

SWEETGOSPELHARMONY.COM
THE GOSPEL in the Law
PART III

He gave gifts unto men.

171

13), earth and heaven being described as each the work of a single hand; whereas the Sanctuary is described as the work of both hands, thus: 'Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, in the place, O LORD, which thou hast made for thee to dwell in, in the Sanctuary, O LORD, which *thy hands* have made' (Ex. xv. 17); so in Ps. lxxviii. 69, the Sanctuary is compared at once to both heaven and earth, the fabrics of the separate hands. It may be further remarked, that, in Ex. xxv. 8 (*supra*), the building of a sanctuary is connected with the dwelling of God among men: 'Let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them;' a verse expressing the same collocation of ideas as Ps. lxviii. 18: 'Thou hast gone up on high [to the mountain of the sanctuary]...to dwell among men.'

The occasion of the composition of Ps. lxviii. has been much disputed, and, indeed, the Psalm itself is allowed to be one of the most difficult in the whole Psalter. The majority of interpreters suppose it to have been written at the time when the Ark was removed from the house of Obed-Edom to Mount Zion, 2 Sam. vi. This view, says Hupfeld, though not adopting it himself, 'gives incontestably the best sense; in fact, it is the only one which suits, not only the mention of Zion, in opposition to Sinai and the heights of Basan, and the historical glance at the earlier leading of God from Sinai onwards, as introductory to this triumphal entry, but also the lofty utterances and prospects connected with it'. A full account of the arguments and opinions of commentators would shew that there is no very strong case made out as yet against the view here adopted¹;

¹ Perhaps, however, the circumstances of Solomon's bringing up of the Ark into the temple would suit as well. Compare ויעלו, 2 Chron. v. 5, with עלית, Ps. lxviii. 18. This is perhaps favoured by ver. 28: but see Perowne, on Ps. v. 7. It is unimportant, so far as the citation is concerned, to distin-

guish between these two occasions.

² 'Satis probabilis est interpretum complurium conjectura, hoc carmen a Davide compositum esse ex occasione illius solennitatis, qua circa sacra ex ædibus Obededomi in arcem Zioniticam ad locum ei paratum transferretur.' Rosenmüller.

it may suffice therefore to dismiss the point with slight notice.

The Psalm opens with the words : 'Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered : let them also that hate him flee before him ;' and that the Psalm deals with a procession of the Ark, is suggested by the correspondence of these its opening words with those addressed to God in the wilderness as the Ark was setting forward on its several journeyings, viz. : 'Rise up, LORD, and let Thine enemies be scattered ; and let them that hate Thee flee before Thy face' (Numb. x. 35). The eighteenth verse is applicable, as above, to the settlement of the Ark on Mount Zion ; and again, the general tenour of the Psalm is in harmony with the circumstances of that time, which was a time of victory and wealth, a time when 'the fame of David went out into all lands ; and the LORD brought the fear of him upon all nations' (1 Chron. xiv. 17). It was a time when 'kings with their armies did flee and were discomfited,' and the victor, enriched with spoil, bethought himself of the unworthy housing of the Ark : 'Lo, I dwell in an house of cedar, but the Ark of the covenant of the LORD remaineth under curtains' (1 Chron. xvii. 1, 2). The enrichment by the spoil of conquered kings, which helped to stir in David the desire to find a habitation for the God of Jacob—and in truth to build that house which it was reserved for Solomon to build—is expressed in the verse cited : 'Thou hast led captives captive ; Thou hast received *gifts* ;' i.e. spoils and tributary offerings from vanquished foes¹ ; or, it may be, offerings from the children of Israel, consequent upon their enrichment by those

¹ 'As on Sinai God had ordered Moses (and somewhat like this from the spoils of the Midianites) to receive contributions for His tabernacle, of which the spoils of the stubborn Egyptians made no small share ; so here from Zion God had been collecting, by the hands

of David, contributions for a Temple, that He might have a fixed residence : He had raised them from the rebellious enemies as well ; for the spoils of enemies, as well as the gifts of the people, David had consecrated to that purpose.'
Mudge.

spoils. The result of this triumphal ascent to the holy Mount was that God became a dweller among men, in the sense already set forth; and thus, while the gifts spoken of are not gifts from God, but offerings to Him, yet the mention of these is but accessory to the great gift of the Divine Presence, which HE, by there fixing His habitation, was to give to men. Zion was to become the central source of celestial graces, wherefrom Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists should issue forth and impart the gifts of the Holy Spirit to mankind; an explanation ultimately coincident with that of the Targum, followed by Rashi, where a like conclusion is arrived at, though by a very different process; the Psalm being referred to the ascent of Moses 'into the firmament,' to his possessing himself of the captive Law, and receiving gifts from the Supernals to give them to the sons of men¹.

In St Paul's citation, Christ is depicted as a conqueror, with a captive train, bestowing gifts, *sc.* from the spoils of victory, as may be illustrated by a reference to the circumstances of a Roman triumph. In the preceding verse, our Lord is spoken of emphatically as the *Giver*—'According to the measure of the gift of Christ.' In the eleventh verse this emphasis is sustained: 'And *He, αὐτός*, gave;' and thereupon follows a specification of the gifts, which are no less than the gift of the Holy Spirit, dwelling in holy men, in strict, though not literal, accordance with the purport of the original Hebrew as above explained: 'And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers.' That St Paul is intentionally departing from the phraseology of the original, as regards the expression, *He gave gifts*, is suggested by the repetition of the word, *He gave*, in ver. 11, where it would be unnatural in a rendering of the passage into Hebrew to use the same word of which the preceding 'gave' is supposed to be the

¹ שנית שני את התורה ולקחת מתנות מן העליונים לתתם לבני אדם

counterpart. The apostle, we may say, expressed the *idea*¹ of the Hebrew in Greek, and then proceeded to develop its application in the latter language, without further verbal reference to the original. Such a practice argues thoroughness of acquaintance with the general purport of the original, and a consequent disregard of possible charges of misapplication, taking their rise from *prima facie* incongruities in this and that detail.

St Paul's citation being admitted to represent the purport of the original, it is still to be asked whether its formal variations from the Hebrew can be accounted for. It would be natural to adopt the familiar Targumic version, if it contained a suitable rendering of the clause. If however the citation was drawn, as some think, from a Septuagintal source, it may be asked why the important change from *take* to *give* was introduced; a change whereby the citation is made to express clearly what the LXX. could only be said to imply obscurely, if at all. The necessity for the variation is apparent. The LXX. describe a captive train, and gifts received, as accessories to the triumph of Him who ascends; the original lays chief stress on the sequel to the ascent, for which the apostle quotes the passage, viz., *a bestowal of spiritual graces*, and God's dwelling among men. The original, be it added, is, after the manner of *types*, partial, and corresponds but inadequately to the antitypical idea. The citation is an application of a type thus partial, and hence some difficulty in details must needs present itself. In the Psalm, the ascent to heaven is represented under the figure of a going up to a sanctuary on mount Zion, and, as a result of this typical ascent, God dwells among men. In the application the Ascension is viewed a *departure* from men, and thus stands out in marked contrast with the ascent

¹ 'The rendering of the Apostle... may be perhaps a free rendering of the passage, *ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*. It is remarkable that the Chaldee has the same, *יִהְיֶה לָהֶם מַתָּן לְבָנֵי נִשְׂאָה*.

As the Targum on the Psalms is manifestly composite, some portions being much earlier than others, this rendering may have been earlier than the time of the Apostle.' *Perowne*.

spoken of in the Psalm ; but the Ascension is supplemented by the Mission of the Comforter to dwell in men, and thus by two steps the direct conclusion of the original is reached.

NOTE ON CHAPTER VII.

A. Dr Lightfoot remarks, on τὸ Ἄγαρ, Gal. iv. 25, that 'it need not necessarily mean, *the word* Hagar ; compare for instance Eph. iv. 9, τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη τί ἐστίν ; where τὸ is the statement, for the preceding *word* was not ἀνέβη, but ἀναβάς.' But this is inconclusive, for neither was the preceding *statement* ἀνέβη. It might have been written that τὸ ἀναβάς implies καταβάς, but for greater simplicity ἀναβάς is resolved into ἀνέβη καί, and the καί being dropped, there follows τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη, κ.τ.λ. This resolution is *a returning to the form of the original*, where only past tenses, עלית, שבית, לקחת, are used.

It may be remarked that, just as ἀνέβη, with the Apostle, implies κατέβη, so take (LXX.) may have implied *give*, as many have supposed. Dr Wordsworth understands באדם to mean, 'in His character as man,' and adds:—'The reception of those gifts in Him and by Him, in His humanity, as our second Adam, virtually implied the donation of those gifts to us, who are mystically united as one body in Him.'

CHAPTER VIII.

A body hast Thou prepared Me.

Ps. xl. 6; Heb. x. 5.

THIS word *body* occurs in the LXX. rendering of Ps. xl. 6; but neither in the present Hebrew text, nor in the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, or Theodotion, where ὠτια replaces σῶμα. The Authorized Version, following the Masoretic text, reads: 'mine ears hast Thou opened.' (1) Some would account for the occurrence of σῶμα as a transcriber's mistake for ὠτια, the c being repeated from the preceding ηθελησας. (2) To others, 'ears' and 'body' are alike suggestive of obedience and service. (3) A third explanation supposes a reference to *the boring of a servant's ear* in token of perpetual enslavement; but the form of the clause (not merely the use of the dual, *ears*) is opposed to this explanation. In the passages referred to, it is provided, that 'if he [the servant] say unto thee, I will not go away from thee: because he loveth thee and thine house, because he is well with thee; Then thou shalt take an aul, and thrust it through his ear unto the door, and he shall be thy servant for ever. And also unto thy maid-servant thou shalt do likewise' (Deut. xv. 16, 17; Ex. xxi. 6). But in the Psalm, it is written, not precisely as in the Authorized Version, '*mine ears hast thou opened,*' but '*ears hast thou opened [dugged] for me.*' (4) Others again suppose the change from *ears* to *body* to have

been made intentionally, in order to express more fully the prophetic meaning of the passage. The foregoing suppositions seem at first sight mutually exclusive ; but, to pass by the third, it may be said that a modification of the last is not irreconcilable with the first and second. The reading *σῶμα* may have owed its origin to an error of transcription, but, when found in the text, may have been adopted deliberately, as associating itself with the thought of *obedience*, and the working of the Father's will. Dean Alford concludes his note with a remark which recognizes the twofold nature of the difficulty presented. First of all, it has to be inquired how the reading arose ; and, secondly, why it has been retained. 'As Christian believers, our course is plain. How the word *σῶμα* came into the LXX. we cannot say : but being there, it is now sanctioned for us by the citation here : not as *the* (or even *a*) proper rendering of the Hebrew, but as a prophetic utterance, equivalent to, and representing, that other.'

I. The fortieth Psalm is not ascribed in the New Testament to any specific author ; the formula of citation being the indefinite λέγει. 'Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, *he saith*.' In the Hebrew it is styled a David-psalm ; but this title being in itself not altogether free from ambiguity, it was perhaps not intended originally to designate David as the author ; and moreover, even if the inscription amounted to a clear affirmation of Davidic authorship, it might still be rejected, if at variance with internal evidence, as being (like the subscriptions of the apostolic Epistles) of no canonical authority. No satisfactory explanation having been suggested on the theory of Davidic authorship, it is here assumed, provisionally, that the reference is to a time of captivity.

The central revelation of the Psalm follows as a sequel to the discovery that there was no inherent efficacy in the sacrifices of the Law ; and this teaching was pre-eminently the teaching of exile and captivity. Faith in the God of Israel then survived, when it had become impossible to join,

as of old, in the temple service; and from this it followed necessarily that JEHOVAH could be served without sacrifice or hand-built shrine. But so long as the legal system remained accessible¹, the worshipper was less likely to attain to a full appreciation of its barely typical significance. This truth would be best taught by an intermission of the temple service; for when the worshipper, far away, it may be, in Babylon, was under a physical incapacity of offering sacrifice, his heart was thereby prepared for other consolations; his ear opened to the new, or as yet unheeded, teaching, that the sacrifice of praise would find acceptance. 'What period in the history of the Jews was more propitious [than that of the captivity] for the circulation of these truths? So long as all the ordinances of the Law were celebrated with their former regularity, the worshipper might seldom realize the possibility of fundamental changes in the system under which he lived. But when the sanctuary itself was levelled with the ground, when the sacrifices were no longer offered... how much was there in an emergency like this to lift their thoughts above the legal institutions, and constrain them to reflect on better things to come'.

