properly *leader of a clan*, and was probably (cf. Exod. xv. 15) the indigenous name borne in Edom by the chiefs of the several φυλαὶ or clans.

xxxvii. 35. The margin warns the reader that the word here used in the original does not denote the material sepulchre, but is the name by which the Hebrews designated the abode of the dead—the “house of meeting for all living” (Job xxx. 23). See the Revisers' Preface.

xlx. 4. *Thou shalt not have the excellency*, viz. the excellency spoken of in v. 3.

5. *Are their swords*. The word is extremely uncertain; but the omission of the preposition *in*, in the Hebrew, is decisive against the rendering of A.V. The meaning *sword* was hinted at first by the Jews, who compared *m'khêra* fancifully with μάχαιρα, and said absurdly that

<sup>1</sup> See Euting, *Sechs Phönizische Inschriften aus Idalion* (1875), p. 14.

Jacob cursed his sons in the Greek language! Nevertheless, it is probable from the context that some weapon is intended; and this sense may be obtained by deriving מִבְּרָה, either from בָּרַר = בּוּר, *to dig*, or *pierce* (Gesenius, Delitzsch), or possibly from בָּרַר, *to be round* (Dillmann), as though the word denoted properly some *curved* weapon.

The margin, *compacts*, implies a different vocalization (מִבְּרֹתֵיהֶם), and a derivation from בָּכַר, which in Syriac means *to betroth*. The allusion will then be to the nuptial contract concluded by the sons of Jacob, on the part of their sister Dinah, with Hamor, in the execution of which Simeon and Levi assumed a prominent part (xxxiv. 25 f.). This incident is certainly alluded to in the second part of *v.* 6.

*Houghed an ox.* Such is the obvious meaning of the Hebrew, found already in LXX. (ἐνευροκόπησαν ταῦρον), and alluding to the spirit of vindictive destructiveness (cf. 2 Sam. viii. 4), which, on the occasion referred to, these two sons of Jacob displayed (cf. xxxiv. 28-9). Most of the other ancient versions, however, vocalized *shur* (wall), for *shor* (ox), and עָקְרִי (Zeph. ii. 4) for עֲקָרִי, obtaining the rendering which was adopted in the A.V.

10. The rendering of the text, which is retained from A.V., can scarcely be correct, though it is difficult to provide a satisfactory substitute. The form of the name *Shiloh* in the sense *Peaceful* or *Peace-bringer*, is not that which a derivative of the root שָׁלַח, *to be at ease*, would have; and שָׁלַח itself is not a pregnant word, like שְׁלוֹם (Zech ix. 10), but often denotes careless, worldly ease (*e.g.* Job xii. 6; Ezek. xvi. 49). These philological arguments against the rendering of the text are supported by the further fact, that there is no allusion to *Shiloh* as a personal name of the Messiah in any other part of the O. T.; nor is the passage so interpreted in any ancient version. *Shiloh* appears first as a name of the Messiah in a passage of the

Talmud of Babylon,<sup>1</sup> where the pupils of different Rabbis compliment their master by connecting his name with a title of the Messiah: thus the pupils of R. Yannai said his name was *Yinnon*, on account of Ps. lxxii. 17, where the words occur, "Let his name be *perpetuated*" (Heb. *yinnon*); those of R. Chaninah said his name was *Chaninah*, on the ground of Jer. x. 17; those of R. Shila said that his name was *Shiloh*, on the ground of the present passage. Clearly, exegesis such as this is of no value in determining the real meaning of a Hebrew phrase; and it is probable in fact that the vocalization *Shiloh* was actually meant to express the meaning *his son* (see below). It is doubtful whether the rendering *Until Shiloh come* appears at all before the sixteenth century; it has certainly only prevailed since that time, probably through the influence of Seb. Münster's version (1534), in which the clause is rendered *quousque veniat Silo* (whence it was adopted in the "Great Bible" of 1539, and subsequent English versions).

The reading of the passage found generally in the ancient versions is עַר כִּי יָבֵא שָׁלוֹה—*שָׁלוֹה* being a poetical equivalent of אֲשֶׁר לוֹ (see 2 Kings vi. 11; Cant. i. 7, etc.)—which may be construed: (1) *until there come that which* (or *he who*) *is his*; (2) *until there come he to whom* (or *he whose*) *is . . .*, the sentence in the latter case being without a subject, and requiring either a word such as הוּא or יְהוֹיָה, referring to שָׁלוֹה, or some expression denoting *dominion*. Of these, (1) is represented by the LXX. *ἕως ἐὰν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ*, which is a legitimate, though paraphrastic, rendering of the Hebrew, and is the first alternative reading given on the margin of R.V. (2) is represented in the variant found often in MSS. of the LXX., and in patristic citations, *ἕως ἐὰν ἔλθῃ ᾧ ἀπόκειται*, which however is *not* a legitimate rendering of the Hebrew, as it interpolates the absent subject (*Till he come whose* [it is]), and in the rendering of On-

<sup>1</sup> *Sanhedrin*, 98b.

kelos, of the Targum of Jerusalem, likewise of Ephrem Syrus and of Aphraates (4th cent.), in which the word *kingdom* (*Till* Messiah come, whose is [the kingdom]) is interpolated.<sup>1</sup> The rendering *Till he come whose it is*, is the second alternative on the margin of R. V.—introduced, however, it may be observed, in terms simply recording the fact of its being an ancient rendering, and expressing no opinion on the question whether it is admissible as a translation of the (presumable) Hebrew עַר כִּי יבֹא שִׁלֹה.

