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

destiny and their position; never was the Spirit more openly claiming acceptance for growing Truth.

As then we have known a little of the power of our Faith; as we have felt the want of forgiveness and the want of support; as we have learnt a little more clearly with advancing years the grievousness of sin and the perils of life, *let us*, each in our place, *hold fast our confession.*

Let us draw near with boldness to the throne of grace— giving utterance to every feeling and every wish—*that we may receive mercy*—receive it as humble suppliants from the Lord's free love—*and may find*—find as unwearied searchers—*grace to help in time of need.*

That access is ever open to the foot of faith. That mercy is unfailing to the cry of penitence. That grace is inexhaustible to the servant who offers himself wholly to the Master's use.

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE FIRST BOOK OF SAMUEL.

THE Books of Samuel present serious difficulties to the translator, and it is scarcely possible to study them without coming to the conclusion that in a large number of cases these difficulties arise from the corrupt state of the Massoretic text. The examination of the parallel passages in the Books of Chronicles and the Psalter confirm this conclusion; and when we turn to the Septuagint, we find that a multitude of its renderings can hardly be explained except on the hypothesis that the translators had before them a Hebrew text differing very considerably from the Massoretic text. The oldest form of the LXX. is found in the Vatican MS. known as B: the Alexandrine

MS. known as A has been extensively revised to bring it into agreement with the Massoretic text; the Sinaitic MS. unfortunately does not contain the Books of Samuel.

That the LXX. frequently misunderstood the Hebrew, and that numerous glosses, duplicate renderings, and corruptions have made their way into the text, is clear enough; but it is equally clear that this version, and in a less degree the other ancient versions, represent readings which solve difficulties in the Hebrew text, and have every appearance of being the true readings. To decide between the rival readings is often a matter of extreme delicacy and difficulty; in the absence of a variety of ancient evidence the subjective judgment of the critic comes largely into play, and conclusions will necessarily differ.

The Revisers have adopted a cautious course of action. They have placed a considerable number of various readings from the LXX. and other ancient versions in the margin, and they have occasionally, though rarely, introduced them into the text. They have recognised an important principle by so doing; but it is questionable whether they have been quite so bold as could be wished. Some of the readings given in the margin are very distinctly superior to those of the text; and there are not a few other readings which appear to have at least an equal claim to be admitted to the margin with those which are to be found there. Still, the Revisers have recognised the imperfection of the Massoretic text, and warned the reader that in cases where there is a doubt as to the true reading, the passage must not be used in argument without further investigation, such as is required where there is a doubt as to the true rendering; and moreover, that some of the apparent difficulties and discrepancies in the Received Text are not due to the sacred writers themselves, but to the accidental blunders or mistaken zeal of copyists.

The First Book of Samuel. It will be noted that the alternative title *The First Book of the Kings,* derived from the Vulgate (*Liber primus Regum*), has been dropped. It was at one time the more familiar name, and in Coverdale's version the title runs : " *The first boke of the kynges, otherwyse called the first boke of Samuel.*"

1. *Ephraimite* for *Ephrathite.* The same Hebrew word אֶפְרָתִי denotes both *Ephraimite* (Jud. xii. 5 ; 1 Kings xi. 26) and *Ephrathite,* i.e. native of Ephrath or Beth-lehem (Ruth i. 2 ; 1 Sam. xvii. 12) ; but it is convenient to observe the distinction in translation.

5. *A double portion.* This rendering gives an excellent sense. Elkanah marked his love for his childless wife in the same way as Joseph showed his affection for Benjamin (Gen. xliii. 34). It is found in the Syriac version and adopted by Gesenius, Keil, etc. But it is very doubtful whether מָנָה אַחַת אַפָּיִם can be so rendered. The expression *a portion, one of two persons,* for *a double portion,* is very strange ; and the sense of *two persons* for אַפָּיִם is unsupported. Other renderings which have been proposed are still more objectionable. *A worthy portion* of the A.V. comes through the Jewish commentators from the Targum, which renders *one choice portion.* But this explanation rests on no philological basis. The Vulgate has *tristis;* and so Coverdale, *unto Anna he gave one deale hevely ;* but again this sense of אַפָּיִם (lit. *in sorrow*) is unsupported by satisfactory analogy. The Revisers have consequently placed the reading of the LXX. in the margin. The words " because she had no child," may be merely an explanatory gloss ; but *howbeit* (πλήν) points to a reading אֶפֶס for אַפָּיִם, which would get rid of the grammatical and lexical difficulty. The clause " howbeit Elkanah loved Hannah," was intended to make it clear that although he gave her only a single portion, it was not from any want of love.