II. The Psalm thus commences: 'I waited patiently for the LORD; and He inclined unto me, and heard my cry. He brought me up also out of an horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings. And he hath put a new song in my mouth, even praise unto our God.' Further on, the subject of the 'new song' is specified. From the mire of despondency the Psalmist has been raised to a sure ground of hope, unmoved by external shocks. He has learned the spirituality of true religion. The temple may be in ruins, but God's truth still reigns. Old things have passed away, and a strange song is put into his mouth—the song of praise. The discovery of the spirituality of true worship is overwhelming. Words

¹ In 1 Sam. xv. 22, obedience is preferred to sacrifice. But *circumstances*, which set the two in opposition, gave rise to this teaching also. See note A.

² Hardwick, *Christ and Other Masters*, Part I. p. 149.

cannot express the grandeur of the conception. 'Many, O LORD my God, are Thy wonderful works which thou hast done, and thy thoughts which are to us-ward: they cannot be reckoned up in order unto thee: if I would declare and speak of them, they are more than can be numbered. Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire ... burnt-offering and sin-offering hast Thou not required.'

Between these last clauses come the disputed words: 'ears hast Thou digged for me;' i.e. *Thou hast revealed to me* the truth that the blood of bulls and goats avails not; that 'sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire.' Thou hast taught me that for which I had no ears before. The expression, *ears hast Thou digged*, is indeed unique, but may be regarded as an intensification of either of two expressions, which might be used in the sense assigned. One of these is exemplified by 1 Sam. xx. 2: 'Behold, my father will do nothing either great or small, but that he will *shew it me*' [lit. *uncover my ear*]; the other by Is. l. 5: 'The LORD God hath *opened mine ear*, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back;' where the first hemistich affirms that *instructions were given*¹; and the second that they were obeyed. In Is. xlviii. 8 the same mode of expression is adopted, but there seems rather to imply *obedience*. There is no reason for excluding either of these two usages, each of which seems appropriate in its context; it may be concluded therefore that there is the same ambiguity in this *digging of ears* as in the common word to *hear*; which implies in some contexts *obedience*, but in others, no more than the bare aptitude for *hearing*.

In Ps. xl., the meaning adopted by many commentators is 'that the *truth just stated had been communicated* to Messiah by the Almighty²;' while others interpret the clause of

¹ אֲדַנִּי פֶתַח לִי אָזְנוֹ, certiore me fecit mei officii et mandata mihi dedit.' Rosenmüller. פֶתַח, to open, is a stronger expression than נָלַח, to uncover, and may be equivalent to כָּרַח in Ps. xl. It is used of engraving. Cp.

Ex. xxviii. 9, 36.

² French and Skinner. *Transl. of Psalms*. So Mudge: 'Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not choose; (Thou insinuatedst into my ears) burnt-offering and sin-offering Thou didst not ask.'

an awakening to the necessity of *obedience*, as contrasted with ceremonial observances: 'Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice.' Against the latter rendering it may be urged that no antithetic particle intervenes¹, such as might have been looked for, if the intention had been to exhibit (in this verse) a contrast between sacrificial celebrations and the open ear of obedience. For this reason, the interpretation: 'Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire, *but* mine ears hast Thou opened,' seems objectionable: nor is this the sole, or even the strongest, objection that is to be urged against it. The seventh verse commences with an emphatic *Then*. 'Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do Thy will, O my God: yea, Thy law is within my heart.' And this word, *Then*, appears to mark off the first *destructive* lesson that sacrifice was 'not required,' from the *constructive* teaching of the following verses, viz. that the real desideratum was conformity to the divine will. To interpret, '*mine ears* hast Thou opened,' of obedience, breaks the continuity of negative statement, and anticipates the positive teaching of the following verses, which seem marked off expressly from the former. The explanation above adopted is free from this objection. It preserves the unity of the sixth verse, and leads up naturally to the contrast introduced in the next verse by *τότε εἶπον*. 'Sacrifice and offering Thou desirest not—this Thou hast taught me—burnt-offering and sin-offering thou dost not require.' *Then*,—when I had unlearned my former error—*then said I, Now have I arrived at*² the truth that had been veiled by previous misconceptions. Having learned what was *not* required, I then came to understand what *was* required, and *what in the volume of the book is enjoined upon me*, viz. 'to do Thy will, O my God.'

In the preceding paraphrase, an unfamiliar application of the Hebrew word, *I come*, has been adopted. The usual ren-

¹ The LXX. has *σῶμα δέ*, but there is nothing in the Hebrew text corresponding to *δέ*.

אז אמרתי הנה באתי במנלה ספר י כתוב עלי.

derings may be described as lacking structural coherence; and this suggests the enquiry, whether some variation in the construction might not result in a closer connection of the adjacent clauses. The word *bāthā*, like words of motion in the classical languages, may be followed by a simple accusative, thus: 'Now have I *come to* what is written;' or, to go back to the primitive meaning¹ of the Hebrew word: 'Now *have I entered into* what is written.' The analogy of our own and other languages suggests for the meaning of the above literal rendering: 'Now have I *entered into* (or arrived at) *the purport of*' what is written.' Thus much being premised, it remains to compare the latter hemistich of this seventh verse, with a strikingly similar passage in 2 Kings xxii. 13:—'Great is the wrath of the LORD that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this book, *to do according unto all that which is written concerning us.*' Following the clew here given, we may thus render Ps. xl. 7, 8—

Then said I, Now I understand:

What in the roll of the book is enjoined upon me.

To do Thy will, O LORD, is my delight:

Yea Thy law is within my heart.

Thus the central revelation of the Psalm consists in two particulars:—

[i.] Sacrifice is not required. (ver. 6).

[ii.] Obedience is required. (7, 8).

The concluding portions of the Psalm fall in with the hypothesis that the whole refers to a time of captivity. In the first half the allusion is to a spiritual revelation, and to a rock of truth whereon the feet of the waverer had been set; in the second to the innumerable physical evils that encompassed the Psalmist, and from which he still had need to be delivered. 'Be pleased, O LORD, to deliver me: O LORD, make haste to help me...Let all those that seek Thee rejoice and be glad in Thee; let such as love Thy salvation say con-

¹ As preserved *e. g.* in the expression for sunset. The sun is said to *go out* and *go in*, when it rises and sets.

For the construction, see Ps. cv. 18, *et passim*.

² See note B, p. 185.

tinually, The LORD be magnified. But I am poor and needy ; yet the LORD thinketh upon me : Thou art my help and my deliverer ; make no tarrying, O my God.'

III. *On the purport of the citation.* In Heb. x. the frequent legal sacrifices of victim after victim are contrasted with the single oblation of the One. 'The law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect ... But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins. Wherefore, when He cometh into the world¹, He saith, Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared me : In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin Thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do Thy will, O God.' (Heb. x. 1—7.)

Then follows an analysis of the passage cited :

By first saying—'Sacrifice and offering and burnt-offerings and offering for sin Thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein ; which are offered by the law ;'—and next saying—'Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God—He taketh away the first' (the legal sacrifices), 'that He may establish the second,' i. e. *the will of God*. 'By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all' (ver. 10) ; where the sanctification is effected *by* or *in* the 'will,' and *through the medium of* 'the offering.'

The citation thus analyzed gives prominence to the same 'first' and 'second' points as does the original ; but the 'second,' relating to the divine will, is supplemented by a specification of the *means* whereby that will is wrought. If the mention of the *σῶμα* be thus supplementary to, and not at variance with, the teaching of the Hebrew Psalm, it becomes a question of secondary moment, how the word *σῶμα* first

¹ See note C, p. 186.

found its way into the LXX. text. Being there, and admitting an interpretation not at variance with the original, it may have been adopted, not as an exact rendering of any Hebrew word there occurring, but simply as a truthful element of the familiar version, which may have found its way into that version as a textual corruption, or may have been adopted, in the first instance, as corresponding paraphrastically to the translator's view of the thought expressed.

On the relation of σώμα to the argument.

Bishop Horsley, after mentioning the emendation¹ whereby Mr Pierce seeks to bring the Hebrew into accordance with the LXX., thus continues his annotations on Ps. xl. :—

The interpretation of the LXX. may seem, in some degree, confirmed by St Paul's quotation. Pierce's conjecture is approved by Bishop Lowth. Bishop Horne, however, very justly remarks, that, 'if the Apostle's argument turned on the word σώμα, such an emendation might seem necessary. But that word is not essential to the argument, which seems to stand clear and full, whatever the meaning of σώμα κατηρτίσω μοι.' He might have added, that the Apostle's argument would be complete, if these words were expunged, or if they had been omitted in the citation. Archbishop Secker was clearly of the same opinion. 'It is not certain,' says the Archbishop, 'that the Apostle argues from the word σώμα at all. He quotes the translation of the LXX. as he found it in his copy; lays a stress on what is in the Hebrew, but none on the rest; either knowing it not to be there, or being restrained by the Spirit of God from making use of it.'—

This however is an extreme statement; though it may be admitted on the other hand that σώμα occurs only as a medium for the operation of the θέλημα, and must be viewed in close and inseparable connection therewith. The inefficacy of the ancient sacrifices, evinced by their multitudinousness

¹ אֲנִי נֹהֵא for אֲנִי נֹהֵא.

(ver. 2), followed from the lack of voluntariness in the offering. They were offered *according to the law*¹, and so on compulsion; but the offering of Christ's life was voluntary: 'I lay it down of myself' (Joh. x. 18); 'Himself He offered through the eternal Spirit' (Heb. ix. 14). But the *σῶμα* was a pre-requisite to His complete submission, and obedience *μέχρι θανάτου* (Phil. ii. 8), to the *θέλημα* wherein we are sanctified.

NOTES ON CHAPTER VIII.

A. The fifty-first Psalm plainly inculcates the need of spirituality in worship. 'Thou desirest not sacrifice' (ver. 16); 'The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit' (ver. 17). But, despite its inscription, it is not clear that this Psalm is to be referred to the age of David. If the rendering, *Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned* (ver. 4) be correct, it is a strong argument against retaining the title: 'To the chief Musician. A Psalm of David, when Nathan the Prophet came unto him, after he had gone in to Bath-sheba.' And, again, the natural interpretation of ver. 18, 19, seems to point to a later age than David's. 'The two last verses seem plainly to shew this Psalm to have been written during the captivity, and therefore the title to be wrong...At present God could not accept any offering, because the temple and altar were destroyed: but, would He in mercy restore them, he would that moment do all those honours to God which He had required in His law.' *Mudge*. (For counter arguments see Phillips *in loc.*) But even if these two difficulties could be explained away, it would still be more natural to suppose that the Psalmist had come at length, after sore perplexity, to feel his sinfulness, although it had not broken out into such open acts as murder or adultery. At length he learns that God's sentence is just (ver. 4). He prays for 'a clean heart,' and 'a right spirit.' The words: 'Deliver me from blood-guiltiness,' are not such as might be

¹ There is a reading *κατὰ νόμον*, which would further emphasize the *compulsoriness* of the old sacrifices.

expected, after the prayer for a perfect inward purity (ver. 7); but a prayer to be delivered from the violence (דמים) of others would be appropriate. With this agree the immediately following expressions, *God of my salvation* [Ps. cxliv. 10], and, *Thy righteousness* [xxii. 31]. Compare Ps. lix. 3.

B. An attempt to make the clauses of ver. 8 more coherent, suggested this construction of כתוב as an *accusative of motion towards*; thus [i.] 'I have come to what is written,' or [ii.] 'I have entered into &c.' I find a like conjecture about the meaning of באתי in Dr Geddes' translation of the Psalm, where the word is rendered:—*Now I come at thy meaning*. The second clause would be *poetically*, הכתוב עלי במגלת הספר, but the *poetical* inversion brings about the omission of the article before כתוב.

This derived use of באתי is not frequent in the Bible, but it may be illustrated by Eccl. iii. 22: מי יביאנו לראת. *Who shall bring him to see?* Cp. בא לפני (Gen. vi. 13). May not the difficult words אבוא בגברות אדני יהוה (Ps. lxxi. 16), mean that, *I will enter upon* (the contemplation or recital of) the mighty acts of the LORD God? With this meaning of אבוא, which agrees well with the context, [and with the construction of Job iii. 6], the verse has been rendered by French and Skinner:

The greatness of the Lord JEHOVAH shall be my theme;
Thy mercies, Thine only, will I commemorate.

