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 לֶלָמֵי בֵּן יְהוֹדֶה יִשָּׂה, 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 ῥόξον is however
absent from the Vatican MS. of the LXX., and it is possible that the word תִּפְלָה 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 פרשם был פרשם was בּוּל פּרֵשַם, that בּוּל was written in the margin as an emendation, to accord with 1 Sam. xxxi. 3, and the text standing in parallel columns, בּוּל was inserted in v. 6, and קַשָּׁת in v. 18. Ewald’s explanation that קַשָּׁת was מְגַזֶּה, accurately, and Thenius’ emendation, מְגַזֶּה, heedfully, have little to be said in their favour.

14. יְבוֹנֶה 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 בְּלָל כָּפֵה בֶּשָּׂם 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 כָּפֵה 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 רַעֵשׁ כְּלֵב are omitted by the LXX., but if genuine, they must be taken as a definition of לֹויִוֹרֵדָם. Can not 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 יָהָ which expresses *had* (lit. "there were to Ishbosheth... שָׁלָطيع לָאֲנָשִׁים... רָתָי לָאֲנָשׁ בָּשָׁרוֹ), 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. נִסֵיָּה must be taken as infin. though it is pointed as perfect, and כיָּנָּא 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 נִסֵיָּה 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'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, שְׁלֵאָם: that hate is the C'thib שְׁלֵאָם, which must be taken as a relative clause.

They say for they said. The imperfect tense וַיָּרָה shows that the words which follow are a proverb in current use.
Cf. 1 Sam. xix. 24. So Coverdale: "Hereof cometh the proverbe." 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 the awaye. The A.V. follows the Targum in rendering burned them, in accordance with the different reading of 1 Chron. xiv. 12; but 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 מְנִיָשְׁנָי shows that it must denote some instrument which was played by being shaken. Sistra (marg.), i.e. στῆτρα, 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 לָאִוני in the parallel passage 1 Chron. xv. 1.

19. A portion of flesh, marg. of wine. The precise meaning of סָלָף, 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 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 מָשָׁאֵל may be quoted, וַיָּתֹר 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. וַיִּחְדֹּשׁ 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 הנה, 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 הנה for them, with the Vulgate. Further, לָאָבָנָךְ, for thy land, comes in awkwardly, and the government of גוּם אֲנָהֶלִיוֹ by repeating the preposition from כְּסַרְיָה is not satisfactory: and the reading of 1 Chron. xvii. 21 לָאָבָנָךְ, together with that of the LXX. here ποὺ ἐκβάλειν σε, points to the substitution of לָאָבָנָךְ for לְאָבָנָךְ, and אלהים for אלהים. 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 לַמָּהָ 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 בְּנֻי, daughters, for dependent towns in Chron. i.c. and commonly.

3. The River, i.e. the Euphrates. The word רֶהֶר 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." אָרָם, Aram, and אָרָם, 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 לָעֲנִים 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., ἀξιόμαχοι, courtiers; the Targum, נדבן, princes; and the Syriac, which has the same word, הביאו: 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 לפניים 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, מלאך, 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 Μωλχόμο, though the gloss τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν was subsequently added. A Jewish tradition, recorded in the Talmud (Aboda Zara., f. 24a), and in the Quastiones Hebraicae 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 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 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, and he sawed for with the Targum, Thenius, Wellhausen, Keil, etc.

xiii. 18. A garment of divers colours, marg. a long garment with sleeves. The term occurs only here and in Gen. xxxvii. 3, 23. It is explained, (1) from Aram. = piece or patch, to mean a patchwork or variegated tunic. So the LXX. in Genesis χιτών ποικίλος; Vulg. tunica polymita: or (2) from = 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 χιτών 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 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": Genevan 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, Quest 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. אַחְיָהוֹד. 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.) ἀπεστείλε 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, בּוּרֵבוֹת הַמַּרְדָּר, is the C'thib; in the plains of the wilderness, בּוּרֵבוֹת הַמַּרְדָּר, is the K'ri. There is the same variation in chap. xvii. 16, where the context is decidedly in favour of the reading fords; 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, יְקָלַל יָכִי; the A.V. follows the K'ri, וַיֹּאמֶר יְקָלַל יָכִי.

12. On the wrong done unto me. A.V. affliction, marg. tears, Heb. eye, following the K'ri, בּוּנֵי. So the Targum. But such a meaning of עַל is unsupported. R.V. follows the C'thib בּוּנֵי, and takes the suffix objectively, as in קְלֲלָה.
in the second half of the verse. But LXX., Vulg., Syr.,
point to the reading יִֽנְּאָֽבָנִי, on my affliction, which is pro-
bably right.

