

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

the flower draws from the light, the richness of perfect beauty.

Yes; that was the secret of their success; and it is the secret of our success. The words are true now as they were when addressed by Zechariah to the poor remnant of Jews struggling to rebuild their outward temple: *Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.* Not first by material change, not by intellectual culture, but by spiritual sympathy will our work be done. Let us take to ourselves the charge of our Epistle, the counsel of Divine fellowship—fellowship with God and man, fellowship with man in God. *Let us draw near unto the throne of grace. . . Let us hold fast the confession of our hope. . . Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works,* and it shall not be long said that the victories of faith are ended.

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD
TESTAMENT.

THE SECOND BOOK OF SAMUEL.

i. 18. The song of *the bow*. This, if the text is sound, is the most probable explanation of the phrase לְלַמֵּד בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה קֶשֶׁת, *to teach the children of Judah [the] bow*. David's elegy was called *the bow*, from the mention of Jonathan's bow in *v.* 22; and it was to be taught to the people in order that the memory of Saul and Jonathan might be handed down to posterity. Cf. Deut. xxxi. 19; Ps. lx. title. The A.V. follows the Targum in explaining the phrase to refer to the practice of archery; but this is improbable, as the bow was already in general use, and such a direction would be out of place here. The word *τόξον* is however

absent from the Vatican MS. of the LXX., and it is possible that the word קָשֶׁת should be struck out, and the clause read simply "and he bade them teach it to the children of Judah." Wellhausen ingeniously conjectures that the original reading in *v.* 6 for בעלי פרשים was פרשים, that בעלי קשת was written in the margin as an emendation, to accord with 1 Sam. xxxi. 3, and the text standing in parallel columns, בעלי was inserted in *v.* 6, and קשת in *v.* 18. Ewald's explanation that קשת = קָשֶׁט, *accurately*, and Thenius' emendation, קָשֶׁב, *heedfully*, have little to be said in their favour.

14. צָבִי may mean *glory*, or as in the margin, *gazelle*; and Ewald (*Hist.* iii. 30), adopting the latter rendering, infers that Jonathan's "personal beauty and swiftness of foot in attack or retreat had gained for him the name of *The Gazelle*." Asahel is compared to a gazelle (*wild roe*) in chap. ii. 18; cf. Cant. ii. 9; and the figure of the gazelle stricken by the hunters on its native hills would be an exceedingly beautiful one. But as the elegy celebrates both Saul and Jonathan, the opening word should include both, and the rendering in the text is preferable. It is moreover supported by the parallelism of "the mighty" in the second hemistich.

21. *Not anointed with oil.* The R.V. refers the epithet בְּגֵלִי מְשִׁיחַ בַּשָּׁמֶן to Saul's shield. It describes it as it lay rusting and uncared for on the fatal field, instead of being polished and prepared for use. For the practice of anointing shields, cf. Isa. xxi. 5. But the rendering of the A.V. which comes down from Coverdale, and is derived from the Vulg. *quasi non esset unctus oleo*, is still retained in the margin as worthy of consideration, on the ground that מְשִׁיחַ is elsewhere always applied to a person. It gives an excellent sense. The shield of the Lord's anointed is flung away, as though he had not been distinguished by any mark of consecration.

8. *Had taken for took.* In all probability he had done it immediately after the battle of Gilboa and before the events related in *vv.* 1-7.

iii. 8. *Am I a dog's head that belongeth to Judah?* i.e. utterly despicable and an enemy to your cause. The words *אשר ליהודה* are omitted by the LXX., but if genuine, they must be taken as a definition of *ראש כלב ליהודה*. cannot be translated as in A.V. following Coverdale and the Genevan, *against Judah*. This rendering is taken from the Vulg., which however transposes the words from the relative clause: "Numquid caput canis ego sum adversus Judam hodie qui," etc.; i.e. "Am I a worthless defender of your cause against Judah?"

iv. 2. *And Ishbosheth, Saul's son, had two men.* A most obvious example of the way in which scribes tampered with the text in early times. The name *Esh-baal* was, as is well known, changed to *Ish-bosheth*, to avoid the scandal of pronouncing the name of Baal. But here, as in *v.* 1, and also in iii. 7, the name was not changed, but struck out altogether; and in this case it has carried with it the preposition *ל* which expresses *had* (lit. "*there were to Ishbosheth*. . . . *היו לאיש בשת* . . . *ושני אנשים*"), making havoc of the grammar. In all three cases the name is retained in the LXX.