So Bp Horsley: 'I will enter upon [the subject of] the Lord Jehovah's great might.' There is another derived use of בא (with עד) in 2 Sam. xxiii. 19, where it is said that Abishai 'did not attain unto [Angl. come up to] the three.' From the meaning: 'attain unto *in prowess*,' to the preceding: viz. 'attain unto *in knowledge*,' the transition is easy. The adjective קרוב is used, (1) of local proximity; (2) of mental proximity, *within reach of the understanding*; as when the law is described as 'not in heaven,' beyond man's reach, but *nigh*, yea even in his heart. It is quite as natural *a priori* for בא, as for קרוב, to have this double application. In later Hebrew, השיג is *very commonly* used as in the following examples:—'But the truth of the matter the human intellect cannot comprehend nor *attain unto*.' 'What then was that which Moses our Rabbi sought *to attain unto*.'

he sought to know the truth of the existence, &c.' Bernard's *Maimonides*, p. 77. For the use of בְּאֵתִי, compare Rashi's paraphrase of אִם בָּאֵתִי לְהַגִּיד וּלְדַבֵּר עִמּוֹ מִסֵּפֶר (Ps. xl. 5): אֲנִי־דָבָר וְג'.

C. With a different division of words we might read, διὸ εἰς, ἐρχόμενος [for εἰσερχόμενος] εἰς τὸν κόσμον, λέγει, κ.τ.λ., or with a slight change: διὸ ὁ εἰς, ἐρχόμενος κ.τ.λ. In favour of the alteration it may be urged that:—

[i.] It gives a grammatical *definiteness* to the sentence.

[ii.] The use of εἰς, or ὁ εἰς [διὰ τοῦ ἐνός. Rom. v. 17, 19], has a special appropriateness in a passage which gives marked prominence to the contrast between the many and the ONE.

[iii.] The Messiah is elsewhere spoken of as ὁ ἐρχόμενος [not εἰσερχόμενος] εἰς τὸν κόσμον. The phrase εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον is used of *Sin* (Rom. v. 12), and of the κενοδοξία ἀνθρώπων (Sap. xiv. 14); but seems *not to be used of persons*, either in the Canonical Books, or in the Apocrypha. It occurs in the *textus receptus* of 2 Joh. 7, but the true reading is probably ἐξῆλθον κ.τ.λ. See (for ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον) Joh. i. 9; vi. 14; ix. 39; xi. 27; xii. 46; xvi. 28; xviii. 37; 1 Tim. i. 15. For ἐρχόμενος in connection with ἦκω (ver. 7), see ver. 37.

CHAPTER IX.

The Allegory of Hagar.

Gen. xvi., xxi. ; Gal. iv. 21—31.

IN seeking to fix the meaning of the word by which the Apostle introduces the 'Allegory' of Hagar, it is natural first of all to have recourse to the Hellenistic authors, with whom the terminology of allegorism was in common use; and of them, especially to one, 'who lived at a time which renders his works peculiarly valuable for the purpose of our enquiry.' Of the works of PHILO, so much has come down to us, that we are in a position not only to discover therefrom the nature of his allegorical deductions, but to estimate their attractiveness to the mind of the writer, and the extent to which they are to be regarded as components of his system. Had fragments of those works alone remained, it could not have been affirmed with full assurance that, whereas 'they [the Christian Fathers] occasionally allegorize, he never misses the opportunity:' that while 'they in a few instances supersede the historical meaning, he can scarcely be said to allow the historical meaning to stand at all:' and that 'they were almost as far as any modern historian from the dreamy inconsecutive apprehension of historical facts which we find in Philo, who is as entirely devoid of the historical sense as an Indian philosopher.' These however we may now admit to be fair statements; and, the prevalence of such extravagance in interpretation being established, it remains to investigate how far the

author of the Epistle to the Galatians is to be regarded as adopting or sanctioning this method of the Hellenists: and, again, how far the usages of the Old Testament Scriptures may have suggested, what their interpreters—Rabbinic and Alexandrian—had developed, and were further developing, to an extravagance of absurdity.

I. St Paul's express words first demand attention. Much learning has from time to time been brought to bear upon them, but with less decisive results than might have been anticipated; and that chiefly, as it would seem, because of the undue prominence which has been given to one detail of the 'allegory.' The chief verbal discussion has centred in St Paul's reason for identifying Hagar with Mount Sinai, or the former covenant; whereas this identification is but a detail, and the chief point which challenges enquiry is the mode and purport of his antecedent transition from history to allegory. Though the key-word of the passage is not *Ἀγαρ*, but *ἀλληγορούμενα*, the grammatical difficulties attendant upon the usual rendering of this latter have been very commonly depreciated or overlooked. The right understanding of the word is the first pre-requisite for the interpretation of the passage. With it the Apostle passes from history to allegory; and it is the mode and purport of this transition which it is the commentator's chief aim to elucidate. Have we therein an argument whereby the folly of the Judaizers is to be refuted; or an illustration whereby the writer's meaning is to be impressed upon the imagination of his hearers? To such enquiries diverse answers have been given.

[i.] Dr Lightfoot expresses the opinion that, 'whereas with Philo the allegory is the whole substance of his teaching, with St Paul it is but an accessory. He uses it rather as an illustration than an argument; as a means of representing in a lively manner the lessons before enforced on other grounds.'

[ii.] It is the view of Professor Jowett, that 'to an Alexandrian writer of the first century (may we not say therefore to St Paul himself?)' the distinction between an illustration and an argument 'could hardly have been made intelligible.

That very modern distinction . . . was precisely what his mind wanted to place it on a level with the modes of thought of our own age. We must therefore find some other way of characterizing the passage. It is neither an illustration nor an argument, but an interpretation of the Old Testament Scripture, after the manner of the age in which St Paul lived; that is, after the manner of the Jewish and Christian Alexandrian writers.'

[iii.] Others, as Dr Wordsworth, so far agree with the preceding statement as to regard the passage in the light of 'an interpretation;' not however a merely fanciful and subjective one. The words of the sacred narrative 'have a second spiritual sense; the holy Apostle does *not take away the History*, but he teaches us what is spiritually signified by it.' 'The Apostle here instructs us how to allegorize aright,—namely to preserve the truth of the history, while we elicit from it its spiritual sense. Abraham, he says, had two sons, from two wives; here is the *History*. He then tells what was their spiritual meaning; there is the *Allegory*.'

There is an ambiguity of application in Dr Lightfoot's statement [i] as it stands. The passage now under discussion consists of two main divisions:

a. The historical citation.

'Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise.' (Gal. iv. 21—23.)

b. Its allegorical application.

'Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage¹, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in

¹ Cf. *ἡ τοῦ νόμου διαθήκη* (Acts iii. 25).

bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free' (ver. 24—31).

The *whole passage* is, or *seems* to be, viewed in the statement (i) as 'a means of representing in a lively form the lessons before enforced on other grounds;' the term 'allegory' being taken to include the narrative, as the groundwork of the allegorical superstructure. In (ii) there is less ambiguity. St Paul's whole treatment of the history is classed with current modes of 'interpretation,' and is viewed as an appeal to the imagination rather than to the judgement of his hearers. The statement (iii) is chiefly objectionable in respect of the expression, '*second* (i.e. spiritual) sense.' The 'spiritual sense'—as will be maintained below—is identical with the true significance of the history; and *the allegorical application* is but 'a means of representing in a lively form the lessons' which might have been, and *are* elsewhere¹, enforced by way of direct and non-allegorical inference from the history.

The great difficulty is in the twenty-fourth verse: '*which things are an allegory, &c.*;' where the statement that the foregoing narrative is 'an allegory' seems to be explained or justified by what follows: '*for* these are the two covenants, &c.' Whether *ἄρα* should be retained or not, in the following verse, is a matter of detail, and of slight importance in comparison with the interpretation of the clause, *ἅτινά*

¹ Rom. x. 6—16, *infra*.

ἐστὶν ἀλληγορούμενα. Bishop Ellicott renders the disputed clause: 'which things *are allegorized*;' and further explains the rendering as equivalent to: 'which things *are allegorical*;' 'by the which things another is meant' (*Genev. Transl.*). Dean Alford adopts the rendering: 'which things *are allegorical*;' and adds: 'i.e. to be understood otherwise than according to their literal sense.' Mr Conybeare's rendering is: 'all this *is allegorical*.' No one of the preceding translations differs materially from that of the Authorized Version, which is adopted by Professor Jowett, and explained as meaning: 'which things are spoken in one way, but designed to be understood in another.' By one and all it seems to be affirmed that there the passage has an allegorical meaning discrete from, and at least equally authoritative with, its direct historical significance.

It may be urged moreover that all renderings which make ἀλληγορούμενα a 'primary predicate', present the general statement, '*which things are an allegory*,' as deduced from or justified by an intricate series of assumptions about *details*; whereas it would have been a more natural order of proceeding to begin with the general assumption that the passage was, in this or that sense, allegorical, and afterwards to apply the proposed method of interpretation to particulars. To the *English reader*, at any rate, it will appear that the Apostle thus inverts the natural order of proceeding, when he writes—or is represented as writing—'which things are an allegory; *for*² these are the two covenants; the one from Mount Sinai,... which is Agar, &c.'

On the meaning and construction of ἀλληγορούμενα.

There are two established usages of the word ἀλληγορεῖν, viz. :

¹ Donaldson, *Greek Gram.* p. 360.

² This *might* be said to imply the broad statement that, the two women being two covenants, all the circumstances of their history were therefore

to be allegorized. The use of γὰρ assumed above is not the only use possible: perhaps it may not be the most appropriate: but suffice it to have called attention to the point.

1. To speak in an allegory.
2. To treat or interpret as an allegory.

The former is adopted in the Vulgate rendering, *per allegoriam dicta*; but this requires the perfect participle, rather than the present (*ἀλληγορούμενα*), which actually occurs.

The latter is more frequently adopted, and the clause is rendered: 'which things *are allegorized*.' This might import, grammatically, either that the things in question were *then* being expounded allegorically (sc. by the Apostle), or that they were *habitually* so expounded. The former does not commend itself as appropriate, although perhaps involved in Dr Wordsworth's statement, that the things 'are *not* an allegory... but they *are allegorized*, or allegorically *expounded*.' The latter is required by the majority of the received renderings, which make *ἀλληγορούμενα* practically equivalent to *ἀλληγορικά*. It may be remarked, however, that this quasi-adjectival use needs explanation, and that it leaves in full force the above-mentioned objection from the context—*αὗται γάρ εἰσιν κ.τ.λ.*

If the received *construction* of the disputed clause be the true one, the words *ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα* are approximately equivalent to *ἅτινα ἀλληγορεῖται*¹. Considering it thus, we may be helped to a different explanation of the force of the participle. The expression, *ἅτινα ἀλληγορεῖται*, is immediately suggestive of such phrases as, *ὄφεις ἀλληγορεῖται ἡδονή*², where it is not stated barely that *ὄφεις* is *allegorized*, or has an allegorical significance; but the thing (*ἡδονή*) is added, to which *ὄφεις* is allegorically equivalent. A like usage of the *active* occurs in *Κρόνον ἀλληγοροῦσι τὸν χρόνον*³. Can the construction in Gal. iv. 24 be assimilated to the foregoing?

In *translating*, as it were, from the language of history to the language of allegory, we may reasonably have recourse to the analogy of translation from any one language, as Hebrew, to any other, say Greek. A suitable example is

¹ See note A, p. 204.

² See Ellicott *in loc.*

afforded by the second Gospel, where the Saviour's words : 'Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani ?' are first transcribed, and then rendered into Greek. The formula of transition is : ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνεύμενον, '*which is, being interpreted ;*' and then follow the equivalent Greek words : ὁ θεός μου, ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί με ἐγκατέλιπες ; If St Paul's formula of transition from history to allegory were rendered analogously, it would import that the narrative, *being allegorized*, i.e. *if* or *when* allegorized, assumed such and such a form. It may be added that the position of the substantive verb, which *precedes* the participle, favours the rendering : 'the which *are*, being allegorized, &c.' The next clause is a parenthetic explanation of the Apostle's reason for applying the allegorical form of representation. 'For these be [the] two covenants'—αὗται γάρ εἰσιν [αἱ] δύο διαθήκαι. St Paul, having premised certain historical facts about Abraham's 'two wives,' undertakes to identify the one with Judaism, the other with the gospel covenant ; first of all assuming that his readers were familiar with the thought that the two wives typified the two covenants. Starting with this *general* assumption, he undertakes to work out the *details* of the allegory ; and thus, from an admission which his readers would readily make, he leads them to a conclusion which they had not foreseen :—

'The which are, being allegorized,—

For these be the two covenants [as all allow]—

The one from mount Sinai...which is Hagar...

