

a specialist for the *heart*. He offers to minister just where the world cannot minister, and to give the one thing—a new heart and a right spirit—that no one else can give.

Has Christ's blessing, then, no reference to our daily life and earthly trials? Oh, yes. There is a blending of heavenly peace with our earthly troubles. They lose their hurtful and oppressive weight. And, again, he who lives by the Spirit of Christ is the one who will be most fit to be trusted in his daily work and duties. He will do these all the more conscientiously and faithfully, and will therefore come to be trusted by his fellow-men. His religion should make him the fitter for the ordinary duties of life, and, as the saying is, 'the stone that is fit for the wall will not be left upon the road.'

Thirdly, *the source of supply*. There can be no

mistaking what Jesus meant as to the source of blessing. He spake with no uncertain sound—'Let him come unto Me.' The only difficulty might be as to what was meant by coming to Him, for many were close enough to Him outwardly, as He spake, and yet, in spirit, very remote. A poor woman touched the hem of His garment, and was blessed, body and spirit, thereby; and yet, as has been said, the Roman soldiers had all His raiment between them, and it did them no particular good. Two persons may be nearer each other, between whom the ocean rolls, than two who may be climbing the same hillside. It is not miles, but sin, that separates from Christ. Faith will bring us near the Saviour, and a perfect trust would mean a complete union. Then would He be with us, renewing day by day, and safely keeping, till the time come at last when we shall be with Him.

The Unity of Deuteronomy.

BY PROFESSOR ED. KÖNIG, PH.D., D.D., ROSTOCK.

III.

(c) Next I raised the question whether the above interchange of singular and plural has analogies *outside Deuteronomy*. In the course of my investigation I have discovered the following:—

(a) Change of address from singular to plural: the 'thou' of Ex 20² stands first for the 'people' (19²⁵), although in the further course of the Decalogue it came to designate every individual member of the people. To the 'we' of 20^{19b} the 'you' of 20²⁰ attached itself, as did the 'ye' of 20^{22b} to the 'children of Israel' (20^{22a}). The 'thou' of 20²⁴ may be individualizing (cf. the sing. 'altar' and 'every place') as in 21² (on the 'thou' of 22¹⁷, see below). Then singular and plural interchange in 'thou shalt never vex a stranger, etc.; for ye were strangers' (Ex 22^{20ab} [Eng. 21^{ab}]). For the individual Israelite of 22^{20a}, who is enjoined in the future to show kindness to the individual stranger, had not himself been a stranger in Egypt. The plural of 22²¹ suits both the preceding sentence and the 'any' (כָּל); but in v. 22 the individualizing singular is introduced, in harmony with the singular object, אִתּוֹ (the 'them'

of the A.V. in v. 23^a is not sufficiently exact). Then singular and plural interchange in 22^{22f, 24ab, 26f}. Specially important is it that the singular is employed all through the section 23^{1-9a}, but the plural in v. 9^b, whereas again the singular is preferred in vv. 10-12, but the plural in v. 13. Next comes again the singular in vv. 14-24, but the plural in v. 25. So the singular is found in 34^{11f}, the plural in v. 13, the singular in vv. 14-26, and yet 34¹⁴ contains the causal proposition, 'for thou shalt worship,' etc., to the preceding 'ye shall destroy,' etc.

(β) Change from plural to singular: 'All the congregation of Israel' and 'the elders of Israel,' who are addressed in Ex 12^{3, 21}, are naturally represented in the first instance by the plural (12^{5-24a}). But in v. 24^b there follows, 'as an ordinance to thee and to thy sons for ever.' If this singular be not individualizing, it is at least strongly parenthetical. This singular is retained also in Sam., Onk., and LXX, and the Pesh. is the first to introduce the levelling אֲנִי וְאַתָּה. Moreover, this fact contains a warning not to

regard simply as the original text those textual traditions in which the change of number is avoided. With Ex 12²⁴ is specially to be compared 'when you reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not,' etc. (Lv 19^{9ab} || 23^{22ab}). After Ex 12^{24b} the author returns again to the employment of the plural in vv.^{25f}. The plural of 13^{3f} refers to the 'people' addressed in 13^{3az}, but the singular follows in vv.⁵⁻¹⁶.