It has been stated that the vocalization שִׁלֹה is probably meant to express the meaning *his son*. The earliest trace of this interpretation is found in the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, in which the clause is rendered “Till the time when the king Messiah comes, *the youngest of his* [Judah’s] sons,” שִׁלֹה being connected fancifully with שְׁלִיָּחָה in Deut. xxviii. 57 (which Onkelos renders [wrongly] by *her youngest son*). This rendering is adopted by several later Jewish authorities, as Yepheth ben Ali (10th cent.), Abulwalid (11th cent.),<sup>2</sup> David Kimchi (13th cent.), but is certainly untenable.

Antiquity, both Jewish and Christian, interpreted the passage in a Messianic sense; but this sense was not bound up with a personal name *Shiloh* (of which Christian antiquity knew, if possible, less than Jewish), but with the context of the verse, and especially with the promise of supremacy and success which it held out to Judah.

The marginal rendering, *Till he, (i.e. Judah,) come to Shiloh*, etc., was first suggested in modern times by W. G. Teller in 1766, was adopted by Herder,<sup>3</sup> and Ewald,<sup>4</sup> and has been advocated by two of the most recent commentators upon

<sup>1</sup> A trace of this (in the feminine שִׁלֹה) perhaps appears in the Peshitto.

<sup>2</sup> Both these writing in Arabic, and perhaps influenced by the Arabic سَلِيل (which they use in explaining it).

<sup>3</sup> *Vom Geist der Hebr. Poesie*, ii. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Jahrbücher der Bibl. Wissenschaft*, ii. 51; *History*, ii. 283 f.

Genesis, Delitzsch (1872)<sup>1</sup> and Dillmann (1883). In favour of this view, Delitzsch urges the great philological difficulty alluded to above, as attaching to the popular explanation of the name "Shiloh," and observes that elsewhere in the O. T. it regularly denotes the place of that name, in the tribe of Ephraim (1 Sam. iv. 12, etc.); then, looking at the history, and supposing the fulfilment to be the settlement of the land described in Josh. xviii. 1, he points out, (1) The marks of early pre-eminence assigned to Judah, (Num. x. 14; Jud. i. 2; xx. 18; Josh. xv.); and (2) That the arrival of the Israelites at Shiloh really marked a turning-point in the history of the people—the completion of the period of wandering, the beginning of the period of rest—sufficiently important to be singled out for notice in the blessing (cf. Josh. xxi. 42; xxii. 4). The subsequent years confirmed the position which Judah thus secured; the *obedience of the peoples* was realized primarily in the victories of David (2 Sam. viii.; Ps. xviii. 43), while at the same time it would include that ideal relation of Israel to the heathen of which the prophets speak more distinctly. Thus, in its ultimate scope, the passage is still Messianic, though the thought is not attached to the word *Shiloh*.

This view, it cannot be denied, is plausible, and it is especially set forth in an attractive form by Herder. The grounds upon which the present writer<sup>2</sup> is unable to accept it, he has stated elsewhere. שֵׁבֶט, standing in ver. 10 without any qualification, appears to him to suggest a *sceptre*, not (as the view just stated requires) a *staff*, viz. of a leader or general; the promise to Judah, then, is not one of pre-eminence merely, or even of supremacy, but of *royalty*. And this interpretation seems to be confirmed by a comparison of the phrase in v. 8 *end* with chap. xxxvii. 7.

<sup>1</sup> Not translated. See also his *Messianic Prophecies* (T. & T. Clark), p. 33 f.

<sup>2</sup> In common with Hermann Schultz, *Alttest. Theologie* (1878), pp. 668–72; Mr. Cheyne, *Prophecies of Isaiah* (ed. 1 and 2), ii. Essay iv.; Conrad Orelli, *Old Test. Prophecy* (T. & T. Clark), *ad loc.*

Judah, however, manifestly enjoyed no royal power till long after the date of Josh. xviii. ; the passages, moreover, cited from Numbers and Joshua, attribute to Judah only dignity or priority, not *supremacy* over the other tribes. It appears to the writer, therefore, the explanation of "Shiloh" as a personal name being not less difficult upon philological grounds, than its explanation as a geographical name is upon historical grounds, that the most satisfactory rendering of the existing text<sup>1</sup> is that of the original LXX.: *till that which (or he that) is his shall come*. The clause may then be regarded as an indeterminate expression of the Messianic hope, which was afterwards defined more distinctly, Judah being designated as the royal tribe, and the sceptre confirmed to it *till that which is his shall come, and he have the obedience of the nations*. Whether the existing text is correct must remain undecided; but it should be remembered that in whatever way the difficult clause under discussion is interpreted, the verse as a whole is Messianic, in that it promises *an ideal future to Judah*.<sup>2</sup>

14. *Sheepfolds for two burdens*. The same word occurs with the meaning *sheepfolds*, in Jud. v. 16. Issachar, though strong, and capable of active effort, was content to recline in pastoral ease, and even to lapse into a condition of absolute servitude. The same reproach of inactivity and indolence is levelled by Deborah, in similar language, against Reuben, in Jud. v. 16.