6. *Rival.* See Prof. Driver's note on Lev. xviii. 18,

where צָרָה is shown to have been a technical term for a *rival* or *fellow-wife*.

9. For, *and after they had drunk*, the Sept. reads, *and presented herself before the Lord.* This reading, which is approved by Thenius, Wellhausen and others, at least deserved a place in the margin, as giving a connexion with the following verses.

15. From the analogy of similar phrases, *e.g.* קְשֵׁה לֵב Ezek. iii. 7, קְשַׁת רוּחַ should mean *obstinate* not *sorrowful*, and the reading attested by the LXX., קְשַׁת יוֹם, *whose lot* (lit. *day*) *is hard* (cf. Job xxx. 25), has strong claims to consideration, and should have been placed in the margin.

16. *Provocation*, for *grief;* assimilation to *v.* 6, where *provoked her sore*, is literally *provoked her with provocation*.

24. The reading of LXX. and Syr., *a bullock of three years old* (cf. Gen. xv. 9), involves a very slight change in the Hebrew text, פר משלש for פרים שלשה ; and appears to be required by the reference to "*the* bullock," in *v.* 25, where the A.V. wrongly gives "*a* bullock." The argument in defence of the Hebrew text, that an ephah of flour implies three animals, as three-tenths of an ephah was the prescribed meal-offering for each bullock (Num. xv. 9), does not go far, as meal-offerings were offered separately (Lev. ii.). Still the def. article may denote "the one which they had brought for the purpose," and the marg. reading cannot be said to be certain.

28. *Granted*, for *lent*. Neither here, nor in Ex. xii. 36, the only other passage in which the Hiphil of שׁאל occurs, does it necessarily mean *lend*. Hannah does not surrender Samuel with any intention of reclaiming him.

ii. 3. *And by him*, Heb. וְלוֹ, is the K'ri, or traditionally authorised reading. It is distinctly preferable to the C'thib וְלֹא, *and not*, which is rendered in the margin, *though actions be not weighed*, i.e. though men do not reflect what they are doing in their arrogance.

14. *Therewith.* So the Heb. text. The margin and A.V. follow the reading of the LXX., Vulg., Syr., and Targ., which seems preferable.

22. *The women that did service at the door of the tent of meeting.* The same expression is found in Ex. xxxviii. 8. The verb צבא, which is used of military service, is also used of the service of the Levites in Num. iv. 23; viii. 24. Here and in Exod., *l. c.*, there appears to be a reference to the regular employment of women in the service of the Tabernacle; probably in washing and needlework, and similar feminine occupations, not, as some have supposed, in spiritual services of fasting and prayer.

25. *God,* for *the judge.* It is a disputed point whether *Elohim* can mean *judges.* It certainly cannot mean *judges* absolutely, but only in respect of their office as the representatives of God, pronouncing the judgment which proceeds from Him. Cf. Ex. xxi. 6; xxii. 8, 9; Deut. i. 17. Whichever rendering be adopted, the sense of the passage, which as Ewald (*Hist.*, ii. 412) suggests, may be an ancient proverb, remains the same. When man offends against man, there is a third superior authority, namely God, who can intervene, either by Himself or by His authorised representatives, to arbitrate between the parties : but when Jehovah is the offended party, there is no one with authority to mediate. The rendering *judge* is however liable to obscure the ancient conception of judicial decisions as proceeding from God.

28. *To go up unto mine altar,* i.e. to officiate thereat; taking לַעֲלוֹת as infin. Kal. So LXX., Vulg., Syr. Cf. Ex. xx. 26. But it may also be taken as a syncopated infin. Hiphil for לְהַעֲלוֹת, and rendered as in the marg. and in A. V. There is a similar ambiguity in 1 Kings xii. 32, 33.

iii. 3. The R. V. follows the order of the Heb. The A. V. transposes *and Samuel was laid down to sleep,* to

the end of the verse, apparently to avoid the possible inference that Samuel was sleeping in the actual sanctuary. But הֵיכָל, *temple*, included the buildings which had been raised round the Tabernacle (i. 9), in one of the chambers of which Samuel was sleeping. The Genevan translators were more faithful to the text. "And yer the light of God went out, Samuel slept in the Temple of the Lord, where the Arke of God was."