Whereas we, brethren, like Isaac, are the children of promise.'

Gal. iv. 24, 28.

The change from the neuter, ἄτινα, to the feminine, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ, if felt at all as a difficulty, may be sufficiently accounted for as brought about by the intervention of the parenthetic, αὗται γάρ εἰσιν αἱ δύο διαθήκαι, where αὗται may be a feminine *attracted* by διαθήκαι, or may mean 'these *women*.' The primary predicate of the main sentence now follows, and, as frequently happens, is so far modified by the parenthesis, that it might, structurally, be regarded as a continuation of it.

After the mention of Hagar (ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ) follow more parentheses, up to the commencement of ver. 28, which introduces the second main division of the allegory. Here the connection with the remote ἅτινά ἐστιν (ver. 24) is broken off¹, and the categorical mode of statement is adopted: ὑμεῖς δὲ... ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα ἐστέ.

The above outline of the allegory exhibits a correspondence between its two main divisions and the two chief points in the history; but the correspondence of each to each is not precisely the same in the second case as in the first; for the name of one wife, Hagar, finds place in the allegory, but not so the name of Sarah. This omission is significant. 'He who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise.' And accordingly, the one κατὰ σάρκα γεννώσα, is mentioned in the allegory; but the name of Sarah is omitted, *because it is St Paul's aim to throw fleshly descent into the background.* For this reason the earthly mother is passed by, and the accepted sons are described emphatically as ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα, children of Promise.

The proposed construction of the introductory formula—ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα—would remove a difficulty, which some now feel, in accepting the statement that the narrative is not *an allegory*, but that it is *allegorized*; that St Paul is 'not denying [or overlaying] the historical truth of the narrative,' but only presenting its actual teachings in a form calculated to impress its inner truth indelibly upon the mind. The argument is wholly historical, and dependent upon the *fact* that a descent from Abraham, κατὰ σάρκα, was not, as the Judaizers contended, the ground of acceptance before God. This the narrative shews plainly; for it introduces a progeny 'born after the flesh,' and not accepted; and another, the sole ground of whose acceptance was 'the Promise.'

¹ Or the case may be put thus. The neuter ἅτινα alludes to the *circumstances* of the narrative; and it is only when a disturbing parenthesis has intervened, that it is followed up by the name of

the woman Hagar. The form of expression in ver. 28 [*not ἐτέρα δέ*, corresponding to *μία μὲν*] indicates a recovery from the disturbing effect of the now remote parenthesis.

The points are then represented in the allegorical form, the better to impress them upon the reader's imagination ; but the argument is summed up in the history itself, and would remain *entire* if denuded of its allegorical adornment. The same argument, be it noted, is deduced directly, in a subsequent¹ epistle, from the narrative which underlies this allegory of Hagar. In the passage alluded to, St Paul is contending that God did not once for all limit His election by a promise to one line, *κατὰ σάρκα*, but still reserved to Himself the prerogative of having mercy 'on whom I will have mercy,' and of having compassion 'on whom I will have compassion.' This reservation was further shewn, argues St Paul, in the preference of Jacob to the firstborn Esau, on whom the election, if merely *κατὰ σάρκα*, must have fallen:—

'For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel : neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children : but, *In Isaac shall thy seed be called* (Gen. xxi. 12). That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God : but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. For this is the word of promise, *At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son* (Gen. xviii. 10). And not only this ; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac ; (For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth ;) it was said unto her, *The elder shall serve the younger* (Gen. xxv. 23). As it is written, *Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated* (Mal. i. 2, 3). What shall we say then ? Is there unrighteousness with God ? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, *I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion* (Ex. xxxiii. 19). So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.' (Rom. ix. 6—16.)

¹ If the allegorical accessories had been introduced in the *later* epistle, it might have been thought that they added something to the argument. As it is,

their disuse confirms the view that they are not only non-essential, but contain no additional argument.

Here the call of the Gentiles is declared to be in strict accordance with that very law by which the Jews sought to establish the exclusive privileges of Abraham's fleshly descendants: granting indeed that they might be communicated, but to those only who should conform as proselytes to the ordinances of Judaism. The *promise* was the one efficient cause of Isaac's acceptance, as again of Jacob's; and God's purpose would still continue to manifest itself in unimagined forms, 'As he saith also in Osee, *I will call them my people, who were not my people.*' (Rom. ix. 25.) In Gal. iv. the argument is similar, and differs only by being represented allegorically. 'You have misread the history,' argues St Paul, 'and have given undue prominence to what was non-essential. You should have laid stress, not on the *κατὰ σάρκα*, but on the *διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*, and then you would not thus have mistaken the nature of the divine election. The two mothers correspond, as you will grant, to the two covenants. Consider the matter in detail; and I will shew you that Jewish externalism corresponds to the natural descent of the outcast Ishmael; while the accepted progeny were then, temporally, sons of Sarah, but then, and now, and eternally, the seed of *Promise.*'

II. Of the two points which remain to be considered, the distribution of the clauses in ver. 25—28 next demands attention.

After concluding that Hagar 'answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children,' St Paul continues: 'But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all' (ver. 26). It is commonly supposed that this verse is an elliptical 'completion of the parallel,' and hypothetically susceptible of expansion into some such form as is below indicated;—

'Now all this is allegorical; for these two women are the two covenants;

The first (*μία μὲν*) given from Mount Sinai, whose children are born into bondage, which is Hagar, (for the word Hagar

in Arabic signifies Mount Sinai); and she answers to the earthly Jerusalem, for she is in bondage with her children.

But [*Sarah is the second covenant in Christ, and answers to the heavenly Jerusalem; for*] the heavenly Jerusalem is free which is the mother of us all. And so it is written, Rejoice thou barren that bearest not; break forth into shouting, thou that travailest not; for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath the husband (Is. liv. 1). Now we (ἡμεῖς δέ), brethren, like Isaac, are children [born not naturally, but] of God's promise.'

The above is extracted from Mr Conybeare's translation of the Epistle. Dean Alford, again, remarks that ἡ δὲ ἄνω (ver. 26) is not opposed to μία μὲν (ver. 24), 'which as Meyer observes, is left without apodosis, the reader supplying that the other covenant is Sara, &c.' So Dr Lightfoot, on μία μὲν—'The true antithesis would have been ἐτέρα δέ, but it melts away in the general fusion of the sentence.' The imperfection of the correspondence between ver. 26 and the second portion of the *narrative* is very plainly allowed too by Professor Jowett, who observes *in loc.*: 'Here St Paul drops the figure, and compares the heavenly Jerusalem with Jerusalem that now is. What we expect to follow is—*But the other covenant is Sarah the freewoman, whose children are free.* Instead of this the Apostle only works out the idea of freedom.' If then the conclusion of the allegory is not found in ver. 26, should it not rather be sought, as above, in ver. 28? It would have been quite in accordance with St Paul's habit of 'going off at a word,' if at the mention of 'Jerusalem which now is,' he had dismissed the narrative from his thoughts, and passed on, by way of contrast to 'Jerusalem which is above.' As it is, we may suppose the mention of the heavenly Jerusalem to have suggested itself in connection with 'Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children;' but the antithesis thus suggested is *subordinated* to the history, and made to lead up to the second main point in the allegory: 'Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of Promise.' This promise (*sc.* to the Gentile Church) is recorded in the preceding verse:

Rejoice thou barren that bearest not, &c. 'So then, brethren, [being thus *by promise*, ver. 23] we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free' (ver. 31).

III. The most perplexing (though not most important) question remains, viz.: How comes Hagar to be identified with mount Sinai and the Jewish polity? The MS. authority and later editors being not very unequally divided¹ about the admission of the word Ἰαγάρ, in ver. 25, it will be necessary to consider the two subjoined readings, whereof the latter (that of the *textus receptus*) is perhaps to be preferred.

[i] τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ.

[ii] τὸ γὰρ Ἰαγάρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ.

A consideration of some importance in deciding between these two classes of readings is, that τὸ Ἰαγάρ, though quite grammatical (in the sense, *the word Hagar*), is, notwithstanding, a combination of rare occurrence², and hence, owing to its strangeness, likely to have been omitted, but very unlikely to have been inserted by error of transcription, or foisted into the text as an emendation. The last word of the preceding verse being Ἰαγάρ, it would be remarkable if from

ἦτις ἐστὶν Ἀγάρ το γάρ Ἀγάρ

something had not been lost in transcription, through *homoteleuton*. If γάρ were omitted, δέ would naturally be supplied; which accounts for the existent reading τὸ δέ Ἰαγάρ. And again, from the tempting omission of the second Ἰαγάρ, the simpler τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ would take its rise.

[i] With this reading, the meaning of the clause can scarcely be, that 'mount Sinai is in Arabia'. 'As it is, the

¹ So Jowett *in loc.* See also note B, p. 205.

² With Ἰαγάρ, the feminine article would be expected, the more so that ἦτις ἐστὶν Ἰαγάρ precedes.

³ Would not this necessitate the changed order, ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ ἐστὶν?

Moreover, if the rendering, *for Sinai is a mountain in Arabia*, were adopted, would there not be a stress on the ὄρος? the order being, ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ, not ὄρος ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ ἐστὶν, which would be required to make ὄρος 'un-emphatic.'

law of emphasis would require it to be rendered, *For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia*; information which the Judaizing Galatians would hardly require.'

[ii] Professor Jowett, with the received reading, thus connects Hagar with mount Sinai: 'For this Hagar is mount Sinai, *in the land of the children of Hagar*.' To the same effect Dr Lightfoot: 'Such too seems to be the most probable account of his meaning, *even if*, with the received text, we retain Hagar: *This Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia*, i. e. it represents mount Sinai, because mount Sinai is in Arabia, the land of Hagar and her descendants. It is not ἡ Ἀγαρ, the woman Hagar, but τὸ Ἀγαρ, the thing Hagar, the Hagar of the allegory, the Hagar which is under discussion.' If, however, the reader's first impression, viz. that τὸ Ἀγαρ points to an etymological¹ connection, be the right one, there is no necessity for assuming that the *current* etymological explanation is to be received. According to this view 'Hagar' contains an allusion to a local Arabic name of Mount Sinai: τὸ δὲ Σινᾶ ὄρος οὕτω μεθερμηνεύεται τῇ ἐπιχωρίῳ αὐτῶν γλώττῃ. This citation is from Chrysostom, who goes on to speak of the mountain as, ὁμώνυμον τῇ δούλῃ. 'To the same effect writes Theophylact, who is often a mere echo of Chrysostom, as do one or two anonymous commentators in the Œcumenian Catena, without doubt deriving their information from the same source.' And further: 'Even if it be granted that his hearers were acquainted with the fact which was the key to his meaning, is ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ at all a likely expression to be used by any writer for ἐν τῇ Ἀραβικῇ γλῶσσῃ or Ἀραβιστί, unless it were made intelligible by the context?' If the explanation be etymological, is it not more likely *a priori* to

¹ See note A, p. 175. It is not disputed that τὸ Ἀγαρ may mean 'the word Hagar'; it is only asserted by some that it does not of necessity mean that. Any other meaning would, however, need illustration from allegorical or other writings. In τὸ ἀνέβη, the ety-

mological substratum of the word is alluded to; but, independently of that, we require analogous usages of *proper names*, to justify the explanation of τὸ Ἀγαρ which is adopted *e. g.* by Dr Lightfoot.

have been drawn not from Arabic, but from Hebrew, which was at once the sacred tongue, and the language in which the narrative in question was written?

To recapitulate the results arrived at:—

1. It has been argued, on merely textual grounds, and independently of any preconceived *explanation*, that the reading τὸ Ἰαγὰρ is to be retained.

2. τὸ Ἰαγὰρ probably means 'the word Hagar.'

3. The explanation of the word is to be drawn from a Hebrew source; the process being either *literal*¹, or *etymological*; probably the latter. But it must not be taken for granted that the explanation is now *discoverable*. Subjoined, however, is a quasi-etymological interpretation that may be worth considering, if not for the result, at least for the process by which it is obtained.

An Interpretation of the word Hagar.