6. Margin. While it is quite true, as the defenders of the Massoretic text urge, that it is characteristic of Hebrew historical writing to state a fact in general terms, and then to repeat the statement with further details (cf. iii. 22, 23; *v.* 1, 3), the double account of Ish-bosheth's murder in *vv.* 6 and 7, is certainly surprising, and the entirely different reading of the LXX. casts additional suspicion on the Hebrew text. The reading of the LXX. can hardly be mere conjecture or corruption, and it gives a clear explanation how the murderers got in and out unobserved. The employment of the portress is illustrated by the customs of

modern Palestine, where women are constantly to be seen sitting at their doors sifting wheat. See Neil's *Palestine Explored*, p. 246.

v. 6. *Except thou take away the blind and the lame, thou shalt not come in hither.* To the present writer the rendering retained in the text, which has come down from Matthew's Bible, *i.e.* from Tyndale, appears to offer no satisfactory sense, and to involve serious grammatical difficulties. הָסִירָךְ must be taken as infin. though it is pointed as perfect, and כִּי אִם requires a finite verb. It is however the rendering of the Vulg. (*non ingredieris huc nisi abstuleris cecos et claudos*), Syr., and (substantially) the Targ., and was adopted by Rashi and Kimchi, and after them by Münster and others. The marginal rendering, on the other hand, which is given, though in a loose form, by the LXX., presents no grammatical difficulty. The verb preceding its subject stands, as often, in the singular; and the perfect tense הָסִירָךְ expresses the confidence of the Jebusites. So secure did they feel in the natural strength of their fortress, as to boast that a garrison of blind and lame would be able to repel David's assault. So Luther; and probably following him, Coverdale: "Thou shalt not come hither but the blynde and lame shal drive y^e awaie."

8. The A.V. of this most obscure passage, which involves the transposition of the first two clauses, and the supplement of an apodosis from 1 Chron. xi. 6, is not defensible. Probably the *watercourse* was some ravine by which it was possible to scale the citadel, and David calls the Jebusite garrison *blind and lame*, derisively retorting their own words. *That are hated* is the K'ri, שִׂנְאֵי : *that hate* is the C'thib שִׂנְאֵי , which must be taken as a relative clause.

They say for they said. The imperfect tense יֹאמְרוּ shows that the words which follow are a proverb in current use.

Cf. 1 Sam. xix. 24. So Coverdale: "Hereof cometh the prouerbe." The rendering of the A.V. appears to follow the interpretation given by the LXX. and Vulg., that *the house* means the Temple, from which the blind and lame were excluded. But apart from the fact that it is by no means clear that they were excluded, this explanation takes no account of the origin of the proverb. The most probable meaning of the words as rendered in the R.V. is that the taunt of the Jebusites came to be used as a proverb with reference to impregnable strongholds.

21. *Took them away.* Similarly Coverdale correctly, *carried thē awaye.* The A.V. follows the Targum in rendering *burned them*, in accordance with the different reading of 1 Chron. xiv. 12; but **וַיִּשְׂאֵם** cannot bear this meaning, though some Jewish commentators endeavour to find it in the word. The rendering probably originated in the fear lest it should seem that David disobeyed the law of Deut. vii. 5. But the two statements are not incompatible.

vi. 5. *Castanets for cornets.* The etymology of **מַנְעַנְעִים** shows that it must denote some instrument which was played by being shaken. *Sistra* (marg.), *i.e.* *σειστρα*, is an exact equivalent for the word, and the instrument may have been similar to the Egyptian instrument so named, which consisted of rings hung on iron rods. (See Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, vol. i. p. 497.)

17. *Tent.* So A.V. rightly for **אֹהֶל** in the parallel passage 1 Chron. xv. 1.

