

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

We may permit ourselves to believe that he did receive Christ as One who died for him, who lived and exercised Divine powers. And though at that early stage he could not have said of Christ that "He was begotten before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made," yet he could have said—not going one inch beyond the teaching of this primitive Epistle—what implies and involves all these things, namely, that he had turned from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for His Son from heaven, even Jesus, which delivereth us from the wrath to come, and that Christ died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with Him.

Nay, perhaps he could have gone further, and said, "The life that I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me."

E. MEDLEY.

"DOUBLE FOR ALL HER SINS."

A CRITICAL EXPOSITION.

"She hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins."—ISAIAH xl. 1.

"And that He would show thee the secrets of wisdom, that they are double to that which is."—JOB xi. 6.

THESE two passages invite attention for two or three special reasons. They are the only passages in the sacred Scriptures in which the Hebrew word occurs which is here translated "double." The word referred to is, however, dual in form, and, in order to be perfectly exact, it is necessary to state that it occurs elsewhere in the singular, though in one passage only, namely, in Job the 41st chapter, 13th verse. The two passages, moreover, present special difficulties, the one a difficulty of reconciliation with the religious instinct of mankind; the other a diffi-

culty in deducing out of it any tolerable meaning, or, indeed, any meaning at all. It is noteworthy and suggestive that the difficulty in each case, though so diverse in character, gathers around the word "double." It is therefore not unnatural to hope that the key that will solve either of these difficulties will also solve the other, or to expect to find the desired key in a truer understanding of the word that is in these cases translated by the English word "double." If we can find a meaning for this word that is etymologically natural, if in the light of this meaning the difficulty vanishes from both passages alike, and if the illumination passes beyond these portions to other important portions of Scripture, we shall need no further evidence of the validity of our conclusions. To this end we have directed our thought, the results of which we now lay before our readers.

Let us first take under consideration the passage which we have cited from the commencement of the 40th chapter in the prophecies of Isaiah. Jerusalem is told that her warfare is accomplished and her iniquity is pardoned, because she hath received of the Lord's hand *double for all her sins*. Let us take one of the most recent as well as one of the strongest expositions of this verse. Professor George Adam Smith writes as follows: "The third clause is especially gracious. It declares that Israel has suffered of punishment more than double enough to atone for her sins. This is not a way of regarding either sin or atonement which, theologically speaking, is accurate. What of its relation to our Articles, that man cannot give satisfaction for his sins by the work of his hands or the pains of his flesh? No, it would scarcely pass some of our creeds to-day. But all the more, that it thus bursts forth from strict terms of dealing, does it reveal the generosity of Him who utters it. How full of pity God is, to take so much account of the sufferings sinners have brought upon themselves! How

full of grace to reckon those sufferings double the sins that had earned them! It is, as when we have seen gracious men make us a free gift, and in their courtesy insist that we have worked for it. It is grace masked by grace. As the height of art is to conceal art, so the height of grace is to conceal grace, which it does in this verse."

These words give us an excellent indication of the point which exposition has reached in dealing with this passage. If we start with the ordinary assumption that the words really mean that Israel had suffered of punishment *more than double enough to atone for her sins*, then the words quoted from Professor G. A. Smith are probably as good as anything that can be said upon the matter. We must take refuge in poetry, and in an all-four analogy between grace and art. But I confess that to me this best of explanations is far from being satisfactory. It neither successfully explains the passage, nor explains it away. I am not concerned about Professor Smith's difficulties respecting Articles and Creeds. All I desire is, that the Bible shall be consistent with itself. The teaching that men are made to work out a kind of atonement on the earth, to bear a punishment which is in some sense a recompense and equivalent for their sin, is not peculiar to this verse, and therefore need cause us no special difficulty here. The reconciliation of this conception with that of the overarching atonement of the Christ and the glad doctrine of the forgiveness of sins is obviously far beyond the range of the present paper. The difficulty we have to face in this particular verse is, not that sin is recompensed, but that it is recompensed *double*. Is this specific difficulty satisfactorily met in the words I have quoted? I do not think so.