In seeking for an explanation of a proper name, it must be borne in mind that according to the usages of Biblical (not to say of Rabbinic) Hebrew, the required derivation may be *altogether fictitious*; and, secondly, that a *compound derivation* is quite as appropriate as one from a single root. It suffices, on the one hand, that the form of the name to be analyzed should resemble the form of certain words with which it is compared; and, secondly, that the name should *suggest*, rather than contain, the word or words which are regarded as its *quasi-constituent* parts. To take two familiar examples:—SAMUEL is variously interpreted as, *heard of God*, and as *asked of God*; but on neither supposition is the 'derivation' fully exhibited in the name. The name ISSACHAR exhibits the transitional phenomenon of a consonant *written*, but *unvocalized*, and therefore unpronounceable; and it thus leads up by two stages to such elliptic compounds as *Samuel*,

¹ In Rabbinical writings, letters are sometimes interchanged according to certain empirical laws. Two words, or sets of words, are then said to be equi-

valent, when their letters can be interchanged in accordance with one of these laws. See *Introduction*.

from which one consonant at least has dropped out in the process of combination¹.

The name HAGAR may be very simply explained on the above principles as an elliptical compound. The accent being on the second syllable, and the vowel having a broader sound than is commonly given to it in English, the word *Hagár* differs but slightly in pronunciation from *Hargár*: much less, certainly, than *Darmesek* (2 Chron. xxviii. 5) from the usual form, *Dammesek* [Damascus]. *Hagar* would thus suggest, by its first syllable, the common word for *ὄρος*, and by its second, the common word for *pilgrimage*² or *sojourning*. The tendency to pronounce *ar* as *a* is observable alike in ancient and modern languages. In a Talmudic form of the Hebrew *amar* (to say), the *r* is replaced by a quiescent consonant [N]. On the other hand, such quadriliteral Hebrew words as *qardom* are formed by the insertion of *r*; while in Syriac, *barth* e.g. is written with the *linea occultans* (the mark of quiescence) under the *r*, and is thus phonetically equivalent to its Hebrew synonym, *bath*. As this Syriac word is phonetically *bath*, but grammatically *barth*, so *Hagar* may, with etymological intent, be regarded as equivalent to *Hargar*.

The article before 'Αραβία has to be noticed. St Paul, when speaking of his visit to Arabia (Gal. i. 17), leaves the name indefinite: 'I went εἰς 'Αραβίαν, and returned again εἰς Δαμασκόν.' Is there any significance in the use of τῇ before 'Αραβία in iv. 25? It might be said that it is a matter indifferent whether the article be here used or not; it is, however, accordant with Old Testament usage to regard ἡ 'Αραβία³ as suggestive of the *Arabah* or *wilderness*. If this allusion be assumed in the passage before us, we have in the explanation of Hagar's name above set forth an expressive reference to

¹ Compound words other than proper names are in like manner defective. Thus פֶּרֶשׁ is explained as compounded of פֶּרֶשׁ and פָּרָה; עֶרְפֶּל, of עֶרֶב and אֶפֶל; and the letter ב has disappeared from רִמְפֵּי. Proper names might be

expected to be still more abbreviated.

² It is sometimes said that the whole name means simply *wanderer* or *wandering*: but the root הָנַר is not used in Hebrew.

³ See Tromm. *Concord. in LXX*.

the historical associations of the covenant which she represents. 'This *Hagar*, or *mount of sojourning*, is mount SINAI, in the wilderness;' where there is the same emphasis on *Sinai* as on *Sion*¹ in Heb. xii. 22. The wilderness was the scene of Israel's wanderings, and mount Sinai in that wilderness represents *Jerusalem that now is*; 'for here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come.' Mount Sion, on the contrary, corresponds to the heavenly Jerusalem, and is contrasted with Mount Sinai: 'For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire...But ye are come *unto mount Sion*, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem' (Heb. xii. 18, 22).

IV. The foregoing explanation of the clause τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ κ. τ. λ. is purely conjectural, and rests upon no authority. Whether it commends itself as plausible or not, we again urge the merely secondary nature of this part of the investigation. The all-important question is, How does the Apostle introduce the allegory? and the answer to this question depends upon the construction of ἀλληγορούμενα. If it be used as above suggested, the argument is clearly based upon the history, and the allegory is not, nor is it supposed to be, of the essence of the argument. In using such a form of representation, the Apostle is adapting his teaching to the receptivity of his Galatian converts, and imitating the patriarchal expedient of associating names and things, in such a way that the name of HAGAR might ever afterwards recall the great spiritual lesson that he purposed to impress upon his disciples.

The forced verbal argumentations of the Rabbins, and their pernicious use of 'the letter that killeth,' may be referred doubtless, in some degree, to a misplaced reverence for each constituent element of the sacred language. It was inconceivable to them that an inspired writer should have used the most ordinary of expressions without some recondite reason for not having used another that might have served as well;

¹ Σιών δρει.

and hence it came to be agreed amongst them, that in very forms and arrangements of the letters, the highest mysteries lay enshrined¹.

It may be granted, however, that the example of the sacred writers themselves must have conspired with other causes to influence the interpretations of the allegorists, of whatever school; and accordingly, it may be surmised that the peculiar significance of the Biblical names was a starting point for diverse extravagances of exegesis; whilst, on the other hand, it is obvious that such extravagances involve a total misconception of the principles from which they took their rise. In the sacred narrative the names of individuals are, ever and anon, adapted to, or explained in accordance with, the most noteworthy circumstances in the lives and conditions of those who bear them. Sometimes, a child is named after the attendant circumstances of his birth; sometimes, a patriarchal blessing is commemorated by a pointed reference to the name of him upon whom it was bestowed. But mark the perversions of the hyper-allegorists. They credited names, not with a marvellous significance, but with a mystic power. They said in effect that Moses was rescued from the water because named Moses; Samuel, asked of the Lord because named Samuel, rather than so named in commemoration of the mother's prayer. Names come thus to be exalted above things, and are viewed as the symbols of transcendental mysteries; while the historical circumstances from which they borrow their significance are cast into the shade, if not utterly forgotten.

Philo, like St Paul, has an allegory of Hagar, but one which reduces the historical personages into mere philosophical abstractions. The subjoined sketch is borrowed from Dr Lightfoot, *Galatians*, ed. 2, p. 195.

"Abraham—the human soul progressing towards the knowledge of God—unites himself, first with Sarah, and then with Hagar. These two alliances stand in direct opposition

¹ See pp. 129, 130.

the one to the other. Sarah the princess—for such is the interpretation of the word—is divine wisdom. To her therefore Abraham is bidden to listen in all that she says. On the other hand Hagar, whose name signifies *sojourning* (*παροίκησις*), and points therefore to something transient and unsatisfying, is a preparatory or intermediate training—the instruction of the schools—secular learning, as it might be termed in modern phrase. Hence she is fitly described as an Egyptian, as Sarah's handmaid. Abraham's alliance with Sarah is at first premature. He is not sufficiently advanced in his moral and spiritual development to profit thereby. As yet he begets no son by her. She therefore directs him to go in to her handmaid, to apply himself to the learning of the schools. This inferior alliance proves fruitful at once. At a later date, and after this preliminary training, he again unites himself to Sarah; and this time his union with divine wisdom is fertile. Not only does Sarah bear him a son, but she is pointed out as the mother of a countless offspring. Thus is realized the strange paradox that *the barren woman is most fruitful*. Thus in the progress of the human soul are verified the words of the prophet, spoken in an allegory, that *the desolate hath many children*."

NOTES ON CHAPTER IX.

A. The clause *ἀτινά ἐστιν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας* (Col. ii. 23), is, in like manner, usually rendered as if *ἔχει* replaced *ἐστιν ἔχοντα*. But, in this case also, it seems best to include the participle, &c. in a parenthesis. See Conybeare and others *in loc.* Where does the parenthesis end? It seems best to make it include *ἐν τιμῇ τινι*. On this hypothesis, we remark that the chief (instinctive) objection to the parenthetic construction seems to arise from the comparative length of the parenthesis; and that, if this be so, then, to state the objection clearly, is to remove it; regard being had to the involved and protracted parentheticism of the Apostle's style. If the paren-

thesis were abbreviated thus: ἄτινα ἐστὶν, λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας, πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός, there would probably be no difficulty in accepting some such rendering as: 'The which *are*, though having indeed a repute for wisdom, *for* (πρὸς) the glutting of the flesh.' Cp. ἐστὶν εἰς φθοράν (Col. ii. 22). The words ἐν ἐθελοθησκειᾷ, κ.τ.λ., which follow upon σοφίας, shew *the element wherein* the repute for wisdom is attained. The clause, καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι, would seem to be best explained by referring οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι to the σῶμα. For this we have the authority of the Greek commentators, and it gives the most natural meaning to ἐν τιμῇ. The parts of the clause are consecutive: the body, being held in no honour, is recklessly abused—it being in the nature of things that are not valued to be used unsparingly. The meaning of the whole passage (on which Dr Wordsworth has some excellent remarks) would thus be, that such wilful, supererogatory enactments as 'Touch not, taste not, handle not' things meant for use and consumption, are, notwithstanding their show of 'wisdom,' for the gratification of the carnal propensities in man's mind. 'The which are (with all their repute for spirituality, in will-worship, and humility, and unsparingness of the body, as of no value, *lit.* held *not in any honour*) for the satiating of the flesh.' This rendering gives a natural *position* and an *antithesis* to the μὲν, which the non-parenthetic readings fail to do.

B. Dr Lightfoot has tabulated the MS. authorities for the various readings of the clause τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ κ.τ.λ. (*Galatians*, ed. 2, p. 189.) The last of the four readings there given being neglected, ought not the preceding to be arranged, not in *three* classes, but *four* or *two*? The reading placed first is (i) τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ ὅρος ἐστίν. 'So it is read in \aleph CFG...Augustine, Jerome...and probably *all* the Latin fathers. This is also the reading of the Gothic Version, except that it omits γὰρ... The MS. \aleph after ἐστίν adds ὃν, in which respect it stands alone, &c.' Next in order, Dr Lightfoot places (ii) τὸ δὲ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὅρος ἐστίν, and (iii) τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὅρος ἐστίν. If, however, (ii) and (iii) are to be separated, ought not \aleph , with its remarkable interpolation after ἐστίν, to stand alone? Thus the testimony in favour of (i) would be diminished. But it seems more natural in balancing the authorities for and against the omission of the word Ἄγαρ, to neglect minor variations, and to

weigh (i), not against (ii) and (iii) taken separately, but against the two combined. We should have then in favour of retaining Ἀγαρ, the authority of 'ABDEKLP with the vast majority of cursive manuscripts, with both Syriac Versions, and with the Greek commentators generally...,' and it would be necessary to reconsider the statement, that 'the strongest, because the most varied, testimony is in favour of the first of these readings.' It is difficult to account for the unexpected occurrence of the word Ἀγαρ, following upon the neuter article, if it formed no part of the original reading. On the other hand, from the reading (iii), the variations (i), (ii) might (or, so to say, *must*) have arisen through *homœoteleuton*.

P.S. ἄτ. ἐστ. ἀλληγορούμενα] '*Quæ alio quodam sensu sunt, sub. talia: vel, Quorum allegoria (quam ὑπόνοιαν veteres vocarunt) talis est.*' Poli Synops. v. 710. f.

γενῶσα] Mr Pater notices, in its bearing upon the Allegory, the avoidance or indirect use of this verb when the mother of JESUS is spoken of. Contrast Matt. i. 16, 20, 21, 23; Luke i. 31, 35; ii. 5, 7 with Luke i. 13, 57. Compare Luke xxiii. 29; Joh. xvi. 21. Bengel remarks on τὸ γεννωμένον (Luke i. 35): 'Vocabula abstracta, et neutro genere expressa, initiis illis valde congruunt.'

CHAPTER X.

The Apology of St Stephen.

Amos v. 25—27 ; Acts vii. 2—53.

‘THE speech of St Stephen is in itself an ample field of study, demanding of us much meditation before we can master either the general argument or the meaning and connection of the parts, and giving occasion for researches into Jewish history, Rabbinical traditions, and Egyptian customs.’ It contains a brief abstract of the sacred narrative—from the call of Abraham to the building of Solomon’s temple—interspersed with more or less direct citations from the original sources ; and its twofold aim, as gathered from antecedent circumstances, is to preach Jesus as the Messiah, and to defend the speaker from the charge of blasphemy ‘against Moses, and against God.’ False witnesses had said of him : ‘This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law : For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us’ (Acts vi. 13, 14) ; and it is in answer to the high-priest’s question, ‘Are these things so?’ that the address now before us was delivered.

