

NOTES ON SELECT PASSAGES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

EXODUS i. 16. Render: "And he said, When ye deliver the Hebrew women, then ye shall look upon the seat, . . ." See Jeremiah xiii. 3, marg. If this sense of the word, *sellor parturientis*, δίφρος λοχείος (Suidas) or λοχειαῖος (Artemidorus v. 73, where λοχειαῖος is probably a combination of λοχείος and λοχαῖος), which seems at least as probable as any other, be retained, then the dual form מַנְיִם may be compared with the Greek Δίφρος and the Latin Bisellium, "a seat for two persons." The construction of מַנְיִם with לַעֲיִ is found in Exodus v. 21.

EXODUS ii. 3. Render: ". . . she took for him an ark of paper-reeds, . . ." Hebrew *Gomé*, the *papyrus* of the Greeks and Romans, and *babeer* of the modern Arabs. Job viii. 8; Isaiah xviii. 1 and xxxv. 7 (not Isa. xix. 7).

EXODUS viii. 12. [Dr. Field leaves the text as in A.V., but proposes a new rendering for the margin, and adds a note as follows.] ". . . concerning the matter (arrangement) of the frogs, which he (Moses) had appointed to Pharaoh." See verses 9, 10. All the commentators (as far as I know) explain לְפָרְעֹה אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם to mean *quas immiserat Pharaoni*, which seems an unusual sense of אֲשֶׁר. I think the O'. and Vulg. have given the correct meaning of the words. O'.: *περὶ τοῦ ὀρισμοῦ τῶν βατράχων, ὡς ἐτάξατο Φαραώ*. Vulg.: *pro sponsione ranarum quam condixerat Pharaoni*.

EXODUS ix. 17. Render: "As yet dost thou set thyself against my people . . ." Gesenius renders: *Aggeris instar opponis te resistis*; for which sense he quotes Aquila's ἀντιποιῆ. But ἀντιποιεῖσθαι (τινος) is not to resist, but to assert one's right to the possession of a thing, *sibi vindicare*, a sense which suits this place admirably, if one could trace its connexion with the Hebrew word מַסְתַּחֲלֵל.

EXODUS x. 10. In place of "look to it; for evil is before

you," render "see how your intent is evil." The construction may be best compared with 1 Kings xx. 7 A.V. : "see how this *man* seeketh mischief." Hieron. (who in this part of the Vulgate is often found paraphrasing instead of translating, perhaps from following Symmachus) gives the sense of the passage very well : *Cui dubium est quod pessime cogitetis?* And so another paraphrastic translator, J. A. Dathe: *Jam satis apparet vos mala intendere.*

EXODUS xvii. 16. Render: "For he said, ¹ Because *there is* a ² monument by the throne of the LORD: War to the LORD with Amalek from generation to generation." ¹ Or, *Because the LORD hath sworn that the LORD will have war with Amalek*, etc. ² Heb. *hand* (1 Sam. xv. 12; 2 Sam. xviii. 18; Isa. lvi. 5).

EXODUS xxxv. 22. [Dr. Field substitutes "necklaces" for "tablets," and adds]: This is probably the meaning of the A.V. "tablets," which is not in Todd's *Johnson*; but in Ebers' *English-German Dictionary*, 1794, I find: "Tablet—das Halsband, auch Armband." So the Peschito.

LEVITICUS ii. 1. The primary signification of מִנְחָה being merely a *gift* (O': δῶρον, 32 times) or *offering*, that particular use of it, which is peculiar to the Levitical law, seems to have acquired the name of "meat offering" from Coverdale downwards, chiefly from its being commonly found in connexion with "drink offering." From this epithet we infer that it was *something to be eaten*, its composition being left to the accompanying description. There seems no objection to this, except that which arises from the vulgar error that "meat" is synonymous with "flesh" or "butcher's meat." In favour of retaining "meat offering," besides a long prescription, is the difficulty of finding a better word. "Meal offering" has the advantage of similarity of sound to the ejected word; but in attempting more than is necessary, viz. to indicate the principal ingredient of the מִנְחָה, it mars the