19. *A portion of flesh, marg. of wine.* The precise meaning of **אֶשְׁפֶּר**, which occurs only here and in 1 Chron. xvi. 3, is uncertain. It is probably derived from a root not in use in Hebrew, meaning *to measure*. The A.V., *a good piece of flesh*, connects it with **שֵׁפַר** *splenduit*, but this is unlikely.

vii. 19. *And this too after the manner of men:* *i.e.* Thou dost condescend to speak familiarly with me, as man speaks

to man. This rendering, which is adopted by Gesenius, Maurer, Thenius, and others, gives a good sense: but though the analogy of **מִשְׁפָּט** may be quoted, **תִּירוּהָ** nowhere else bears this meaning. The literal rendering of the words is accordingly given in the margin. Cf. Coverdale, *Is this the lawe of men?* The emphasis is on *man*, and the words are best understood as an expression of humble surprise, that God has vouchsafed to grant to human beings such as himself and his posterity, a perpetual dominion. The text in Chron. is quite different.

23. *What one nation, etc.* The order of the words is in favour of the marginal rendering, which lays stronger emphasis on the uniqueness and separateness of Israel's position in the world. **אֶחָד . . . מִי** may, however, be taken together as in the text.

It is difficult to believe that the text of the latter part of the verse is sound. The only tenable explanation of **לְכֶם**, *for you*, is that David "with oratorical vivacity addresses the people"; but such an address is out of place in a prayer; and it seems best either to omit the word altogether, with the LXX., or to read **לָהֶם** *for them*, with the Vulgate. Further, **לְאַרְצֶךָ**, *for thy land*, comes in awkwardly, and the government of **גוֹיִם וְאֱלֹהֵיו** by repeating the preposition from **מִמְצָרִים** is not satisfactory: and the reading of 1 Chron. xvii. 21 **לְגֵרֶשׁ**, together with that of the LXX. here *τοῦ ἐκβαλεῖν σε*, points to the substitution of **לְגֵרֶשׁךָ** for **לְאַרְצֶךָ**, and **אֱלֹהֵים** for **אֱלֹהֵיו**. The clause will then run as follows: "To do for them great and terrible things, in driving out from before thy people which thou redeemedst to thee out of Egypt, nations and gods."

27. Marg. *been bold*. So the Genevan. The literal rendering is *found his heart*; and *heart* in Hebrew, as in English, frequently denotes *courage*.

viii. 1. *David took the bridle of the mother city out of the hand of the Philistines*: i.e. wrested the control of their

metropolis from them; a poetical equivalent for the prosaic statement in 1 Chron. xviii. 1, that David "took Gath and her towns out of the hand of the Philistines." This is the best explanation of an obscure phrase for which numerous interpretations have been proposed. Though אִמָּה does not occur elsewhere in the sense of *mother city*, the idea was a familiar one. Cf. 2 Sam. xx. 19, and the use of בָּנוֹת, *daughters*, for dependent towns in Chron. i.c. and commonly.

3. *The River*, i.e. the Euphrates. The word פְּרָת is not in the C'thib or written text, but is inserted in the K'ri or traditional read text, which the A.V. follows.

4. *A thousand and seven hundred horsemen*. The text as it stands can mean nothing else. *Chariots* of A.V. is introduced from 1 Chron. xviii. 4, but this correction leaves the discrepancy of the numbers untouched, and a larger force of chariots than of cavalry is most unlikely. The reading of the LXX. agrees with that of Chron., "a thousand chariots and seven thousand horsemen," and may perhaps be right.

13. *The Syrians*. Note the margin. The text as it stands cannot be right. For *Syrians* we must read *Edomites*, or else insert from the LXX. after *Syrians*, "and he smote the Edomites." אַרַם, *Aram*, and אֶדוֹם, *Edom*, are constantly confused. The context requires a reference to Edom; the Valley of Salt was in the neighbourhood of Edom, not of Syria (2 Kings xiv. 7); 1 Chron. xviii. 11, 12, and the title of Ps. lx., support the change.