I. Of the citations with which this address abounds, one stands out, by general consent, as its *characteristic*, and gathers round it a greater complication of difficulties than any other. It is taken from Amos v. 25—27, and is introduced as

follows: 'And they made a calf in those days, and offered sacrifice unto the idol, and rejoiced in the work of their own hands. Then God turned, and gave them up to worship the host of heaven; as it is written in the book of the prophets, *O ye house of Israel, have ye offered to me slain beasts and sacrifices by the space of forty years in the wilderness? Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them: and I will carry you away beyond Babylon*' (Acts vii. 41—43).

1. For the question, *Have ye offered &c.?* diverse answers have been assumed. Some infer that the Levitical sacrifices were *not* offered in the wilderness; or, at least, that the system was (owing to the difficulties of the situation) in partial abeyance. Others, as Dr Pusey, emphasize the pronoun, and maintain that the sacrifices were not offered to God. 'God does not say that they did not offer sacrifice at all, but that they did not offer unto *Him*. The *unto Me* is emphatic. If God is not served wholly and alone, He is not served at all.' Not dissimilarly Jerome, seeking '*quomodo hostias et sacrificium non Deo obtulerint in deserto*,' concludes that after the making of the golden calf, '*omnia quæ fecerunt, non Deo, sed idolis fecisse monstrantur. Et quod, postea, quædam Domino eos legimus obtulisse, non voluntate, sed pænarum fecerunt metu... Dominus autem non ea quæ offeruntur, sed voluntatem respicit offerentium*.' It is commonly held that the answer to the question, Μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηέγκατέ μοι; must be negative, but it is disputed whether the negation is to be made absolute or relative: whether the '*No*' means '*Not then* [from the nature of the case] *as in after time*;' or with implied reproach, '*Not to Me*.' With the latter explanation, the sequence is as follows: 'Have ye offered to *Me* slain beasts...? Not so, but ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch... And I will carry you away beyond Babylon.' The third clause here follows naturally upon the second, but the rendering of καὶ ἀνελάβετε is harsh. Mr Humphry combines the first and second clauses more harmoniously, by making both interrogative. 'Did ye sacrifice to *Me* forty years in the

wilderness, and yet adopt the worship of Moloch?' But the words *καὶ μετοικιῶ ὑμᾶς*, do not follow very smoothly upon this. It might indeed be conjectured that this harshness in the Greek has arisen from the literal transference of Hebrew idioms into a strange language, while in the original the same harshness has no place. But the original, *as usually explained*, is scarcely more harmonious than the Greek; its abruptness being fairly represented by our Authorised Version: 'Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? But [*lit.* and] ye have borne the tabernacle of your Moloch...Therefore will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus' (Amos v. 25—27). It is possible, however, so to render the passage as to avoid this appearance of abruptness.

2. The first verb of Amos v. 26 is *in the same tense* as that which stands at the commencement of ver. 27, and which is taken by the LXX. and others as a future. The Hebrew commentator Rashi has, accordingly, adopted the expedient of rendering the former also of these verbs in the future: '*Ye shall bear.*' If ver. 25 be now dismissed for a while as parenthetical, a close connection is apparent between the verses which precede and follow, thus: 'And judgement shall run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream. And ye shall take up the tabernacle of your Moloch...And I will cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus.'

3. The coherence of these verses with the preceding may be made more complete by rendering the word for '*Take thou away*' (ver. 23), as an infinitive (rather than as an imperative), although it is not denied that the received imperative rendering is equally grammatical. Two arguments however may be advanced in favour of the infinitive rendering. (a) It makes the parallelism still more complete (the infinitive serving, as it well may, for a quasi-future); and (b) the *putting away* is best ascribed to God Himself, who, in ver. 22, 'will not accept though ye offer.'

4. There remain some points to be noticed in the twenty-sixth verse.

The word translated *Moloch* cannot be a proper name, for if so, it could not be joined with a possessive affix (*your*). This however does not stand in the way of an indirect reference to Moloch, as 'your king' (*melech*). *Chiun* should also be taken as a noun substantive, in the sense, *pedestal* (of your images). So Jerome and Theodotion¹, as seems required moreover by the parallelism, for otherwise, '*perit rhythmicus ille verborum concentus*.' In the next clause, for 'star of your gods,' may be read *star-gods*, in accordance with a not uncommon usage², illustrated by Gen. xvi. 12, where Ishmael is called a *wild-ass of a man*, and by Hos. xiii. 2, where *sacrificers of men*, are not such as sacrifice men, but *men who sacrifice* (Kimchi). The verse in question may be taken as describing, first of all, the idols' paraphernalia; and secondly, in parallelism with this, the star-gods themselves, whose *canopies* and *pedestals* had been mentioned separately. The whole passage, with the exception of the parenthetic twenty-fifth verse, may now be rendered as below.

'Woe unto you that desire the day of the LORD! to what end is it for you? the day of the LORD is darkness, and not light. As if a man did flee from a lion, and a bear met him; or went into the house, and leaned his hand on the wall, and a serpent bit him. Shall not the day of the LORD be darkness, and not light? even very dark, and no brightness in it? I hate, I despise your feast-days, and I will not smell the savours of your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer me burnt-offerings, and your meat-offerings, I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts. But will put away from me the noise of thy songs; and will not hear the noise of thy viols. And judgement shall run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream... And ye shall take up the tabernacle of your king, and the

¹ Pusey *in loc.* See note A, p. 222.

² This being also a Greek construction it might be asked whether the LXX. *δορυ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν*, might not also be rendered your 'star-god.' This is doubt-

less a non-natural rendering of the Greek; but regard should be had to the extreme literalness with which the LXX. often rendered difficult sentences or expressions.

pedestal[s] of your images, your star-gods, which ye made for yourselves. And I will cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus, saith the LORD, whose name is The God of Hosts' (Amos v. 18—27).

The judgement and justice which they had neglected and cast down to the ground (ver. 7), should burst forth, after long repression, and sweep them away as with a flood (ver. 24). The idols wherein they trusted should be found unavailing in their calamity; themselves must swell the captive train. In other passages, God is depicted as bearing and carrying the infant Israel; here, by way of contrast, the idols need to be carried. They are no helpers in distress, but a dead weight and an accession to their makers' burdens. You made them 'to yourselves;' you must *take them up* and carry them. This word *take up*¹ (Amos v. 26) is from the same root as the word for *burden* in Is. xlvi., where the same contrast between God and the idols is expressed. 'Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth, their idols were upon the beasts, and upon the cattle: your carriages were heavy loaden; they are a *burden*² to the weary (beast). They stoop, they bow down together; they could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity. Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel, which are borne by me from the belly, which are carried from the womb: And even to your old age I am he; and even to hoar hairs will I carry you: I have made, and I will bear; I even I will carry, and will deliver you. To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal, and compare me, that we may be like? They lavish gold out of the bag, and weigh silver in the balance, and hire a goldsmith; and he maketh it a god: they fall down, yea they worship. They bear him upon the shoulder, they carry him, and set him in his place, and he standeth; from his place shall he not remove: yea, one shall cry unto him, yet can he not answer, nor save him out of his trouble' (Is. xlvi. 1—7. Cp. Jer. xlix. 3).

¹ נָשָׂא.

² נֶשֶׂא.

According to the interpretation which these verses illustrate, there is no allusion in Amos v. 26 to sacrificial celebrations in honour of Moloch, in contradistinction to the sacrifices spoken of in ver. 25. The *grammatical objections* to any such contrast will appear from an analysis (*infra*) of the last-mentioned verse; but, independently of these, the expressions used in ver. 26 do not naturally convey the notions of sacrifice, &c. This is well brought out by Dr Pusey, who, while arguing in favour of this contrast, intimates the inadequacy of the words used to express it. 'But whether *the king*, whom the Israelites worshipped in the wilderness, was the same as the Ammonite Molech or no, those dreadful sacrifices were then no part of his worship; else Amos would not have spoken of the idolatry as *the carrying about his tabernacle* only. He would have described it by its greatest offensiveness.'

5. The parenthesis (ver. 25), thus far omitted, has next to be considered. It may be rendered literally, with due regard to *emphasis*: 'Sacrifices and oblations offered ye me in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?' a negative answer being presupposed, as in Gen. xvii. 17, where the arrangement is similar: 'Unto him that is an hundred years old shall a child be born?' A still closer parallel is afforded by 2 Sam. vii. 5: 'Shalt thou build me an house for me to dwell in?' which is replaced in 1 Chron. xvii. 4 by the direct negation: 'Not thou shalt-build-me the house to dwell in.' As in the passage from 2 Sam. vii., the vocative 'thou' is emphatic, and the 'me,' being joined to its governing verb, is devoid of emphasis. So in Amos v. 25, there is an emphasis on 'sacrifices and oblations,' but none on the pronoun 'me,' which is joined here also to its verb, and would thus seem to be degraded, so far as emphasis is concerned, to the level of a pronominal affix. The Hebrew is fairly represented by the LXX: *μη σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατέ μοι, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ, τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*; and the question, thus put, seems to require a negative answer, and to exclude the supposition that the pronoun is to be emphasized. The question

comes in passing as an impassioned expostulation: 'Sacrifice and oblation offered ye me during the forty long years of wandering in the wilderness?' God's favour was graciously bestowed, not purchased by vain oblations, through that most notable crisis, that spring-time of national existence (Hos. ii. 15). 'Ye offered me then no oblations; think not that my favour is to be purchased by them now.' One more consideration confirms the parenthetic rendering of ver. 25. The following verses being referred to idolatries *prevalent in the time of Amos*, and to judgements *then impending*, it is no more than natural to separate them from a verse which alludes to the circumstances of a long-past age. It might indeed be worth while to ask whether this consideration could not be explained away, *if* grammatical considerations pointed to a connection (of sequence or of direct contrast) between the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth verses; but, as it is, such a connection can scarcely be brought about, except by departure from the laws of emphasis, and by a non-natural use of particles. The rendering (Rashi's) above adopted, which makes ver. 26 a declaration of coming judgement, and connects it with ver. 24, is free from the like grammatical objections. The rapid rush of denunciation is interrupted for a moment, and only for a moment, by the expostulation: 'Sacrifices and oblation offered ye me in the wilderness?' The answer is so obvious, or, from another point of view, the reproof is so unanswerable, that no pause is made for a reply. The course of judgement is no longer stayed. 'And ye shall take up and carry the idols that your own hands have made, and I will cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus, saith the LORD, whose name is The God of hosts.'

The virtual statement that sacrifices were not offered in the wilderness may be taken, as above remarked, with a certain latitude. It is competent, some would say, to affirm that *the richness and magnificence* of the later sacrifices are alone excluded. 'Ye offered not then these costly sacrifices.' Sacrifice was not then, as it came afterwards to be considered, the staple of divine service; a meritorious ground of ac-

ceptance, and the price of God's favour. Some, with Lightfoot, are of opinion that though *public* sacrifices were at times offered, yet individuals seldom or never rivalled, in their oblations, the display of later times—and that from the difficulty of obtaining victims in the wilderness. This hypothesis makes due allowance for the mention of *coals upon the altar* (Numb. xvi. 5, 9, 10), and for the peculiar nature of Korah's sin, which consisted in the usurpation of sacerdotal functions. Dr Pusey remarks, that the sacrifices in the wilderness were 'not the freewill offerings of the people, but the ordinance of God performed by his priests. The people, in that they went after their idols, had no share in, nor benefit from, what was offered in their name.' By others the 'forty years' is taken as a round number for $38\frac{1}{2}$; and it is held that during the interval '*post vitulum confectum et explorationem Cananæ*' no sacrifices at all were offered. The general ordinances about sacrifice are thought, by advocates of this last view, to refer by anticipation to the time of settlement in the promised land. But it would suffice, perhaps, to grant that the sacrificial system was not fully developed in the wilderness, and that the one main point insisted upon was the fulfilment of the moral law. There would then be no need to gloss over the sacrifices of Sinai; which were no part of an established system, but an exceptional celebration, for the ratifying of a covenant. 'And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words' (Ex. xxiv. 8). An important declaration of Jeremiah is calculated to throw further light upon this subject. 'For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them up out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: But this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well unto you' (Jer. vii. 22, 23).

II. *The Apology.*

Against the HOLY PLACE, and against the LAW, 'this man ceaseth not,' said the false witnesses, 'to speak blasphemous words.' The centre of the law was *Sacrifice*; and the law was in abeyance when the daily sacrifice was taken away. We should expect then to find in the *Apology*, a formal and direct notice of the sacrificial system and of the holy place, and not mere '*digressions*' respecting the idolatries of the Jews, and concerning the temple. MOSES, their lawgiver, was to be superseded, and the customs which he delivered them to be changed: such is the final clause of the indictment, standing in parallelism with what precedes.