15. *Under taskwork for unto tribute*. The word (סֵם) denotes regularly not the mere payment of tribute, but

<sup>1</sup> The *plena scriptio* is of late introduction; many MSS. as well as all versions have שֵׁלוֹה (not שִׁלוֹה).

<sup>2</sup> It stands between xxii. 17; xxvii. 29, on the one hand; and Ps. xviii. 43-4; Amos ix. 11, 12 on the other. For a fuller account of the exegesis of the passage in both ancient and modern times, the author may be permitted to refer in advance to a paper in the forthcoming number of the *Cambridge Journal of Philology*, pp. 1-28.

liability to forced labour. Cf. Jud. i. 28, 30, 33; 1 Kings v. 14; ix. 21, etc.

19. *Upon their heel.* Pursuing them in flight.

20. The reading of the margin does not substantially affect the sense, but is preferable grammatically to that underlying the text: for while merely implying a different division of two Hebrew words, it improves the construction in both verses (אִשָּׁר, עָקַבְתָּם; אִשָּׁר, עָקַבְתָּם; the מ is superfluous in v. 20—אִשָּׁר being naturally the *nom. pendens*, as גַּר, v. 19; Deut. xxxii. 4; Ps. xi. 4; xlv. 4 [Heb. 5] etc.—and desiderated in v. 19). The ancient versions have nothing corresponding to *out of*.

24. *Strong.* The word (in this form) does not occur elsewhere in Hebrew, and the precise meaning is uncertain. The rendering of the text is given by the Jews, and derives some support from Syriac.<sup>1</sup> That on the margin is supported by the Arabic usage, and by the use of the *Piel* conjugation in 2 Sam. vi. 16.

The last clause is very difficult and almost certainly corrupt. The text has been differently explained; it may perhaps be understood to mean *from thence*, *i.e.* from God, Joseph became a guardian and defence of his people, viz. in Egypt. But this, which is the best explanation, is strained (in particular, *stone* is never used figuratively, as *rock* is, for a *defence*), and needs more to be supplied in thought than is probable. As rendered in the margin, the third clause of the verse carries on the thought of clauses 1 and 2, pointing again, with fresh emphasis, to the source of Joseph's strength, *from thence*, *i.e.* from heaven, *from the shepherd, the stone of Israel* (titles of God; cf. xlviii. 15, and, later, Ps. lxxx. 2), *sc.* were his arms made strong. The second margin follows the vocalization of the Peshitto (מִשָּׁר for מִשָּׁר), cf. Ps. xx. 2. This has the advantage of relieving the verse of the awkward *from thence*, though *name* is not very appropriate

<sup>1</sup> If the meaning *durus, difficilis*, given by Castle, is correct.

in parallelism with *hands*. Probably the corruption in reality lies deeper, and is beyond the reach of the emendator's hand.

26. Margin : הַרְרֵי־עַד, *ancient mountains* (see Deut. xxxiii. 15; Hab. iii. 6), for הַרְרֵי עַד, *my progenitors* (lit. *my conceivers*), *unto*, the next word מְצַוֶּנָה being derived from צוה, and taken in its usual sense of *desire*, instead of being derived from צָוָה *to mark out, circumscribe*, Num. xxxiv. 7 f. (cf. for the form מְצַוֶּנָה from צָוָה), and explained as *limit, utmost bound*. This reading is represented in LXX. ὑπερίσχυσεν ὑπὲρ εὐλογίας ὀρέων μονίμων κ.τ.λ. ; and a trace of it is found, side by side with the other reading *my progenitors*, in the rendering of the fragmentary Jerusalem Targum.

l. 11. *Abel* means a *grassy place, or meadow*, and occurs similarly in other geographical names (e.g. Num. xxxiii. 49; Jud. vii. 22; xi. 33). It has no etymological connexion with *ebel*, mourning.

S. R. DRIVER.

---

## THE LOST SHEEP AND LOST PIECE OF MONEY.

### LUKE xv. 1-10.

THE heathen philosopher Seneca made a practice of dining with his slaves, and when challenged for an innovation so directly in the teeth of all customary proprieties and so offensive to the Roman mind, he defended himself by saying, that he dined with some because they were worthy of his esteem, and with others that they might become so. The action and its defence were alike admirable, and read a salutary lesson to the aristocrats of Rome. But it was even a greater shock to the Pharisees, and if possible even more unaccountable, that Jesus should prefer the society of notorious sinners to their own irreproachable manners