In the so-called 'Law of Holiness' (Lv 17-26), where Aaron and his sons (17²), or the 'children of Israel,' etc. (18² 19² 20², etc.), are addressed, the plural naturally predominates. Its first occurrence is in 'ye shall eat' (17¹⁴). But it interchanges with the singular as follows:—Plur. 18²⁻⁶; sing. 18⁷ (this 'thou' is individualizing)⁻²²; plur. 18²⁴⁻³⁰ 19^{2-9a}; sing. 9b-10ab^{az}; plur. 10b^{β-12}; sing. 13^f; plur. 15^a; sing. 15b-18; plur. 19^a; sing. 19^b; plur. 23-27^a; sing. 27^b; plur. 28; sing. 29; plur. 30^f; sing. 32^f; plur. 34^{az}; sing. 34^{aβ}; plur. 34b-37 20^{7f}; sing. 19 (the 'of thy mother' is individualizing); plur. 22-26; sing. 21^{8a}; plur. 8b 22¹⁹⁻²²; sing. 23; plur. 24^f. 23^{3-22a}; sing. 22^b; plur. 24^f. 24³ (the sing. 24^{7f} refers to Moses)²² 25²; sing. 3-5; plur. 6^{az}; sing. 6a^{β-7} (detailing)^{-9a} (the individualizing 'thou' is retained); plur. 9b-13 (detailing sing. 14^a); plur. 14^b (individualizing sing. 15^f); plur. 17-24; sing. 25. 35-37; plur. 38; sing. 39-44^a (a generalizing plural is found again with special distinctness in 'from the heathen that are round about you,' 44^b); sing. 47. 53; plur. 26¹⁻³⁹.

Outside the *Pentateuch*, too, this change of number is to be remarked. I found the transition from singular to plural, e.g. in Ps 11^{1b} (Kethib), 32⁸ ('I will instruct thee,' etc.),⁹ ('Be ye not,' etc.), 105¹¹ ('Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of *your* inheritance'). The transition from plural to singular is accomplished in the prophecies of Malachi as follows:—Plur. 1^{2-8a}; sing. 1^{8b}; plur. 2¹³. 14^a; sing. 2^{14b}; plur. 2^{15b^{az}}; sing. 2^{15b^β}.

(d) Further, the question had to be put whether this change of number had analogies. I have mentioned above that the interchange of singular and plural construction of the word 'Israel' stands upon the same footing as the varying construction of other collectives (cf. my *Syntax*, § 346 d-s). But here it is to be added that the interchange of plural and singular is a widely extended phenomenon. This will be perfectly clear if besides the example, 'cursed be everyone that curseth thee' (אֲרִיבֶךָ אֲרִיבֶךָ, Gn 27²⁹), one compare all the cases in my *Syntax*, § 348 m-z, and the passages Am 6^{9f},

Ps 5^{9a}. 10^a, etc., which I have reserved for another linguistic treatise. This syntactical phenomenon is known under the name of the 'singular used distributively in reference to a plural' (cf. Davidson, *Syntax*, § 116, Rem. 1). But it is well to remember that the general subject 'one' is expressed by the 3rd sing. as well as the 3rd plur. (see my *Syntax*, § 324 c-h); e.g. 'one called' is expressed by אֶחָד (Gn 11⁹, etc.), or by אֶחָדָה (1 S 23²⁸, etc.) [A.V. has substituted in both instances the passive form], and in this respect there are variants in Sam., LXX, and Pesh., which are enumerated in my *Syntax* (§ 324 i). Besides, the circumstance is noteworthy that the general subject 'one' is expressed not infrequently by the 2nd sing. (§ 324 b). In this way certain instances of the employment of 'thou' may be explained, when that word suddenly appears in the midst of an exposition (cf. the 'thou' of Ex 21², which has its parallel in 'a man' (אִישׁ) of 21⁷, etc.; the 'thou' of 22¹⁷ [Eng.¹⁸] || לְכֹל 'whosoever'; ? Lv 21⁸). Further, since elsewhere also the subject addressed interchanges with the general subject 'one' (e.g. Lv 2⁸ 24^{7f}. 25²⁶⁻²⁸), this kind of interchange furnishes all the less a mark of diversity of authorship (against Steuernagel, *Di.* 1898, p. vi).