The defence opens with an allusion to the call of Abraham, and the divine revelations to their great progenitor; and this is followed up by a brief sketch of the people's history, till the time when Moses came to free them from Egyptian bondage. 'Seeing one of them suffer wrong, he defended him, and avenged him that was oppressed, and smote the Egyptian: For he supposed his brethren would have understood how that God by his hand would deliver them: *but they understood not.* And the next day he shewed himself unto them as they strove, and would have set them at one again, saying, Sirs, ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one to another? But he that did his neighbour wrong thrust him away, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a judge over us? Wilt thou kill me, as thou diddest the Egyptian yesterday? (Ex. ii. 14). Then fled Moses at this saying, and was a stranger in the land of Madian...This Moses whom they refused, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a judge? the same did God send to be a ruler and a deliverer by the hand of the angel which appeared to him in the bush.... This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, *A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; Him shall ye hear...*To whom our fathers would not obey, but thrust him from them, and in their hearts turned back again into Egypt.' Moses 'received the *lively oracles* to give unto us,' but the people demanded

visible objects of worship: 'Make us gods to go before us.' Sacrifices and oblations were not required (ver. 42); but they, not content with a spiritual service, made for themselves images to worship. The (portable) *tabernacle* of Moloch suggests the '*tabernacle* of witness' (ver. 44); and this, by contrast, the fixed habitation built by Solomon for the mighty God of Jacob (ver. 47). 'Howbeit the most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet, Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool: what house will ye build me? saith the Lord: or what is the place of my rest? Hath not my hand made all these things? Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers: who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it.'

The opening of the speech was calculated to conciliate the populace, by its implied assurance that the sacred traditions were after all not repudiated by the speaker; while at the same time, it embodies the important truth that the Promise was prior to and independent of the Law. But the thirty-seventh verse contains the central point of the argument. It is said that Moses foretold the advent of a prophet like unto himself. That prophet, St Stephen affirms to be JESUS of Nazareth; and thus, far from desiring to subvert the Mosaic institutions, he is but urging upon his fellow-countrymen the injunction of Moses: 'Unto Him shall ye hearken.' The coming Prophet was to *be like unto Moses*, with whom accordingly JESUS is compared in two particulars, corresponding to the two main charges of blasphemy, against the Temple, and against the Law. The second charge is refuted by the expostulatory interrogation of Amos: 'Sacrifices and oblations offered ye me in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?' The sacrificial system was not in force under the rule of Moses; hence JESUS, in requiring a spiritual service,

and dispensing with sacrifice, *was like Moses*, 'who received the *lively oracles*¹ to give unto us,' and gave to obedience its due exaltation above ritual. Again, 'our fathers had [only] the *tabernacle of witness* in the wilderness,' for the 'house' was not yet built. 'I have not dwelt in an house since the day that I brought up Israel unto this day; but have gone from tent to tent, and from one tabernacle to another' (1 Chron. xvii. 5). Under the rule of *Moses* there was no temple, and the Divine Presence was not thought of as localized; JESUS, therefore, *was like Moses*, for He taught that 'the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth' (Joh. iv. 21, 23). This argument from the non-existence of the temple in the time of Moses, is supplemented in the following verses. David, 'who found favour before God,' desired to build a temple: but his longing was not to be gratified; it was reserved for Solomon to build the 'house.' The word Solomon² being emphasized, this point in the argument is brought out. The nation had subsisted till that time—had passed through its greatest crises, and outlived its most fondly remembered rulers—and still...no *house* was built. It was *Solomon* who built it;... and even then, it was not in temples made with hands that God deigned to dwell.

A third point in the comparison is to be noted.

To Moses it was said: 'Who made thee a ruler and a judge over us?' Him 'our fathers would not obey, but thrust him from them.' JESUS, therefore, *was like Moses*, because he was rejected by the people. 'As your fathers did so do ye...And they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers.' Thus the Apology is completed, and the charges brought against St Stephen's teaching are turned into corroborative arguments. 'You reject the doc-

¹ See note B, p. 223.

² Σολομῶν δὲ ὑποδόμησεν αὐτῷ οἶκον.

trine of JESUS of Nazareth, because He dispenses with the temple and its sacrifices. But it is for this reason that you should the rather enrol yourselves as His followers; for by the spirituality of His teaching He is designated as *like unto Moses*, in whose day the sacrificial system was in abeyance, and the temple was not yet built. By your rejection of Him, you liken Him still further to that great lawgiver, '*to whom our fathers would not obey, but thrust him from them.*'

III. *The Gospel before the Law.*

1. The Promise to Abraham contained the Gospel in itself, and thus the Gospel was before the Law. In connection with this subject a remarkable verbal argument is used by St Paul. 'Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy SEED, which is CHRIST' (Gal. iii. 16). The plural of this Hebrew word for seed occurs once only in the canonical writings, viz. in 1 Sam. viii. 15: 'And he will take the tenth of your seed[s], and of your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants;' where the plural, *seeds*, must be taken to mean *grain* or *crops*, probably with reference to *different* kinds of crops. In strict accordance with this application of the plural, is the ordinary use of the singular, viz. as a collective expression for *descendants*, implying the unification of a multitudinous posterity in a *single line*. 'It has been urged,' writes Dr Lightfoot *in loc.*, 'that the stress of the argument rests on a grammatical error; that as the plural of the word here rendered *σπέρμα* is only used to signify *grain* or *crops*, the sacred writer could not under any circumstances have said, *seeds as of many*... But the very expression in St Paul, which starts the objection, supplies the answer also. It is quite as unnatural to use the Greek *σπέρμα* with this meaning, as to use the Hebrew זרעים. Avoiding the technical terms of grammar, he could not express his meaning more simply than by the opposition, *not to thy SEEDS, but to thy SEED*. A plural substantive would be

inconsistent with the interpretation given; the singular collective noun, if it admits of plurality (*as it is interpreted by St Paul himself*, Rom. iv. 18; ix. 7), at the same time involves the idea of unity. The question therefore is no longer one of grammatical accuracy, but of theological interpretation.' In Gen. xv. 5, the collective singular, 'seed,' implies, on the one hand a multiplicity of individual descendants, and on the other a unity and limitation; for the promise is *restricted* (Gen. xxi. 12) to the line of Isaac—'in Isaac shall thy seed be called.' The singular expresses *one line* of posterity, as in Gen. iv. 25, where Eve exclaims, in reference to the birth of Seth: 'God hath appointed me *another seed* instead of Abel, whom Cain slew.' That St Paul did not build his argument upon a grammatical misconception, is made sufficiently obvious by his express words, shortly following:—'For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for *ye are all one in Christ Jesus*. And if ye be Christ's, *then are ye Abraham's SEED*, and heirs according to the promise' (Gal. iii. 27—29). The Apostle here explains what is meant by the *oneness* of the seed spoken of in ver. 16. It is a oneness of *kind*, harmonizing an infinity of diverse individualities; Jew and Greek are made one IN CHRIST, and, being thus unified by being made 'part of Christ,' they are included in that *one* seed whereon the promise rested¹.

Referring to Heb. ii. 11, where the sanctified are called brethren of the Sanctifier, Professor Jowett remarks—with perhaps over nice regard to uniformity of statement—that 'Christ is not the same as His Church, however close may be the connection between them.' This consideration however has no *special* bearing on St Paul's argument from the singular *σπέρμα*, in connection with which it is adduced by the above-named commentator. If St Paul's representation of Christians

¹ 'Ye are all *one man* in Christ; *Abraham's seed* and heirs according to and if ye are *part of Christ*, then are ye promise.' (Lightfoot.)

as *one* in Christ, be inaccurate in Gal. iii. 28, then consistency demands the repudiation of other allusions to Christ's *mystical body*, as illogical and erroneous. If however the reality of the idea be presupposed, due allowance must be made for its concurrence with the view of the singular (*σπέρμα*) propounded in ver. 16. We are familiar with the former method of representation, but less familiar with the latter : and it is from this inequality that our difficulty in interpretation arises. The two pictures must be viewed at once and with like appliances, before they will combine inseparably as a life-like whole.

2. In the Divine purpose, wherein the Law had exhibited itself from the first as temporary and conductive, the Gospel was before the Law: but in what particulars (it may be asked) is this Divine order manifested to human intelligence? Two such particulars are dwelt upon (*supra*) by St Stephen, who, as regards *Sacrifice* and the *Temple*, maintains that the Gospel system existed before the Law. A third, not indeed independent of the preceding, is the catholicity of the promise to Abraham:—‘And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed’ (Gal. iii. 8). As the taking away of the daily sacrifice favoured the growth of a more spiritual conception of true worship; so the destruction of the temple, and the dispersion of the chosen race, concurred with a greater diffusiveness in their hopes and anticipations. ‘Rising above the exclusiveness which marred the greatness of the Israelite,’ the later Psalmists ‘would extend the rights of Abraham’s children to all; for have not all, who are in heart the true servants of Jehovah, been born again as citizens of Jerusalem?’ These late approximations to the spirit of the Gospel were then brought about by a return to a state of things more or less resembling what had pre-existed, when the law was yet future. When St Paul thus writes:—‘Moreover,

¹ *The Psalms chronologically arranged.* By four Friends. In this work Dr Ewald’s theories are given.

brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea ; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea ; and did all eat the same spiritual meat ; and did all drink the same spritual drink : for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them : and that Rock was Christ ' (1 Cor. x. 1—4)—it is thought by some that he attributes to the Jews of the age referred to, such a spiritual conception of Christ as was lacking in the Apostle's times. However this may be, the circumstances of the former time were in some respects favourable to the more spiritual frame of mind. When an elaborate ritual system was established, there would be a not unnatural tendency to satisfy its express requirements more and more perfunctorily, and thus to glide, in lapse of time, into sensuous conceptions of Divine worship. The temple again, and the narrow localization of their chief acts of worship, would tend to materialize the Jews' conception of the Divine nature. To what end then served the law ? Narrowing this broad question to the point at issue, we may answer, that what was lost in spirituality was gained in definiteness. There may have been oscillations in the chosen people's religious progress ; but to assume an absolute retrogression would seem to imply, in some sort, a negation of a divinely fore-ordained plan. In earlier times, the Promise may have presented itself with more of spirituality ; in later times, with more of definiteness : it remained for those who, like St Paul, could look back upon the historical CHRIST, to combine the utmost diffusiveness and spirituality with a sure personal appropriation of the Promise.

3. 'It will greatly heighten the interest of this speech, if we can see reason to believe that it left permanent impressions on the mind of one of the hearers, the young man Saul ; and that though it failed to convince him at the time, yet he dwelt on it after his conversion, as the Apostles, after the Resurrection, called to mind some of the sayings of our Lord. That this was actually the case, is rendered highly probable by the circumstance that St Paul often falls upon

the same arguments, and uses the same expressions (not very common ones), which are here attributed to St Stephen ¹. Having exemplified this statement, Mr Humphry concludes that 'These coincidences, taken separately, might not have much force; but when joined together, they are surely strong enough to warrant the belief that the seed which was now sown in the Apostle's mind, was afterwards quickened and brought forth fruit, and that the arguments and expressions of Stephen never passed from his memory. Indeed, it is not unlikely that we owe the preservation of the speech, as we have it in this chapter, to St Paul. For among the hostile audience of the martyr, who besides would be likely to treasure it up, or to communicate it to the Evangelists?'

From the apology of St Stephen, may not St Paul have derived a thought on the priority of the Gospel to the Law?

NOTES ON CHAPTER X.