For his cursing of me, reading קְלֵלָתִי with the C’thib. A.V. follows the K’ri, קְלֵלָתִי. The variation is not recog-
nised in some editions of the Hebrew text.

14. Weary. If יִֽנְּאָֽבָנִי 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 יִֽנְּאָבָנִי as the name of a place. So far as the form of the word is concerned this is quite possible (cf. יִֽנְּאָֽבָנִי, 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 יָֽלָלְנָה, יַלְלָלְנָה, יַלְלָלְנָה 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, אֶתְרַח, and Jether, יֶתֶר, are of course only different forms of the same name. ὁ Ἰεβανδήνσ in common text which follows B.

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

21. The Cushite for Cushi. The def. article shows that כַּשִׁי is not a personal name, as in Zeph. i. 1, but a gentilic 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 נַעֲרֵי עַבָּדָךְ by בֶּן עַבָּד הָמָלֶק 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 אֲנָה עַבָּד הָמָלֶק was originally a marginal gloss on אֲנָה עַבָּד, 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 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 , 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 , 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 is a corruption of some rare word denoting some specially formidable weapon. Cf. the LXX. κοπψη, a mace.

19. The comparison of this verse with the parallel
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passage in 1 Chron. xx. 5 shows that one or both texts are corrupt. (1) The reading Jair is preferable to Jaare-oregim. Oregim is the word for weavers in the line below, inserted here by a careless scribe. The letters of עיר, Jair, were then transposed to give the form of a construct state, Jaare, before ערי, Oregim. (2) The words נְגִיאֵלָת הַבְּטֵלְבֶּהוֹת [slew] Goliath, so closely resemble in form and sound גָּלִיאת הַבְּטֵלְבֶּהוֹת, 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. חבלוֹת תְּבוּלִים, to twist, bind, means both cords and pangs. The parallelism decides for the first meaning. Cf. LXX. σχωλα, Vulg. funes. The A.V. follows its predecessors from Coverdale, who was probably influenced by the rendering of the LXX. in the Psalter שׁוֹאֵל, 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 יאֵפֶת may mean in his wrath (marg.). But cf. v. 16.

12. Gathering of waters. So the Genevan: even the gatherings of waters. לְעָרָה, 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 לְעָרָה, and the rendering dark waters was probably suggested by the various reading לְעָרָה in Ps. xviii.

33, 34. Guideth for maketh, deriving יֵעִר from Marg. setteth free, deriving it from יֵעִר, to shake off, loose. "His way," "his feet," according to the C'thib:
marg. "my way," "my feet," according to the K'ri, תָּנָא, and LXX., Vulg., Targ., Syr.

46. Shall come trembling, following the text of Ps. xviii. 45, יַעֲשֵׂה יְתֵרָה, which in its ordinary sense of gird themselves does not suit the passage, but may possibly be explained from the Syr. סְכָנָה, claudicavit, come limping.

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

xxiii. 3, 4. The brevity of this oracle (וַיָּבֵא, v. 1) makes it difficult to determine the exact construction and sense. It is possible, as in the text, to regard יְתֵרָה as the subject, and הבּוֹא 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 (אִם = אִם) 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) יִדָּבְדוּתָה, 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 יִשְׁבֵּבָה, Jashobeam, and the corruption may have originated in the carelessness of a transcriber who substituted for יִדָּבְדוּתָה the word יִשְׁבֵּבָה from the line above. The reading of the LXX. however, is Ἰεσσεθᾶς, and Wellhausen thinks that ידְּבִדְוּתֶה in Chron. is a corruption of יִדָּבְדוּתָה (אָשָׁבַע = ישבעל) which he believes the LXX. had still before them in the text of Chron. (2) For יִתְּכְמִכְסִי, the Hachmonite, or קָרְאָהָנִי, the son of a Hachmonite, as in Chron. (3) The last clause has neither grammar nor sense. In place of; יִנֵּה נִנְנָ יאַעטִי, the same was Adino the Ezrite, must originally have stood, as in Chron., the words יִבְאֶה יאַעטִי, 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 יִנֵּה with ב is not found elsewhere, 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.


The two sons of Ariel. לאיריאל 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 בֵּן, sons of, which may easily have fallen out after ישעֵי.

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 ἢ 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"?

Οτ' οὖν γὰρ διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνέγκα πέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκρῶν βεσαλα, ἐπεὶ μὴ ποτὲ ἤχει θεῖ ζῆν ὁ διαθεμένος."—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