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.¹

i. 2. For "without form, and void" (cf. Seb. Münster² [1534]: informis et inanis) has been substituted the less special "waste and void"; the same word רָעָה 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,

¹ 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.

² 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.


30. Margin: living soul. The Hebrew nephesh 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. ἡσύχασθαι does not occur elsewhere in the sense of the Greek ἔσυχα (in ἔσυχα ὅμως); but the similar preposition ἔσεσθαι 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 dost 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
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; יָנִּים cannot be derived from נָלַג to get, and נָלַג 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, Dammések is the Hebrew name of the city which we call Damascus; but 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. If the text be sound, either Dammesek 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. merely resumes the subject before the predicate, as ii. 14, 19; ix. 18, and often. This would be מ, 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 מ is a marginal gloss upon the obscure מ, 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 seest, 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 מ not מ. 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; מ, for instance, means hither elsewhere, not here. Wellhausen’s suggestion is worth mentioning מ. 1 Geschichte Israels (1878), p. 329 (Eng. Tr. p. 336).
‘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 ὁ υπερήφανος [rather ὁφθαλμός; 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 (במיהא could not give rise to מיהא).

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 מ 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 מ with מ. But the sense roam 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 τῷ Χῖ, Vulg. Feliciter), and most of the other ancient versions.1 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

1 The Syriac, My fortune cometh; Onkelos, Fortune cometh; Pseudo-Jonathan, אנתה מחלא חרב, the good star cometh—following the reading given on the margin, וּלְךָ (לך)
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.),¹ 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' ἔξοχην (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. ἱγγεμόν, has been retained, with explanatory margin, *chief.* The word (ἡγέω) 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 φυλαι 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.

xl ix. 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'khera* fancifully with μάχαιρα, and said absurdly that

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 שָׁנֵב, either from כֹּר, to dig, or pierce (Gesenius, Delitzsch), or possibly from כֶּרֶן, to be round (Dillmann), as though the word denoted properly some curved weapon.

The margin, compacts, implies a different vocalization (ךָּרֶן), and a derivation from כֶּרֶן, 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. (ἐνευροκόπτησαν 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 מַשָּׁר (Zeph. ii. 4) for מַשָּׁר, 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 של, to be at ease, would have; and של itself is not a pregnant word, like לְבָנָה (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,¹ 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 רַחָם נַבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל being a poetical equivalent of רַחָם יִשְׂרָאֵל (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 נַבְנֵי or נַבְנֵי, referring to נַבְנֵי, 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 τὸ 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-

¹ 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. 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 (presumptable) Hebrew נֵּאָבָן שָל שֶׁלָּם.

It has been stated that the vocalization נֵּאָבָן 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,” נֵּאָבָן being connected fancifully with נֵּאָבָן 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.), 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, and Ewald, and has been advocated by two of the most recent commentators upon

1 A trace of this (in the feminine נֵּאָבָן) perhaps appears in the Peshitto.
2 Both these writing in Arabic, and perhaps influenced by the Arabic סֶלֶל (which they use in explaining it).
3 Vom Geist der Hebr. Poesie, ii. 6.
4 Jahrbücher der Bibl. Wissenschaft, ii. 51; History, ii. 283 f.
Genesis, Delitzsch (1872)\(^1\) 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\(^2\) is unable to accept it, he has stated elsewhere. נטוש, 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.

\(^1\) Not translated. See also his Messianic Prophecies (T. & T. Clark), p. 33 f.
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 text¹ 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.²

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 (בֵּן) denotes regularly not the mere payment of tribute, but

¹ The plena scriptio is of late introduction; many MSS. as well as all versions have רֶשֶׁף (not רֶשֶׁף).

² 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 (אֱלֹהִים בָּדַדְתָּם, for מְאַלְּחָה בָּדַד, the מְאַלְּחָה is superfluous in v. 20—רְשָׁע being naturally the *nom. pendens*, as יְרוּם, v. 19; Deut. xxxii. 4; Ps. xi. 4; xlvi. 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.¹ 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 (אָשֶׁר לְפֶדֶת for לְפֶדֶת), cf. Ps. xx. 2. This has the advantage of relieving the verse of the awkward *from thence*, though *name* is not very appropriate

¹ 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: יְהוּדָה, ancient mountains (see Deut. xxxiii. 15; Hab. iii. 6), for יְשֵׁר, my progenitors (lit. my conceivers), unto, the next word יָעָשׂ being derived from יָשֵׂה, and taken in its usual sense of desire, instead of being derived from יָשֵׂה to mark out, circumscribe, Num. xxxiv. 7 f. (cf. for the form יָעָשׂ from יָשֵׂה), and explained as limit, utmost bound. This reading is represented in LXX. ὑπερίσχυσεν ὑπὲρ ἑβολύγιας ἑφόν 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.

1. 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