The solution given is, that it is the height of grace to conceal grace. The response rises irresistibly to our lips: If that be so, in the case of God at least, then the Divine method of dealing with men is inexplicable, and not at all

calculated to reach the height of grace. For, with the supposed exception of this obscure passage, God, as revealed in the sacred Scriptures, is for ever striving to make the world see how gracious He is. There is clearly some point where the analogy breaks down. Here again, however, we are on the verge of a vast subject upon which we cannot now enter, namely, the relation of the perfection of God's grace to the full proclamation of it. However it may be in the case of a man, it is certain that God's grace is not lessened by His desire to make us know that He is gracious. Therefore the explanation that God is *concealing* His grace is scarcely satisfactory in the light of the fact that the one aim of the historical revelation was to *reveal* His grace. Besides, the minimizing of the evil desert of sin in any way is contrary to the whole tendency of the sacred Scriptures. Grace can be magnified only while the full awfulness of sin is steadily kept in view; so that the remission of sin is always made to magnify Divine grace through the sense of the exceeding sinfulness of sin. On the other hand, wherever the recompense of sin, and not its remission, is dealt with, solemn care is taken to represent the recompense as not exceeding the desert of the sin; for the slightest suspicion of punishment beyond desert would throw human life straightway into moral confusion. The meaning, then, which is usually given to Isaiah's words, even if it is poetry, is very dangerous poetry, and not the sort of thing we should expect a prophet to play with. It was the prophet's usual vocation, not to hide the grace of God, but to reveal it; not to magnify punishment and minimize sin, but the reverse; not to represent God as punishing sin excessively, but to extol His perfect justice. The difficulty is, in our judgment, one of very great magnitude, and no number of ingenious explanations can remove the discordant voice which it raises when we seek to relate it to the spirit and teaching of the sacred Scriptures as a whole, and particu-

larly to the vocation of the prophet as the proclaimer of the grace of God. We propose, therefore, to raise the question: Is the meaning which has been assigned to the Hebrew word כפלים the correct one, or is the difficulty one caused by mistranslation and misinterpretation? The expectation of discovering that the word has been wrongly interpreted is strengthened by the fact that, in the book of Job, where the same word also occurs, it has been found impossible to make any good sense by giving it the meaning which is given to it in Isaiah.

Let us begin with the simple form כפל as found in the 41st chapter of the book of Job, 13th verse. The arrangement of the Hebrew Bible makes it the 5th verse. Amid slight variations of translation, the meaning of the word is not at all in doubt. כפל רסנו means; "The doubling of his bridle." The word does not mean the doubling of a thing by adding an equal quantity to it, but by folding one part over the other, like the complementary parts of a bridle. The corresponding verb כפל often occurs in the Old Testament, and always in the sense of doubling one part over another. The primary idea of the word is, therefore, that of two corresponding parts, which together make up a complete whole, each part being the complementary equivalent of the other.

From this elementary form, which simply expresses the act or the condition of doubling, we pass to the dual form, כפלים, in which the one side of the doubled thing stands out against the other as its correspondent or equivalent. This natural, and one is almost tempted to say obvious, meaning of the word at once removes the great difficulty that has encumbered the passage in Isaiah, and brings the utterance into line with the whole spirit and trend of the Scriptures. The poetry of Scripture, here as elsewhere, no longer seems to forget the demands of spiritual truth, and God's justice and mercy are alike sacredly guarded even in

word. Sin has received such recompense as, and no more than, is still due to it even under a covenant of grace; and mercy, never forgetful, leads Israel even through that recompense into a large and wealthy place. Thus righteousness and mercy are vindicated together. It seems perfectly clear to me that the natural interpretation and translation of the words is: “Her warfare is accomplished, her punishment is accepted, for she hath received of the Lord’s hand *the double* (or *a double*) for all her sins. The natural meaning of the word “double” as so used is, as I have pointed out, not punishment *more than double enough to atone for her sins*, but such punishment as is a *sufficient recompense* for those sins, completely satisfying the demands of Divine righteousness. It is an assertion, not of injustice, but of superb justice in the midst of mercy.

The results we have attained not only show the naturalness of our interpretation, but also, I think, exhibit the unwarrantableness of the ordinary one. As the word is so rare, we cannot take a very wide survey, but all the cases we can examine lead us to the same result. To make a word which means “doubling up a thing into two correspondent parts” mean, in this passage, the suffering of twice as much punishment as was merited by the sin, is, to say the least, to read into a primitive word an expansion of meaning which it could only receive by frequent use and a very long period of development, even if the dual form could ever have sufficient elasticity to undergo the change. Objections to the old interpretation, therefore, confront us at every point.