11. *I will do.* Lit. *I am doing.* It ·is a pity that the Revisers did not express this idiomatic use of the present participle to denote the certainty of an event, which though still future to the eyes of men, is already begun in the Divine purpose. Cf. Gen. vi. 17; and see Prof. Driver's *Tenses,* § 135, 3.

iv. 1. It is certainly right, with Vulg. and Syr., to treat the clause, *And the word of Samuel came to all Israel,* as the conclusion of the preceding section, and not as the introduction to what follows. The sense of the words is, that Samuel communicated to all the people the revelation which he had himself received; and not, as their position in the Heb. text at the head of chap. iv. implies, that Samuel summoned the people to commence the war which ended so disastrously, and in connexion with which his name is nowhere mentioned.

Now Israel went out. Before these words the LXX. and Vulg. insert a clause which certainly deserved a place in the margin. It not only relieves the abruptness of this beginning, but explains the word *against,* lit. *to meet* (לִקְרַאת), which implies that the Philistines were the aggressors. It runs: "And it came to pass in those days, that the Philistines gathered together to fight against Israel."

8. *Plagues.* The marginal *smiting* should be noticed. It is the same word as that translated *slaughter* in *v.* 10. The reference is not to the plagues, but to the overthrow of Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea, the shores of which

are called *wilderness* in Ex. xiv. 3. The consternation
produced among the *Philistines* by this disaster is referred
to in Ex. xv. 14; and Rahab speaks of it as inspiring the
Canaanites with terror (Josh. ii. 9 ff.).

13. *By the way side watching.* The Massoretic text can
hardly be sound. דרך, *way*, requires the article; and *the
way* would naturally mean the road leading into the city.
But it is evident from what follows that the messenger did
not pass Eli as he entered the city, but came to him after
he had told his tidings there. The reading of the LXX.
given in the margin is certainly more probable. Eli was
sitting on his seat beside the gate of the outer court of
the Tabernacle (i. 9; cf. *v.* 18 of this chapter), with some
attendant beside him, watching the road by which the
messenger would arrive.

v. 6; vi. 1. The additions in the LXX. state what the
Heb. text does not mention until vi. 5, 6. They may be
merely an inference from vi. 5, 6, but there are many other
indications that the translators had a text before them in
these chapters differing very considerably from the Mas-
soretic text.

vi. 6. *When he had wrought wonderfully.* There seems
to be no sufficient ground for departing here and in Ex.
x. 2 from the usual sense of הִתְעַלֵּל, which is that given
in the margin. See Num. xxii. 29; 1 Sam. xxxi. 4; Jer.
xxxviii. 19. So LXX. ἐνέπαιξεν. The expression finds a
parallel in Ps. ii. 4.

vi. 18. *Even unto the great stone.* The Heb. text is cer-
tainly corrupt, and אבן must be read with the LXX. and
Targum for אבל. But this is not the only corruption.
What is the meaning of *even unto the great stone?* and what
construction of the clause is possible? To supply *which
stone remaineth* is at least as violent an expedient as to
emend by reading (1) וְעֵד, or (2) וְעֹד, or (3) omitting עד
altogether; and rendering (1) *and the great stone is a*

witness . . ., or (2) *and still the great stone remaineth,* or (3) *and the great stone remaineth,* etc.

19. Much has been written about this verse; and the structure of it, as well as the curious variation of the LXX., make it all but certain that the text is corrupt. It seems incredible that 50,070 men should have perished in a country village; and the unexampled collocation *seventy men, fifty thousand men*, without any copula, indicates that the larger number is a gloss which has made its way into the text. Possibly the number was originally expressed by a letter used as a numerical sign, and explained once rightly and once wrongly in marginal notes, both of which were eventually incorporated in the text. The Revisers might surely have gone so far as to place the words *fifty thousand men* in brackets. None of the attempts to explain the number are satisfactory.

viii. 3. *Lucre.* Why should not בֶּצַע be rendered *unjust gain*, as in the description of the qualifications of a judge in Ex. xviii. 21?

ix. 5. *Take thought*, i.e. be anxious. This archaism retained here and introduced in x. 2, is not in this case actually misleading, as it was in Matt. vi. 25; but it hardly conveys to the ordinary reader the full sense of דָּאַג.