18. *Was over the Cherethites*. The margin calls attention to the fact that the words *was over* must be supplied from the parallel passages in chap. xx. 23 and 1 Chron. xviii. 17. The text as it stands gives no sense.

18. *Priests for chief rulers*. The Hebrew word כְּהֹנִיִּם is exactly the same as that applied in v. 17 to Zadok and Ahimelech. Similarly in chap. xx. 26, Ira the Jairite appears, in addition to the priests Zadok and Abiathar, as

“*priest* (A.V. *chief ruler*) unto David;” and in the list of Solomon’s officers in 1 Kings iv. 5, Zabud the son of Nathan is styled “*priest* and the king’s friend.” The A.V. and before it the Genevan in translating *chief rulers*, followed the paraphrase in 1 Chron. xviii. 17, “*chief about the king*”; the version of the LXX., ἀνλόρχαι, *courtiers*; the Targum, רברבין, *princes*; and the Syriac, which has the same word, ܩܘܕܫܐ: but the Vulg., Luther and Coverdale render *priests*. Coverdale adds a marginal note “*Some reade: rulers.*” Whether the offices were identical, and Wellhausen’s inference that David “exercised unfettered control . . . over the appointment of the priests, who were merely his officials” (*History of Israel*, E. T., p. 132), is sound, or whether the explanation suggested in Chronicles, that in certain cases the word כְּהֹנִים means *ministers* in a civil capacity, is correct, is an exegetical and historical question which cannot be discussed here.

x. 6. *The king of Maacah* for *king Maacah*. Though Maacah was a common man’s name, there is no doubt that a small Syrian kingdom in the neighbourhood of Geshur is here meant. The A.V. renders it correctly in 1 Chron. xix. 6, 7.

Men of Tob for *Ish-Tob*. Cf. Jud. xi. 3.

xii. 30. *Their king*, marg. *Malcam*. There can be little doubt that in Jer. xlix. 1, 3, and Zeph. i. 5, מַלְכָם, *Malcam*, is a variant form of the name of the Ammonite god, Molech or Milcom. And it may be so here. The pronoun *their* comes in awkwardly; and the original LXX. probably took it as a proper name Μολχόμ, though the gloss τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν was subsequently added. A Jewish tradition, recorded in the Talmud (*Aboda Zara*, f. 24a), and in the *Quæstiones Hebraicæ in libros Paralipomenon*, attributed to Jerome but certainly spurious (ed. Vallarsi, iii. 873), tells how the crown was snatched from the idol’s head by Ittai the Gittite, because a Hebrew might not take spoil from an idol, though

he might receive it from another man's hand! It seems, however, more natural that the *king's* crown should have been placed on David's head, and the rendering in the text on the whole deserves the preference.

31. Margin: "put them to saws, and to harrows of iron, and to axes of iron, and made them labour at (העביר העביר) the brickmould": i.e. condemned them to various forms of hard labour. It would be a relief if this milder view of David's treatment of the Ammonites could be taken, but the rendering in the text probably gives the right sense. It is true that וישם במגרה does not strictly mean *put them under saws*, but *put them on or at saws*; and we should probably read as in 1 Chron. xx. 3 וישר, and he sawed for וישם, with the Targum, Thenius, Wellhausen, Keil, etc.

xiii. 18. *A garment of divers colours, marg. a long garment with sleeves.* The term כְּתֹנֶת פְּסִים occurs only here and in Gen. xxxvii. 3, 23. It is explained, (1) from Aram. פֶּס = *piece or patch*, to mean *a patchwork or variegated tunic*. So the LXX. in Genesis χιτῶν ποικίλος; Vulg. tunica polymita: or (2) from פֶּס = *palm of the hand or sole of the foot*, to mean *a tunic with sleeves and reaching down to the feet*. So the LXX. here χιτῶν καρπωτός, Vulg. tunica talaris. The latter explanation is adopted by almost all modern commentators, but seems to have been thought by the Revisers not sufficiently certain to displace the rendering in the A.V. It certainly, however, suits the context best.