effect of its contrast with "drink offering" (e.g. Joel ii. 14); it also conveys an erroneous notion of that very ingredient, which was not "meal" (קֶמַח), but "fine flour" (סֹלֶת). Thus Solomon's provision for a day is stated to be thirty measures of fine flour (סֹלֶת) and sixty measures of meal (קֶמַח). There is the same distinction between "meal" and "flour" in English. "Meal," according to the dictionaries, is "the substance of edible grain ground to fine particles, and not bolted or sifted." "Meal bread" is the popular name for what is otherwise called "brown bread." The ancient versions sometimes (Peschito always) render מִנְחָה by a word expressive of its composition, but the fineness of the flour is rightly indicated by such words as *σεμίδαλις*, *simila* or *similago*, and מִנְחָה.

LEVITICUS xvi. 8. Render: ". . . the other lot for Azazel." Though "the scapegoat" should be rejected as the rendering of אֲזַזֵּל, it might be retained in the heading, and continue to be used, both in its technical and popular sense, as a convenient and appropriate name (though not Scriptural) for the second or live goat.

LEVITICUS xviii. 18. [Dr. Field advocates the retention of the rendering in A.V. text, with the deletion of A.V. margin. He proposes "to be a rival to her" (adopted by Revisers) as an alternative for "to vex her." He also refers to a letter addressed by him to the Bishop of Ely (Dr. Harold Browne) in 1870, which reads as follows—"I read in a late debate in the House of Lords your criticism on Leviticus xviii. 18, in which (I quote from the *Standard*) you say that the Hebrew phrases 'a woman to her sister' and 'a man to his brother' should *invariably* be translated 'one to another.' Now I think you will find, on further investigation, that there is a peculiarity in the use of these well-known idioms, which is *not* found in the above text: namely, that they are always *extra constructionem*, or might be included in a parenthesis; so that אִשָּׁה or אִשָּׁה in such

cases neither governs the verb nor is governed by it. In the common example וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִישׁ אֶל-אָחִיו the construction is: 'And they said (namely) each (said) to his brother.' I do not say that וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִישׁ would not be a good construction; and indeed I have found one or two instances of this construction with רָעוּהוּ for אָחִיו, but as a rule the verb is in the plural; e.g. Exodus xi. 2. However, I believe no example can be found of אִישׁ in such cases being governed by the verb (as you propose in Lev. xviii. 18), nor do I see how it could grammatically be so arranged."]

DEUTERONOMY xxi. 14. Render: ". . . thou shalt not exercise dominion over her, because . . ." So the Greek κατακυριεύειν (which seems to come nearest to the meaning of the Hebrew הִתְעַבֵּר) is rendered Matthew xx. 25 ("exercise lordship," R.V.). In Genesis i. 28, where the LXX. have κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς, the Samaritan version has עמרו עליה (Gesenius).

DEUTERONOMY xxviii. 57. Render: "and toward her afterbirth that . . ." The rendering "and that on account of her afterbirth" seems to be precluded by the continual repetition of וְיָבִי; and there is no reason why the "evil eye" should not be represented as glancing from the *object* to the *subject* of envy; looking upon the one with malignity and upon the other with gloating.

DEUTERONOMY xxxiii. 25. The marginal versions are rather more probable; but not so much so as to prevail (against nearly all the ancient versions) to eliminate from the English Bible a text which is so deservedly popular.

JOSHUA ix. 4. The marginal version [i.e. in R.V.] should be adopted: it is quite certain. Not "most" but *all* the ancient versions in Walton read ד not ר. And it is against all probability that two such forms as הַיְצִטִּיר and הַיְצִטִּיר, both ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, should occur in the same narrative within nine verses. Moreover, their assuming the character of ambassadors did not prove that they came from a far country.

FREDERICK FIELD.