8, 16. The readings of the LXX. in *v.* 8, "that shalt *thou* give," for "that will *I* give," and in *v.* 16, "I have looked upon *the afflictions of* my people" (cf. Ex. iii. 7), deserved mention in the margin.

x. 27. *But he held his peace.* The objection to this rendering is that it does not explain the כ prefixed to מַחֲרִישׁ. Why should it be said "he was *as* one holding his peace"? The objection to the marginal rendering is that the Hiphil of חרש nowhere means *to be deaf*, though this sense may be supported by the use of the Kal in Micah vii. 16. Thenius' criticism moreover is sound, that in place of וַיְהִי we should expect to find the subject expressed, to mark the contrast

between Saul and his detractors. The reading of the LXX., found also in the ordinary text of the Vulgate in combination with that of the Massoretic text, has strong claims to consideration. It gets rid of the difficulties, and forms a suitable introduction to the next chapter, which otherwise opens very abruptly. The change required in the consonants is extremely slight, וַיְהִי כְמַחֲרִישׁ for וַיְהִי כְּמֶחֱדָשׁ, and for the form of expression Gen. xxxviii. 24 may be compared.

xii. 3. The various reading of the LXX. given in the margin is of remarkable interest on this ground if on no other, that it is at least as old as the Greek translation of Ecclesiasticus, which was made not later than 130 B.C. In ch. xlvi. 19 we read, "And before his long sleep [Samuel] made protestations in the sight of the Lord and His anointed, I have not taken any man's goods, so much as a shoe (χρήματα καὶ ἕως ὑποδημάτων): and no man did accuse him." But the complete incorporation of the sense in the text makes it exceedingly probable that the reading existed in the Hebrew original of Ecclesiasticus, for it is not the kind of quotation which a translator might be tempted to alter to agree with the version with which he was familiar; and if so, the reading existed in the Hebrew text of Samuel which the author of Ecclesiasticus used. It is easy to see how וּנְעָלִים עֲנוּ בִי might be corrupted into וְאֶעְלִים עֵינַי בּוֹ. As regards the intrinsic merits of the reading, though וּנְעָלִים, *even a pair of shoes*, comes in somewhat awkwardly, עֲנוּ בִי, *answer against me*, is a great improvement before וְאָשִׁיב. *A pair of shoes* was a proverbial expression for a mere trifle. Cf. Amos ii. 6; viii. 6.

xiii. 1. This verse is one of the clearest cases of the imperfection of the Massoretic text. The words are the formula commonly used to denote the age of a king at his accession, and the length of his reign.[1] They cannot be

----
[1] Cf. 2 Sam. ii. 10; v. 4, and frequently in the Books of Kings.

rendered as in the A.V. They are entirely omitted by the original LXX. (Cod. B); and the most probable account of them is that they were introduced by a scribe who thought it a convenient point for inserting the usual notice of a king's age and the length of his reign. But he left the numerals blank; *thirty,* which is found in a later recension of the LXX., is not improbable, for Saul was in the prime of life when he was made king; but most likely it rests on conjecture only. *Two,* however, cannot possibly be right. The events of Saul's reign must have occupied more than two years, and the deterioration of his character presumes a much longer period. Nor can *two years* be explained of the time which had now passed since his accession. Apart from the regular meaning of the formula, Jonathan appears as a stalwart warrior, and if Saul was thirty at his accession, much more than two years, at least ten or fifteen years, must have passed before the events recorded in this chapter took place. Though *two* stands in the Hebrew text, the Revisers ought certainly to have placed it in brackets.[1]

xiii. 21. *Yet they had a file for the mattocks,* etc. A most difficult passage. הַפְּצִירָה פִּים is rendered by the Targum, which the Jewish commentators Kimchi and Rashi follow, by שׁוּפִינָא, *a file,* lit. *edge-sharpener;* and Aquila's barbarous rendering, ἡ προσβόλωσις στόματα (προσβολή = *point* or *edge*), represents the same meaning. In this case the meaning will be that while for forge-work (לִלְטֹושׁ, *v.* 20 = *to sharpen by forging*) the Israelites had to go down to the Philistines, they had files for ordinary use. But the root corresponding to פצר appears in Arabic to bear the mean-