xiv. 14. *Neither doth God take away life.* So וְלֹא יִשָּׂא אֱלֹהִים נַפְשׁ must be rendered. The woman urges David to be merciful as God is merciful, who does not immediately punish the sinner with death, but rather strives to win him to repentance. There is a pointed allusion to David's own case (chap. xii. 13). The older versions of Coverdale and Matthew rightly, "and God will not take away the lyfe":

Great Bible, "neither doth God spare any soule": Geneva and Bishops', "neither doth God spare any person."

xv. 7. The "ancient authorities" which read *four* instead of *forty* are the LXX. according to Lucian's recension (see De Lagarde's ed.), the Syriac, the Arabic, and Vulg. (ed. Sixt.); Josephus, *Ant.*, vi. 9. 1; Theodoret, *Quæst in Reg.*, p. 433. Internal evidence is strongly in favour of *four*. The only obvious *terminus a quo* in the context is Absalom's reconciliation to his father; and forty years could hardly have passed since then.

12. The marg. *sent Ahithophel* is the grammatical rendering of the Heb. וַיִּשְׁלַח . . . אֶת־אֲחִיתֹפֶל. But what can this mean? The context seems to require some alteration of the text which will give the meaning *sent for*. Vulg. *accersivit*. LXX. (some MSS.) ἀπέστειλε καὶ ἐκάλεσε, *sent and called*.

17. Whether *Beth-merhak* is retained as a proper name, or translated *the Far House*, some definite place is meant outside the city before the road crossed the Kidron; and the correct rendering brings out one of the graphic details which abound in this narrative of David's flight.

28. *At the fords of the wilderness*, בְּעֵבְרוֹת הַמְדָּבָר, is the C'thib; *in the plains of the wilderness*, בְּעֵרְבוֹת הַמְדָּבָר, is the K'ri. There is the same variation in chap. xvii. 16, where the context is decidedly in favour of the reading *forde*; and some definite place rather than a large district would naturally have been fixed upon for the messenger to meet David. All the Versions, however, support the K'ri.

xvi. 10. *Because he curseth, and because*, etc. The R.V. renders the C'thib, בִּי יִקְלֵל וְכִי; the A.V. follows the K'ri, כִּי יִקְלֵל כִּי.

12. *On the wrong done unto me*. A.V. *affliction*, marg. *tears*, Heb. *eye*, following the K'ri, בְּעֵינַי. So the Targum. But such a meaning of עֵין is unsupported. R.V. follows the C'thib בְּעֵינַי, and takes the suffix objectively, as in קָלַלְתִּי

in the second half of the verse. But LXX., Vulg., Syr., point to the reading *בְּעֵנַי*, *on my affliction*, which is probably right.

For his *cursing of me*, reading *קָלַלְתִּי* with the C'thib. A.V. follows the K'ri, *קָלַלְתָּו*. The variation is not recognised in some editions of the Hebrew text.

14. *Weary*. If *עֵיפִים* is rendered *weary*, the sentence is incomplete. The mention of some place, to which *there* at the end of the verse may be referred, is required. Hence the marginal alternative to *Ayephim*, taking *עֵיפִים* as the name of a place. So far as the form of the word is concerned this is quite possible (cf. *בְּחִירִים*, *Bahurim*); but no such place is mentioned elsewhere, and it is possible that the name of the place has fallen out of the text.

xvii. 3. The Massoretic text of this verse is suspicious, and the various reading of the LXX. might well have found a place in the margin. "And I will bring back all the people unto thee, as a bride returneth to her husband; thou seekest the life of one man only, and all the people shall be in peace."

17. The A.V. neglects the tenses and unwarrantably transposes the clauses in this verse. It may be taken as in the text, as the historian's parenthetical statement of the way in which news was conveyed to David; the verbs *והלכה*, *והגידה*, *והגידו*, *ילכו* and *והגידו* being regarded as frequentative: *used to go and tell them; and they would go and tell*, etc. (cf. Prof. Driver's *Tenses*, § 120). In this case the events since Absalom's entry must be supposed to have occupied some days, during which communications were kept up. Or it may be taken, as in the margin, as a continuation of Hushai's words to Zadok and Abiathar.