(e) Steuernagel has not sought for these analogies to the interchange of 'thou' and 'ye.' But he also has made remarks by which he has himself—unconsciously—weakened the force of his main argument. For he expressly admits (*Di.* 1898, p. v) that in the so-called document Pl 'some laws are given with the singular (12⁸⁻¹²) or the plural (16²¹⁻¹⁷⁷) form of address, whereas in other laws the address is avoided, e.g. 21¹⁵⁻²¹ 23¹⁸.' Consequently, the presupposed redactor of Pl must have assumed that Moses in addressing Israel could have employed either 'thou' or 'ye.' This possibility must have been assumed also by the 'simple writer' who, according to Steuernagel (*Di.* 1898, p. ix), united the document Sg with Pl. This assumption of the 'simple writer,' whom Steuernagel presupposes, is all the more important, because this redactor has regarded the change of number as possible even in sentences which are most closely connected, e.g. in sentences with the imperf. consec. (7^{8b}), or in relative sentences (11⁸). No more have the Samaritans doubted the possibility of Moses' having employed 'thou' side by side with 'you.' For the Sam. Pent. has rejected this change of number only in relatively

few instances; cf. besides the above-cited passages, Dt 11²³ (מלפני and ממכ), 12^{16a} (תאכל), 13⁶ (המוציא), 28^{62b} (שמעתם). In other instances the Sam. has simply transferred the change of number to another passage, 14³ (תאכלו), as in M.T. 14⁴, 22²⁶ (הוצאתם || תעשו). In other passages, finally, the Sam. itself offers this change, although it is not found in M.T.; 16³ (תאכלו), whereas the sing. precedes and follows. In like manner it offers אמת יורשימ for אמת יורש in 18^{14a}. These variants of the Sam. are not mentioned by Steuernagel. But it is important to make this addition, in case the impression arose that the Sam. sought to set aside the change of number.

(f) In view of all these circumstances, I am compelled to pronounce it too rash to use this interchange of numbers as the basis of a thorough-going partition of Dt 4^{44ff.} This interchange gives no sure title to separate off either small or great sections of a literary product, and to ascribe these to different authors.

6. But has not Steuernagel brought forward other facts by which the strength of his fifth argument is increased?

In *Rahmen des Dt.* (1894, p. 9) he remarks, '5²⁸ and 9⁹ are by their contents pretty exactly attached to one another. In 5²⁸ the command was given to Moses to go up the mount to God; in 9⁹ Moses is found on the mount.' But the בַּעֲלֵתִי, 'when I was gone up unto the mount' (9⁹), contains nothing more than an historical reminiscence, a reference to an ascent he once made of the mount. Moreover, this reminiscence, contained in 9⁹, is completely explained by v.⁸, and this again by v.⁷, that is to say, an example is meant to be given of how Israel at an earlier period provoked God to anger. Hence the circumstance that Moses in 5²⁸ speaks of his approach to God, and in 9⁹ of his ascending the mount, is merely a fortuitous coincidence of the two passages in an external feature. Other tokens of the connexion of 5²⁸ and 9⁹ would need to be present in order to prove that these passages were once directly coupled.

Are such tokens supplied by the linguistic differences enumerated in *Rahmen des Dt.* p. 23? There Steuernagel urges that Sg employs the simple יהוה 11 times, יהוה אלהיך 32 times, and יהוה אלהינו twice, whereas Pl employs the

simple יהוה 23 times, יהוה אלהיכם 6 times, and יהוה אלהינו 5 times. But he himself adds 'that in parenthetic speech it may have been more natural to designate God as one who is the God of the person addressed.' To be sure he declines to admit the validity of this objection, because also in the parenthetic sections of Pl in chaps. 10 f. יהוה אלהיכם is not the prevailing form of expression throughout, but is found exactly the same number of times as the simple יהוה (4 times). But it appears to me that this is sufficient, and if one considers the sections of chaps. 10 f. which Steuernagel (*Dt.* 1898) claims for Pl, the simple יהוה is found in 10¹¹ 11^{17ab. 23} (narratives and promises), יהוה אלהיכם in 10¹⁷ 11^{2. 25. 27f.} (narratives and announcements). Besides, Steuernagel has refused to assign 'Jahweh your God' of 11^{13. 22. 31} to his Pl.