This utterance of Isaiah must be distinguished from that in the 16th chapter of Jeremiah, 18th verse: “And first I will recompense their iniquity and their sin double.” The word “double” here is a translation of כִּשְׁנֵיהָ, which means a “repetition,” and the intention of the utterance is somewhat different from that of the other. Jeremiah

desires to intimate that the recompense for sin will be ample and long and severe, so as to prove a thoroughly effective course of discipline. Isaiah desires to tell the people that God has accepted their punishment as a sufficient counterpart to their sin. The force of the words in Jeremiah might be brought out by translating them thus: "And first I will recompense their iniquity and their sin once and again," that is, repeatedly and abundantly. The same words, with a similar idea, occurs in the 17th chapter of Jeremiah, 18th verse: "Break them with a double breaking," *i.e.*, "Destroy them with double destruction." Here we have כִּשְׁנָה again denoting repetition; so that the idea is, that the blow shall be repeated, in order that a complete result shall be attained. Double destruction is equivalent to complete destruction. A precisely similar idea, expressed in a similar way, is found in the phrase, "The second death," in the book of Revelation.

In the 61st chapter of Isaiah, 7th verse, we meet with כִּשְׁנָה again, this time on the side of happiness and prosperity, denoting as before completeness, amplitude, abundance. "For your shame ye shall have double, and for confusion they shall rejoice in their portion; therefore in their land they shall possess double; everlasting joy shall be unto them." It has been necessary to go through these cases of כִּשְׁנָה, lest any should imagine that the serious religious difficulty we found and sought to remove in the beginning of the 40th chapter of Isaiah confronts us also elsewhere. We have now sufficiently examined the relevant passages to show that this is not the case.

The natural Greek equivalent of כִּפְלַיִם is διπλοῦς. Their original meaning is precisely the same. The difference between them arises from the fact that διπλοῦς acquired variant meanings through frequent use and long development. This causes the difficulty that its meaning in any given case may at times be somewhat uncertain. We will

first however turn to a case where the meaning is sufficiently defined by the context, namely, the 18th chapter in Revelation, the 6th verse: "Render unto her even as she rendered, and double unto her the double according to her works. In the cup which she mingled, mingle unto her double. How much soever she glorified herself, and waxed wanton, so much give her of torment and mourning." Now, John's "διπλώσατε αὐτῇ διπλᾶ and κέρασατε αὐτῇ διπλοῦν" have caused as much perplexity to expositors as Isaiah's כְּפָלָיִם. Dr. Milligan writes thus concerning it: "The voice from heaven proclaims in a *double* form, as *sins* and as *iniquities*, the guilt of the doomed city, and invites the ministers of judgment, according to the *lex talionis*, to render unto her *double*. The command may also be founded upon the law of the theocracy, by which thieves and violent aggressors of the poor were required to make a double repayment to those whom they had injured, or it may rest upon the remembrance of such threatenings as those by the prophet Jeremiah: 'I will recompense their iniquity and their sin double.'"

The important thing missing in such suggestions as the foregoing is the necessary critical distinction between the words of different meanings that are all alike translated "double" in our English Bible. The thief under the law of the theocracy was required to pay כְּפָלָיִם, which simply and primarily means "twice as much or as many." Jeremiah speaks of recompensing iniquity and sin כְּפָלָיִם, which means "once and again." But John's διπλᾶ is at least *primarily* equivalent to כְּפָלָיִם, which means "either side of a whole that is doubled." That this is the meaning of διπλᾶ in this passage is placed beyond all dispute both by the phraseology and the context. As to the context, it plainly states that the intention is to give Babylon a just equivalent of punishment for her sins. "Render unto her even as she rendered. . . . How much soever she