25. *Ithra the Israelite*. It is hard to see why *Ithra* should be specially designated *the Israelite*, and the true reading is probably that given in the margin from 1 Chron. ii. 17, *the Ishmaelite*. So the LXX. (cod. A but not cod. B)

here. *Ithra*, יִתְרָא, and *Jether*, יֶתֶר, are of course only different forms of the same name. ὁ Ἰεζραηλῖτης in common text which follows B.

xviii. 13. *His life*, נַפְשִׁי, C'thib: marg. and A.V. *my life*, נַפְשִׁי, K'ri. *Wouldest have stood aloof*, marg. *wouldest have set thyself against me*. הִתְיַצַּב מִנִּנְר, *to stand over against*, may denote an attitude either of indifference, or of hostility. Cf. Obad. 11.

21. *The Cushite for Cush*. The def. article shows that כְּנִישִׁי is not a personal name, as in Zeph. i. 1, but a gentile name. He was an Ethiopian slave in attendance on Joab. Cf. Jer. xxxviii. 7.

29. *The king's servant, even me thy servant*. The exegesis of אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ הַמֶּלֶךְ by אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ is meaningless. On the other hand the reading of the A.V. and marg. *and me thy servant*, assumes that Ahimaaz points to the Cushite approaching in the distance, which is scarcely probable. The order of the words, moreover, is unusual, and Wellhausen's conjecture that אֶת עַבְדְּךָ הַמֶּלֶךְ was originally a marginal gloss on אֶת עַבְדְּךָ, which has got into the text, is possibly right; or the text may be altered so as to yield the sense given in the Vulg.: "when Joab thy servant, O king, sent me thy servant."

xix. 25. *When he was come to Jerusalem*. This is the most obvious rendering. But "came down" in v. 24 (cf. v. 31), and the position of the narrative, seem to imply that Mephibosheth came to meet David at the Jordan. Accordingly the marginal rendering, which is grammatically possible, deserves consideration. Cf. v. 15. So Vulg. *cumque Jerusalem occurrisset regi*.

43. The margin, *and were not we the first to speak of bringing back our king?* agrees with vv. 10, 11.

xx. 24. *Tribute*. Rather as in the marg., and in the corresponding list of Solomon's officers in 1 Kings iv. 6, cf. 1 Kings v. 14, *levy*. The word is used of the forced

labour employed in public works. *Over the tribute* is, however, the rendering of the LXX. and Vulg.

xxi. 4. *Neither is it for us to put any man to death in Israel.* The rendering of the A.V., *neither for us shalt thou put any man to death in Israel*, though grammatically possible, and retained in the margin, does not agree with the context, for the Gibeonites plainly desired blood for blood, and the explanation that their quarrel was not with Israel at large, but only with the house of Saul, has to be read into the words. The R.V. on the other hand gives an excellent sense. 'We may not compound this blood feud for a money ransom (cf. Num. xxxv. 31), nor have we the right to put any one to death; it rests with you, as king, to act.'

8. *The five sons of Michal. . . . whom she bare to Adriel.* According to 1 Sam. xviii. 19 it was *Merab* who was married to Adriel, while the name of Michal's husband was Palti (1 Sam. xxv. 44) or Paltiel (2 Sam. iii. 15). The explanation of the A.V., derived from the Targum, cannot stand, for יִלְדָה means *bare*, not *brought up*, and it is clear that there is an error in the text, and that *Merab* must be read in place of *Michal*.

10. *Was poured, for dropped.* The A.V. was misled by the LXX. and Vulg. But a reference to Exod. ix. 33 decides the sense of the word נִתְּדַ, and it is significant. Rizpah kept her watch until *abundant* rain showed that the curse had been removed.

16. *A new sword*: marg. *new armour*. The Heb. text has only the adjective הַדְּשָׁה, *new*; and there is nothing to indicate what substantive should be supplied, whether *sword* as in the Vulg. *ense novo*, or *armour*. A third possibility, however, deserves consideration, that הַדְּשָׁה is a corruption of some rare word denoting some specially formidable weapon. Cf. the LXX. *κόρυνη*, *a mace*.