It is generally supposed that the numerals have fallen out, and that וּשְׁתֵּי is the remains of the second, so that the original reading was perhaps " twenty *and two* " or " thirty *and two* "; but Wellhausen conjectures with much probability that both numerals were originally left blank, and that שְׁתֵּי is only a corruption of the initial letters of שָׁנִים, first accidentally repeated as שְׁנֵי and then changed for the sake of grammar to שְׁתֵּי.

ing *to notch* or *blunt an edge;* and the rendering of the margin is very probably right. This sense was adopted by Jerome, though he construed the sentence differently: *retusæ itaque erant acies vomerum.* *And to set the goads* depends on *went down.*

xiv. 18, 19. The Ark was sometimes carried out to the field of battle; and it is hardly fair to say that the historian must have mentioned its transportation from Kiriath Jearim to Saul's camp, if it was really there. But it is clear from the context that Saul wished to consult the oracle whether he should order an attack or not. And the Ephod which contained the Urim and Thummim, not the Ark, was the proper instrument for ascertaining the Divine will: and *bring hither* is a term used of the Ephod, but not of the Ark. See chaps. xxiii. 9; xxx. 7. Moreover, *withdraw thine hand,* i.e. desist, would be quite inappropriate if he was ordering Ahijah to get ready the Ark to be carried out to battle. It seems certain that we should follow the LXX., and read, as in the margin, *ephod* for *ark of God:* and *he wore the ephod at that time before Israel,* for *the ark of God was there at that time with the children of Israel.* In any case וּבְנֵי must be corrupt, for it means *and,* not *with the children,* and cannot be translated. A reminiscence of the true reading is perhaps preserved in the Targum of v. 19, which substitutes קְרִיב אֵפוֹדָא, *bring near the ephod,* for *withdraw thine hand.*

51. The true reading of this verse is important, as determining the relationship of Saul to Abner. *Saul's uncle* in v. 50 may refer either to Abner or to Ner, but more probably to the latter. Josephus expressly states that Kish and Ner were brothers, and sons of Abiel, and so attests the reading בְּנֵי אֲבִיאֵל for בֶּן א'. Saul accordingly was Abner's first cousin, which agrees with the general impression produced by the history, that they were about of the same age. It is true that the genealogies

in 1 Chron. viii. 33; ix. 39, make Ner the father of Kish, and consequently Abner Saul's uncle; but Ner is not mentioned among Saul's ancestors in 1 Sam. ix. 1; and as in 1 Chron. ix. 36, Kish and Ner appear as brothers, Bertheau proposes to read in the other passages *Ner begat Abner*, instead of *Ner begat Kish*.

xv. 12. *Monument* for *place*. The Hebrew word יָד, lit. *hand*, is applied in 2 Sam. xviii. 18 to Absalom's pillar, and similarly used in Isa. lvi. 5 for *a memorial;* as it were an outstretched hand to arrest attention. Here some kind of a trophy or memorial of the victory is meant. Vulg. *fornicem triumphalem;* and according to Jerome it was an arch of myrtle palms and olives. Coverdale rightly: *had set him up a pillar;* the A. V. *place* is the rendering of Münster and Pagninus, and comes originally from the Targum, which has *a place to divide the spoil*.

xvii. 2. The slight change of *vale* for *valley* should be noticed. עֵמֶק denotes the broad open vale;[1] גַּיְא, *valley*, denotes the depressed bed of the stream in the middle of the vale. The opposing armies were encamped on *the mountain*, i.e. the slopes on either side of the vale.

6. *Javelin*. The A. V. *target* follows the LXX. and Vulg., and A. V. marg. *gorget* is derived from Kimchi; but it is clear from Josh. viii. 18, 26 that some kind of a spear is meant by כִּידוֹן.

12. The Revisers have justly noted in the margin that *vv.* 12–31 and 55—chap. xviii. 5 are omitted in the LXX. They are absent from B and some other MSS.;[2] though they are contained in A it is clear that at least *vv.* 12–31 were absent from some ancestor of the MS., for *v.* 12 begins with καὶ εἶπεν, the opening words of *v.* 32, which the scribe was actually beginning to copy, when he stopped to incorporate the missing section. The Greek version moreover differs in character from the LXX., and

---

[1] Compare our *Vale of White Horse* and the like.   [2] See Field's *Hexapla*.

is assigned by Dr. Field to Theodotion.[1] The result of these omissions is a straightforward and consistent narrative. David, who had become Saul's armour-bearer (xvi. 21), accompanied him to battle; and when Goliath defied Israel, David resolved to encounter him. Observe how naturally *v.* 32 follows upon *v.* 11, and xviii. 6 upon xvii. 54.