Further, Steuernagel (*Rahmen des Dt.* p. 23) remarked that סגולה is found in Sg, 7⁶ 14² ('a redactor's addition going back to 7⁶') 26¹⁸. 'Sg uses always סגולה, Pl always נחלה (9^{26. 29}).' But if it is not already certain that 14² is from another hand than 14¹, one is not entitled to assert this because 'inheritance' occurs twice in proximity to 'you' (9²⁵). Further, Steuernagel (p. 24) alleges that the collocation 'eat and be full' occurs only in Sg (6¹¹ 8^{10. 12} 11¹⁵ 14²⁰ 26¹²). But if the distinction between Sg and Pl is by no means yet established, can one prove it from the circumstance that that form of speech is found only in the six passages cited? How, if in the plural portions, which confessedly bear pre-eminently the character in question, it was less natural to employ the phrase mentioned? Besides, the latter is found also in 31²⁰ (*Dt.* 1898, p. xxxi), a verse which belongs to 'R'! In any case, it is precarious to have recourse to the Sam. (*Rahmen des Dt.* p. 24), where a remarkable expression בפני (7²⁴) is set aside. In *Dt.* 1898, p. 71, the vv. 19¹¹⁻¹³ are denied to Sg, because the latter expresses 'neighbour' by אח, whereas in 19¹¹ we have רע. Yet upon p. xxxiii we read, 'רע stands as designation of fellow-countryman in Sg side by side with אח (=real brother) 13⁷, in quotations 15² (bis) 19^{4f.}, and probably in citations 23^{25f.} (bis) 24¹⁰.' That is to say, Sg does employ רע as well, and why is e.g. 15² a 'quotation'? Steuernagel himself merely says, on p. 55, 'זה דבר ה'

(‘and this is the word [A.V. manner] of the release’) is a formula with which Sg *appears* to cite older laws (see 19⁴; cf. 18³).’ The expression of uncertainty which is contained in the ‘appears’ may have had very good reasons.

Steuernagel (*Rahmen des Dt.* pp. 24 f.) lays emphasis also upon this, that Sg is certainly acquainted with the pentateuchal source J, and perhaps with E, but that Pl ‘had very probably only E before him.’ This, however, is uncertain. Even Steuernagel himself (*Dt.* 1898, p. xxxi) says: ‘It cannot be decided whether Sg used the com-

posite J E, or only J, or E.’ These remarks do not appear to me to be calculated to strengthen the force of the argument drawn from the interchange of ‘thou’ and ‘ye.’

On the other hand, Steuernagel himself (*Dt.* 1898, p. xxiii) confesses that ‘the difference of spirit which prevails in Sg and Pl respectively is not such that the one excluded the other.’

Taking all the above data into consideration, I am unable to see in the partition of *Dt* recommended by Steuernagel a critical procedure with sufficient grounds to justify it.

The Crown of Life.

REVELATION II. 10.

BY THE REV. W. ERNEST BEET, B.A., SOUTHAMPTON.

THE use of the word *crown* in this and kindred passages of our English versions of the New Testament is somewhat misleading, and tends to obscure the writer’s meaning. This is due to the fact that it suggests to our minds ideas very different from those suggested by the word *στέφανος*, of which it is the translation. We closely associate the idea of a crown with those of sovereignty and power, the crown of a monarch being regarded as the symbol of his authority and rank, and thus equivalent to the Greek *διάδημα*, or diadem, a word with which we meet three times in the Revelation of St. John (12³, 13¹, 19¹²), but not elsewhere in the New Testament. In these three passages *crown* fairly reproduces the author’s meaning. With these exceptions, it is invariably used as the equivalent of *στέφανος*, or wreath. Generally speaking, this latter word carries with it no suggestion of kingship or earthly rank, though a partial exception may be found in its use in the Gospels of the crown of thorns which was placed upon the Saviour’s brow. There the idea of kingship does seem to be involved, as the crown of thorns was a cruel imitation of the wreath worn by the Cæsars, though even this was very far from being a crown as we understand the term. Elsewhere, however, its reference is to the athletic festivals of Greece, the victors in which were crowned with a garland of pine, of olive, or of bay, as the case might be. The meaning of many

passages in the New Testament will be much clearer and more forceful if it be borne in mind that the crown spoken of is not the diadem of the sovereign, but the garland of the victorious athlete. For instance, if instead of *corruptible crown* (1 Co 9²⁵) we read *fading wreath*, we see that the reference is not to the regal diadem, which may endure for centuries, and is about as imperishable as anything made by the hands of man, but to the garland of leaves which, in a few hours, is withered and dead. Thus, when the true meaning of the word used is realized, the impressiveness of the contrast drawn by St. Paul is greatly enhanced. The essential element of the connotation of the word *στέφανος*—the *crown* of the Epistles, and, with the exception of the three instances quoted above, of the Apocalypse—is that of successful achievement, and not, as the English word immediately suggests to our minds, the royal rank of its wearer.

We are now in a position to understand, more clearly than would otherwise be possible, the meaning of the familiar phrase ‘crown of life,’ and to answer the question, Under what circumstances may we conceive of life as being crowned? In attempting an answer to this question, we shall do well to turn our attention for a moment to the teleological view of life, which is a marked feature of the idea of a well-ordered society as conceived in the Socratico-Platonic system. Things are