19. The comparison of this verse with the parallel

passage in 1 Chron. xx. 5 shows that one or both texts are corrupt. (1) The reading *Jair* is preferable to *Jaare-oregim*. *Oregim* אַרְגִּים is the word for *weavers* in the line below, inserted here by a careless scribe. The letters of יַעִיר, *Jair*, were then transposed to give the form of a construct state, יַעִיר, *Jaare*, before אַרְגִּים. (2) The words בֵּית־הַלְחָמִי־אֶתְנַלִּית, *the Bethlehemite* [slew] *Goliath*, so closely resemble in form and sound אֶת־לַחְמִי־אֶתְנַלִּית, *Lahmi the brother of Goliath*, that it is extremely probable that the one reading is a corruption or correction of the other. Possibly the text of Chron. was altered by a scribe who stumbled at the statement that Goliath was slain by Elhanan, the form of the alteration being suggested by the similarity of sound. In that case the text of Samuel deserves the preference. It is quite possible that more than one Gittite giant bore the name of Goliath.

xxii. 6. *Cords for sorrows*. חֲבָלִים from חָבַל, *to twist, bind*, means both *cords* and *pangs*. The parallelism decides for the first meaning. Cf. LXX. *σχοῖα*, *Vulg. funes*. The A.V. follows its predecessors from Coverdale, who was probably influenced by the rendering of the LXX. in the Psalter ὠδῖνες, made familiar by the *Vulg. dolores inferni*, and by the use of the words in Acts ii. 24.

9. The parallelism *out of his mouth* decides for the rendering *out of* (lit. *in*) *his nostrils*, though בְּאַפּוֹ may mean *in his wrath* (marg.). But cf. v. 16.

12. *Gathering of waters*. So the Genevan: *even the gatherings of waters*. הִשְׁרֵת, found here only, is explained from a cognate Arabic word meaning *to assemble*. The A.V. margin *bindings*, comes from Kimchi, who compares the root קָשַׁר, and the rendering *dark waters* was probably suggested by the various reading הִשְׁכֵּת in Ps. xviii.

33, 34. *Guideth for maketh*, deriving וַיִּתֵּר from תוֹר. Marg. *setteth free*, deriving it from נָתַר, *to shake off, loose*. "His way," "his feet," according to the C'thib וַיִּרְכּוּ, וַיִּנְלִי:

marg. "my way," "my feet," according to the K'ri רַרְפִי, רַגְלִי, and LXX., Vulg., Targ., Syr.

46. *Shall come trembling*, following the text of Ps. xviii. 45, יִהְרָגוּ. The text here reads יִהְרָגוּ, which in its ordinary sense of *gird themselves* does not suit the passage, but may possibly be explained from the Syr. ܝܫܘܥܝܢ, *claudicavit, come limping*.

51. *Great deliverance giveth he*. So the C'thib, מְגִדֵּל, יְשׁוּעוֹת, with Ps. xviii. 50; and all the ancient versions. The K'ri is מְגִדֵּל יְשׁוּעוֹת, *a tower of deliverance*.

xxiii. 3, 4. The brevity of this oracle (נְאֻם, v. 1) makes it difficult to determine the exact construction and sense. It is possible, as in the text, to regard מוֹשֵׁל as the subject, and יִכְאֹר בְּקֶרֶךְ as the predicate introduced by ו, as is sometimes the case when the subject is virtually a protasis and the predicate an apodosis (*when a man rules . . . he shall be*, etc.): or, as in the margin, to supply *there shall be* in v. 3, and *it shall be* at the beginning of v. 4. The words depict the blessings which will attend the rule of a righteous and God-fearing king. They are an outline sketch of the ideal king to whom Israel's hopes were more clearly directed by subsequent prophecy; and though partially realized in the better kings of Judah, find their complete fulfilment only in Christ. The A.V., *he that ruleth over men must be just*, makes it seem that the object of the words is to describe the necessary characteristics of a ruler, rather than the result of the rule of one to come, who, it is assumed, will possess these characteristics.