The Hebrew text, on the other hand, presents, as is well known, the most serious difficulties. How came David, if he was Saul's armour-bearer, to be absent from his side in the campaign? how was it that he was wholly unaccustomed to the use of weapons? how could he be unknown to the king and to Abner? Various explanations of these and other difficulties have been proposed by the defenders of the integrity of the Massoretic text; but they cannot be regarded as really satisfactory. Apart from the evidence of the LXX. the Hebrew text shows evident signs of having been pieced together at *v.* 12 ff.; and the most natural conclusion and the most reasonable solution of the difficulties is to suppose that the original form of the narrative has been preserved in the LXX., while the Hebrew text has been interpolated from some other source either documentary or oral. These additions, taken perhaps from some popular story of David's life, certainly do not harmonise with the rest of the narrative in their present position. Possibly if we had the whole story before us, we might see that the difficulties only arise from the displacement of the different events from their proper order; as it is, the difficulties must be candidly acknowledged.

52. *Gai,* for *the valley.* Heb. גַּיְא as in *v.* 3, but without the definite article. It seems most probable that *Gai* is a copyist's error for *Gath.*

---

[1] Note for example ἀνὴρ ὁ μεσσαῖος, *v.* 23, for δυνατὸς, *v.* 4; φυλιστιαῖος for ἀλλόφυλος, *ib.*; ἐστηλώθη, *v.* 16.

xviii. 8. It is not easy to see why the Revisers did not notice the further omissions of the LXX. in this chapter. They are as follows. From, *and what can he have more,* *v.* 8, to the end of *v.* 11, *vv.* 17–19, 21 *b,* 29 *b,* 30. The narrative gains very distinctly by these omissions. Saul was wroth at David's popularity, *v.* 8 ; and was afraid of him, *v.* 12, and removed him from his presence. When he saw his power increasing he stood in awe of him, and schemed how he might get rid of him indirectly. Failing in this, he was yet more afraid of David, *v.* 29, and at last, throwing off all disguise, openly expressed his wish for David's death, xix. 1. Three stages in the development of Saul's enmity are clearly marked ; and while it cannot be pronounced impossible that Saul should have threatened David's life in a fit of madness the very day after their triumphal return, the narrative as given by the LXX. has the advantage of naturalness.

28. For, *Michal Saul's daughter,* the LXX., has *that all Israel,* a reading which certainly deserved a place in the margin, for it supplies the motive of Saul's increasing fear of David mentioned in *v.* 29.

xix. 22. The absence of the article with בּוֹר is suspicious, and points towards the reading בּוֹר הַגֹּרֶן preserved by the LXX. *Secu* is unknown, and the reading of the LXX. is ἐν τῷ Σεφί, i.e. בַּשְׁפִי, *in Shephi,* or *on the hill.*

xx. 19, 41. For אֵצֶל הָאֶבֶן הָאָזֶל, by *the stone Ezel,* the Sept. reads παρὰ τὸ Ἐργὰβ ἐκεῖνο ; and for מֵאֵצֶל הַנֶּגֶב, *out of a place toward the south,* ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀργάβ. In both cases the reading of the LXX. preserves the original word אַרְגֹּב, which the translators failed to understand. It survives only in the name *Argob,* but means *a mound* or *cairn of stones.* The mention of the place previously agreed upon is required in *v.* 41, and מֵאֵצֶל, *from beside,* could hardly be joined with הַנֶּגֶב which denotes a quarter of the compass, or a district.

xxii. 6. *Saul was sitting*, etc. A vivid picture of the king sitting in state under the well-known ancient tree, with his spear, the emblem of royalty, in his hand, and his retainers standing round him.

9. *Stood by*, for *was set over*. This rendering seems to be required by the use of the phrase in *vv*. 6, 7, and elsewhere in Samuel. The rendering in the margin and A.V. is that of Vulg., Targ., Syr. The Sept. has, "who was set over Saul's mules." Cf. xxi. 7.

xxv. 6. *To him that liveth in prosperity*. In default of any certain explanation of the obscure לֶחָי the A.V. has been retained in the text. It seems, however, hardly justifiable to read *in prosperity* into the simple word *to the living one;* and the marginal explanation, which regards לחי as a form of greeting, *All hail!* lit. *for life!* is preferable to this. But it is very questionable whether חי can be thus used in the singular. The rendering of the LXX. is εἰς ὥρας, i.e. *for the coming season!* a new year's greeting, apparently interpreting the word by כָּעֵת חַיָּה which is rendered εἰς ὥρας in Gen. xviii. 14; but this cannot stand as an explanation of the word. The Vulg. has *fratribus meis*, regarding the word as a contraction for לְאֶחָי. This can hardly be right, but it points to Wellhausen's conjecture that we should read לְחָי as a contraction for לְאָחִי, *to my brother*. This is perhaps the best solution. David's brotherly greeting is intentionally contrasted with Nabal's surly rejoinder.