glorified herself, and waxed wanton, so much give her of torment and mourning." These words are perfectly clear, and the remainder of the passage must be interpreted in harmony with them. The phrase, "Double unto her the double," leads to the same result. For, by the usual interpretation, it should mean four times as much punishment as the sin deserved. If $\delta\iota\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ means twice as much, then to double the double must be four times as much. This could scarcely be defended, even as an ebullition of poetry. But let $\delta\iota\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ have its primary meaning of a whole folded up into two correspondent sides, and the whole passage becomes harmonious and clear. To "double the double" is to set over against sin an equivalence of punishment, as one side of a sheet of paper is doubled over against the other. Sin is only one-half of a whole, the other half being recompense. When recompense overtakes sin, then the "double is doubled," that is, the two sides meet in exact correspondence. This is brought out with equal clearness in the words:—"In the cup which she mingled, mingle unto her double." Babylon has mingled the cup of sin. Into this Heaven pours just recompense, and so mingles the completed "double." So the whole passage is only an expansion of the opening words, "Render unto her even as she rendered."

The words, "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour" (1 Tim. v. 17) have also caused no little difficulty to commentators, for they will persist in interpreting $\delta\iota\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\varsigma \tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ as meaning twice as much honour as somebody else receives. It is difficult to see how "twice as much honour" could so specifically imply money payment. Honour may increase indefinitely without any question of money payment at all. It appears to me that here again the difficulty is solved by returning to the primary meaning of $\delta\iota\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}$, and particularly to that use which we have seen of it in which payment stands over against, and

appropriately completes, desert. Those accustomed to this use of *διπλοῦς* would immediately understand that the apostle was enjoining the giving of material recompense to the elders that were worthy. The "double honour" was an honour that lacked not the side of recompense.

The peculiar word *διπλότερον* in Matthew xxiii. 15th verse is probably to be interpreted by the same key. Its comparative form is an awkward one in any case, and one does not wonder at its extreme rarity. But if it is formed from *διπλοῦς* in the sense of *twice as much*, then the reason for this comparative form becomes quite a blank. For thus it could only mean, "More twice as much," which is unintelligible. The translation "Twofold more" simply ignores the comparative form, and treats the word as if it were the simple form *διπλοῦν*. It is not surprising that some expositors have fallen back on the meaning "dolosum." Yet the last meaning does not fit well into the context. If we take the word *διπλοῦς* in the meaning we have already found for it in other passages of the New Testament, the coining of the comparative, though still clumsy, becomes more natural, and the sense it gives falls also naturally into the context. Taking *διπλοῦς* to mean a correspondent or equivalent folding over of two sides of a whole, one against the other, one can understand the rough coining of a comparative form to denote the inequality, when one of the sides that were expected to correspond proved greater than the other. Thus, a thing is *διπλότερον* when it is a second half which, to use an Irishism which is really involved in the word, is greater than the first half to which it should correspond. The proselyte is to stand over against the Jew, so forming his *διπλοῦν*, but he proves *διπλότερον*. The words therefore probably mean, "More than an equivalent to yourselves." The proselyte improved upon his original.

The translators who gave the world the Septuagint

Version have rightly rendered כְּפָלִים in Isaiah by διπλά, but I cannot be dogmatic as to what they meant by it. Yet, on returning to this fact from our examination of the use of the word in the New Testament, I think we can infer with probability that they had caught the right meaning of the word כְּפָלִים and expressed it in Greek by the appropriate word διπλά. But they seem, like King James's translators, to have been over fond of variety of expression. Διπλά sometimes means, like כְּשֵׁנָה, the doubling of a thing or process, and is used to represent this meaning in the Septuagint on more than one occasion. But in such cases it means, not a double equivalence of recompense, but, like כְּשֵׁנָה, a repetition of the same thing; as when, for example, Joseph's brethren take double money in their sacks. In this proclamation in the 40th chapter of Isaiah, therefore, the natural and unstrained meaning of διπλά is the same as that of כְּפָלִים, and may well have been intended by the translators to denote simple adequacy of punishment for the sin.

The use of this key in the passage we have marked out in the book of Job leads to some interesting results, but these must be reserved for another paper.

JOHN THOMAS.

ASIDE FROM THE MULTITUDE.

A STUDY IN ST. MARK VII. 33.

IF the parables of Christ are miracles for the wisdom with which they were spoken, His miracles are no less parables for the directness, the force, and the variety of the lessons conveyed in and through them. Looked at from this point of view, the miracles of our Lord appear separated by a quite immeasurable distance from any wonders wrought by human skill or genius. He taught by His actions. Hence it is the part of the devout student to watch Him at work