5. According to the affirmative rendering, *verily*, given in the text, David confesses with humiliation that his house does not correspond to the ideal, and yet rests his hope on the divine covenant. But the interrogative rendering (לֹא = הֲלֹא) given in the margin, *for is not my house so with God? . . . for all my salvation, and all my desire, will he not make it to grow?* is adopted by most modern commenta-

tors. According to this view, David bases his hope of the ideal righteous ruler on the covenant relation into which God has entered with his house.

8. The corruption of the text of this verse is manifest. (1) *יֹשֵׁב בַּשֵּׁבֶת*, *one sitting in the seat*, can hardly be taken as a proper name *Josheb-basshebeth*, and a proper name is required in its place. Chron. reads *יֹשֶׁבֶעַם*, *Jashobeam*, and the corruption may have originated in the carelessness of a transcriber who substituted for *עַם* the word *בשבת* from the line above. The reading of the LXX. however, is *Ἰεσοσθέ* = *ישבשת*, and Wellhausen thinks that *ישבעם* in Chron. is a corruption of *ישבעל* (= *אשבעל*) which he believes the LXX. had still before them in the text of Chron. (2) For *תַּחְכְּמוֹנִי* *Tahchemonite*, should be read *הַחֲכָמוֹנִי*, *the Hachmonite*, or *בְּרַחְכְּמוֹנִי*, *the son of a Hachmonite*, as in Chron. (3) The last clause has neither grammar nor sense. In place of; *וְהוּא* *יהוּא*, *the same was Adino the Eznite*, must originally have stood, as in Chron., the words *הוּא עוֹרֵר אֶת הַנֵּיטוֹ*, *he lifted up his spear* (cf. v. 18), or their equivalent.

9. The text of this verse is also corrupt. Not to press the fact that the construction of *חרף* with *ב* is not found elsewhere, *שָׁם*, *there*, implies the previous mention of a place, and we should probably correct the text from Chron. by inserting *he was with David at Pas-dammim* before *when they defied the Philistines*.

20. *A valiant man*. So the Kri *אִישׁ חַיִּל*. Marg. *Ish-hai* with the C'thib *חַיִּל*.

The two sons of Ariel. *אֲרִיאֵל* means *lion of God*, a title given by the Arabs and Persians to men of distinguished bravery. It appears to be a proper name here; and the Revisers follow the LXX. in inserting *בְּנֵי*, *sons of*, which may easily have fallen out after *שְׁנֵי*.

xxiv. 23. *All this, O king, doth Araunah, etc.* Thus rendered, the words form the conclusion of Araunah's speech. The marg. rendering *Araunah the king* is gram-

matically possible, but it seems hardly probable that so important a fact as that Araunah was the former king of Jebus should be only mentioned incidentally. Perhaps אֲרָאֻנָה should be omitted altogether, and the words taken as a remark of the historian, *all this did Araunah give (i.e. offer) unto the king.* So the LXX., and some MSS of the Vulg.

A. F. KIRKPATRICK.

"TESTAMENT" OR "COVENANT" ?

Οπου γὰρ διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου· διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μὴ ποτε ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῆ ὁ διαθέμενος."—HEB. ix. 16, 17.

It is generally admitted that *διαθήκη* has in ver. 15 its ordinary meaning of "covenant." But a large number of expositors, including several of the first rank, such as Chrysostom (who does not hint at any other interpretation), Calvin, De Wette, Bleek, Delitzsch, think that in vv. 16, 17 the word passes over into the meaning of "testament," or disposition of property by will. The awkwardness of the transition from the notion of covenant to that of testament is more or less fully acknowledged. But we are compelled to choose the view that offers fewest difficulties. Four proposed renderings of the passage assume that *διαθήκη* means covenant throughout, and all are certainly open to grave objection.

1. Some have translated *διαθέμενος* "the appointed victim." It is sufficient to say that in no other passage has *διαθέμενος* a passive meaning.

2. Some have proposed to render *διαθέμενος* "the mediating victim." But *διατίθημι* does not mean "to mediate."

3. The view of Ebrard is much more worthy of consideration: When a sinner enters into covenant with the