22. *The enemies of David*. We should expect *David*, and this, as is noted in the margin, is the reading of the LXX. Kimchi says that *the enemies of David* is a euphemism (כנוי) for *David*, and it is possible that the scribes substituted it in the text in view of the non-fulfilment of the oath. Cf. xx. 16.

xxvii. 8. *Girzites*. So the C'thib. It has been conjectured that the tribe here mentioned at one time wandered

northwards, and gave its name to Mount Gerizim, as their neighbours the Amalekites left traces of their migration in the name "hill country of the Amalekites" in the territory of Ephraim (Jud. xii. 15). The A.V. *Gezrites* follows the K'ri, but Gezer was far distant from the locality of David's operations.

The Revisers have placed in the margin the reading of some MSS. of the LXX., *from Telam,* because (1) it is not easy to see why *of old* should be inserted, unless the words are an addition made long after the time of David; and (2) *even unto the land of Egypt* implies that some terminus *ex quo* has preceded. Telem, perhaps the same as Telaim (xv. 4), was on the southern border of Judah (Josh. xv. 24).

xxviii. 13. *A god* for *gods*. A.V. follows LXX., Vulg., Syr., in rendering *gods;* but Targ. has *the angel of the Lord,* and it is clear from *v.* 14 that only a single figure appeared. *Elohim* here signifies *a supernatural, non-earthly, being.*

16. *And is become thine adversary.* The true reading of this passage is a matter of importance from a theological point of view. If the Massoretic text is sound, it must apparently be translated thus. But the word rendered *thine adversary* is עָרֶךָ, and עָר = צָר is not a pure Hebrew but an Aramaic word, occurring in the O. T. only in Ps. cxxxix. 20,[1] a psalm full of Aramaisms, and Dan. iv. 16 (Aram. E.V. 19). And when we turn to the ancient versions, still more suspicion is cast on the reading. The LXX. and Syr. read "is on the side of thy neighbour," *i.e.* לְרֵעֶךָ or עִם רֵעֶךָ; the Targum paraphrases, *and has become the help of a man who is thine enemy;* similarly the Vulg. : transierit ad æmulum tuum, *has passed over to thy rival.* Aquila and Theodotion have κατά σου = עָלֶיךָ, *against thee;* Symmachus alone renders ἀντίζηλός σου (the word which he uses in Ps. cxxxix.), *thine adversary.* It seems on the whole best

---

[1] Even there Hupfeld and others question the correctness of the reading.

to follow the reading of the LXX.; and this accords ex-
cellently with the natural rendering of the first clause of
v. 17, *and the Lord hath done unto him.*

xxx. 2. *And all,* supplied from the LXX., is clearly
necessary.

20. It is hard to see what sense this verse makes as it
stands, and the reading of the Vulg., with which that of
the LXX. in the main agrees, might have been given in the
margin: "And he took all the flocks and the herds, and
drove them before him; and they said, This is David's
spoil." David not only recovered his own property, but
took a rich booty besides.

xxxi. 9. *The house of their idols* should surely be *the
houses of their idols.* See Ewald's *Gr.,* § 270. But LXX.
and 1 Chron. omit בית, *the house of.*

<div align="right">A. F. KIRKPATRICK.</div>

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

XIV.

THE CROSS THE DEATH OF LAW AND THE TRIUMPH OVER EVIL POWERS.

" Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was
contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross; and having
spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing
over them in it."—COL. ii. 14, 15.

THE same double reference to the two characteristic errors
of the Colossians which we have already met so frequently,
presents itself here. This whole section vibrates con-
tinually between warnings against the Judaising enforce-
ment of the Mosaic law on Gentile Christians, and against
the Oriental figments about a crowd of angelic beings
filling the space betwixt man and God, betwixt pure spirit