A. The occurrence of the name Remphan (not found in the Hebrew) has to be accounted for. There are various readings of the word, one being 'Ραιφάν. Some suppose the LXX. to have read ריין (for כין), and thence to have obtained 'Ραιφάν by transliteration. So Gesenius: 'LXX. interpretes כין nomen proprium numinis esse censuerunt, licet hoc (כ et ר inter se permutatis, cf. v. c. נאח Nah. i. 6, LXX. ἀρχάς = נאח) corrupte scribebant 'Ραιφάν, 'Ρηφάν; moxque magis etiam corrumperent librarii in 'Ρεμφάν, 'Ρεμφά' (*Thesaur.* 670 a). Against this view, it is urged that י would not have been replaced by φ ['Ut taceamus, ריין illos potius per 'Ρενάν expressuros fuisse.' *Rosenmüller.*] So Montfaucon—quoted by Rosenmüller—'Litera *Vau* nunquam consonantis vice fungitur in fragmentis per Græcos descriptis, nec fungi posse videtur, quandoquidem initio vocum exprimitur per ού (οὐαεί, ויחי, et vixit; οὐεσσακή, וישקרו, osculatus est). In medio autem et fine vocum modo per ου; modo, et quidem frequentius, per ω redditur.' But,

¹ Humphry on *Acts vii.* See Conyb. and Howson's *St Paul.*

on the other hand, it should be noted, that the LXX. were much given to transliterating difficult words; and hence arises a presumption that 'Ραιφάν has resulted *somehow or other* from transliteration. Another explanation is, that the word פִּי' was read as an Arabic word, and replaced by a Coptic synonym for *the planet Saturn*. But, supposing the translators to have been acquainted with some such word as 'Ραιφάν, or 'Ρεφάν, actually existing, may we not conjecture that they would have attempted to force the difficult Hebrew word under consideration into agreement with this seemingly appropriate 'Ραιφάν? Would not this suffice to account for a rare, or unique, consonantal rendering of the letter פ, elsewhere replaced [Montfaucon, *supra*] by ου, or ω? Other transliterative solutions might however be suggested.

B. In Acts vii. 38—41, it is said that:

(i) Moses ἐδέξατο λόγια ζῶντα δοῦναι ἡμῖν.

(ii) The people said, ποίησον ἡμῖν θεούς. And they rejoiced ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν.

In the citation (ver. 42, 43):

[i] Sacrifice offered ye me in the wilderness?

[ii] Ye took up τοὺς τύπους οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς.

Here a parallelism is observable.

Moses is mentioned (i) as the institutor of a spiritual worship: God declares [i] that He required no sacrifice in the time of Moses.

But the people (ii) craved for a sensuous worship, and made themselves a calf, &c.: Ye took up [ii] the images which ye had made to worship. [In Amos the expression is '*which ye made for yourselves*.' Cp. ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν.]

There are two main differences between Amos v. 25—27, and St Stephen's citation. (a) In the former there is no mention of Moloch and Remphan. (b) St Stephen, as it would seem, notwithstanding the mention of Babylon, refers καὶ ἀνελάβετε to the forty years; whereas the corresponding Hebrew word points onward from the time of Amos. But neither variation affects the general sense of the passage cited; whereof the main purport is to proclaim the inefficacy of a merely external worship, and to illustrate this inefficacy by an allusion to the circumstances of the forty years.

CHAPTER XI.

The Imprecations of Psalm LXIX.

A FEW passages, conspicuous for their sustained severity of denunciation, are fatal (some think) to certain theories, which might otherwise have seemed not inapplicable to the imprecations of the collective Psalter. 'We find in the Psalms terrible denunciations of the writer's enemies, withering anathemas, imprecations so awful that we almost tremble to read them. How are we to explain the occurrence of such prayers for vengeance? Are they justifiable? Are they, not the mere outbursts of passionate and unsanctified feeling, but the legitimate expression of a righteous indignation? Or are they Jewish only, and not Christian? And if so, then how are we to reconcile this with a belief in the Divine authority and inspiration of the Scriptures? Such language is certainly very different from anything we meet with in the New Testament; and yet, if it is not legitimate, if we may not use it ourselves, then how can it be said to be given by inspiration of God?'

Having thus stated the difficulty, Mr Perowne goes on to notice the 'non-natural' interpretations of those who argue that 'such language could be lawfully used now, only with reference to the enemies of our souls' peace;' and adds: 'Yet it is obvious how impossible it is to carry out this principle of interpretation. How, for instance, in wrestling with spiritual enemies, could we adopt with any definite meaning

such words as these:—Set Thou a wicked man over him, and let Satan stand at his right hand. When he shall be judged, let him be condemned; and let his prayers become sin. Let his days be few, and let another take his office. Let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow, &c.?—It is manifestly out of the question: the gulf is too wide between the original sense and the attempted application.' The illustration is from the hundred and ninth Psalm, which, 'in the awfulness of its anathemas, *surpasses everything of the kind in the Old Testament.*' But second only to this in deliberateness of detailed invective, and in some particulars almost surpassing it, is the sixty-ninth Psalm. Both of these are cited in the New Testament, and come, therefore, within the scope of the present enquiry: to both, moreover, a *special* explanation is perhaps applicable. It is proposed therefore to devote to each a separate section, wherein their peculiar difficulties may be discussed; independently of the general comparison which will be entered upon subsequently, between the Ethics of Christianity and the Ethics of Judaism.

I. *The structure of Psalms lxix., cix.*

Not to mention the theory which represents the maledictions contained herein as calm and unimpassioned statements of the evils that await the sinner; it should be noted, that an apparent breach of continuity results, in each case, from treating the disputed expressions as IMPRECATIONS proper, so long as the received translations are retained.

1. The sixty-ninth Psalm 'was written under circumstances of great and unmerited suffering, by one who was persecuted for righteousness' sake...In the former part of the Psalm we have the fact of this persecution detailed, in the form of a humble complaint to God, together with an earnest prayer for deliverance. In the latter part *there is a marked change of feeling.* The sad, humble, subdued, entreating tone in which he had spoken, turns suddenly into a strong outburst of indignant execration. One curse is heaped upon another, till the whole terrible series is completed in the

prayer that those who have persecuted and mocked God's afflicted servant, may have their names blotted out of His Book of Life¹. But to render the analysis of the Psalm less incomplete, it should be added, that after this marked change of feeling, the Psalmist—dropping all mention of his persecutors—gives expression to 'joyful hopes and vows of thanksgiving for God's mercy,' as in other Psalms, *with which that in question has been compared*. Psalms xxii. and cii. describe like circumstances, and express like hopes, with Ps. lxix.; but the medial curses of this last have no counterpart in the former two. In Ps. xxii., the utmost malice is simply deprecated, and the Psalmist hopes for the *conversion* of the heathen (ver. 27). In Ps. lxix., no less than Psalms xxii. and cii., the salvation of God's servant is contemplated as a theme for universal gratulation. Without straining this consideration, we may say, that it removes any *a priori* presumption which might be conceived to exist, in favour of the commonly received application of the curses in Ps. lxix.

2. There is a still greater seeming incongruity in Ps. cix. The plaintive tone of its opening verses is thrown aside at ver. 6; to be taken up again at ver. 20. The intermediate section alludes to an INDIVIDUAL; but before and after, the Psalmist makes no allusion to any specific enemy—not even in the verse which sums up the imprecations supposed to be directed against the one foe singled out². This Psalm too, like others above-mentioned, 'closes with the confident and joyful anticipation that his prayer is heard and answered.' There is a way of accounting for the change from the plural to singular and back again, which gives a greater consistency to the representation, and obviates the necessity of presupposing violent transitions in tone and feeling. It is thought by Dr Sykes, Dr Kennicott, and by the renowned Hebrew commentator Mendelssohn, that the imprecations proceed *from the Psalmist's enemies to himself*; not, as is commonly supposed, from him to them. Subjoined is an attempt to apply a like

¹ Perowne, on Ps. lxix.

² 'Let it thus happen from the Lord unto mine enemies, &c.'

method to Ps. lxix.: but before entering upon the discussion, it may be well to illustrate, by a few examples out of many, the characteristic of the Hebrew style upon which this explanation depends.

II. *Marks of citation, wanting in Hebrew.*

"As there are not in Hebrew any marks, like our inverted commas, to shew where a train of thought is interrupted by a quotation—as when a speaker introduces abruptly the words of another person, or of himself at a previous time—passages sometimes occur in which it is requisite to supply such marks in a translation; and so, at times a dialogue will be found, without anything to point it out as such in the Hebrew Text, but the alternate members of which must, in the translation, be each enclosed in inverted commas. Thus [Numb. xxiii. 7] Balaam says, *Balak the king of Moab hath brought me from Aram, from the mountains of the east:*

‘Come, curse me Jacob,
And come, defy Israel.’

How shall I curse, &c.?

[Prov. xxiii. 34, 35]. *And thou shalt be as one lying in the midst of [the] sea, even as one lying on the top of a mast:*

‘They have stricken me, [yet] I felt no pain;
They have beaten me, but I perceived it not,’ &c.

where it will be observed that the words enclosed in inverted commas, are supposed to be uttered by the drunkard¹."

In certain contexts, the English language will bear the like sudden and unmarked transitions. Thus in Is. xxii. 13², it is sufficiently obvious, without typographical intimation, that the words: 'Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we shall die;' are a quotation, not an expression of the Prophet's

¹ Mason and Bernard, *Hebrew Grammar*, Vol. II. p. 163.

² Quoted by St Paul: 'If after the manner of men I have fought with

beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? *Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die.*' (1 Cor. xv. 32.)

own frame of mind. But in many other places, there would be a considerable risk of putting words into the mouth of a wrong speaker, and thereby perverting and misapplying them. The risk is less in Hebrew, only because this abruptness of transition from one speaker to another is a recognized peculiarity of the language¹. In our Authorized Version citations are frequently introduced by words printed in italics, to shew that there is nothing in the Hebrew corresponding to them. Thus: 'The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against His anointed, *saying*, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us' (Ps. ii. 2, 3). 'All they that see me laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, *saying*, He trusted on the LORD that He would deliver him: let Him deliver him seeing he delighted in Him' (Ps. xxii. 7, 8). The true construction of Ps. x. 4 appears to be:—

The wicked, such is his pride, [*imagines that*]
 'HE will not require.'
 [*That*] 'There is no God,'
 Is all his thought.

'Set the trumpet to thy mouth,' writes the Prophet: and in immediate sequence follow the words of proclamation: '*As an eagle against the house of the LORD*' (Hos. viii. 1). 'They flee [*amid cries of*] Stay, stay,' is briefly expressed, in Nah. ii. 8, by the words, 'They flee, Stay, stay.' And a bold ellipsis in Habakkuk (i. 11) is well supplied by our translators: 'He shall pass over, and offend, *imputing* this his power unto his god.'

III. *Introductory remarks on the sixty-ninth Psalm.*

There are two series of denunciations in this Psalm which must be considered separately. The former are contained

¹ This abruptness is chiefly observable in poetical passages. But see 1 Sam. i. 20: 'and called his name Samuel, Because [*said she*] I have asked him of the LORD.' See further, Mason and Bernard, Vol. II. p. 167, on 1 Kings iii. 16—28.

in ver 22—25; the latter (which are of greater severity), in ver. 27, 28.

1. The twenty-sixth verse, which separates the two series, stands thus in the Authorized Version:

For they persecute *him* whom thou hast smitten;
And they talk to the grief of those whom thou hast wounded.

It is intended to express thereby, that the preceding curses were imprecated by the Psalmist upon his enemies, in return for their persecution of him. It is however to be observed, that the original is simply: 'For whom thou hast smitten &c.' where the relative might, irrespectively of the context, be either singular or plural; but, to judge by the parallelism, is plural¹. This consideration removes (*infra*) an antecedent objection to the proposed transference of the foregoing curses, from the mouth of the Psalmist to the mouth of his enemies.

2. The expression, 'TALK TO the grief of &c.' in the second hemistich of 26, occurs once only elsewhere, viz. in Ps. ii. 7: 'I WILL DECLARE the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.'

In this latter case, *the thing declared follows upon the words, 'I will declare.'* In the former case we might look for an analogous specification of the words which the enemy *talks*, to the grief of (*i. e.* so as to grieve²) the divinely afflicted. Thus:

They talk to the grief of those whom thou hast wounded:
'Add iniquity unto their iniquity:
And let them not come into thy righteousness.
Let them be blotted out of the book of the living,
And not be written with the righteous.'

3. It may be objected that the whole weight of authority is against the proposed rendering of ver. 26; but it is found,

אמר רבי משה ולהכאיב חלליך יסערו את העם הזה אשר אתה הכיית
זה לזה שאנחנו מוכים וחללים (Rashi).

² This construction is adopted in the (Aben Ezra). See note A. p. 242.
following comment:

upon examination, that there is precisely that disagreement among commentators which paves the way for a new rendering, by shewing the unsatisfactoriness of such as have been proposed. It is a significant fact that the Hebrew text has been denounced as *obviously corrupt* in its reading of the passage, and as needing to be assimilated to the LXX. *προσέθηκαν*. Of modern commentators, Dr Ewald agrees to the proposed alteration, and expresses his acquiescence with characteristic decision¹. Others, with Rosenmüller, would elicit a like meaning from the text as it stands². It seems then, that there is no such concurrence of testimony, as at first sight appears, in favour of the received view of these imprecations and against that suggested in the foregoing paragraph: but, on the contrary, to those who regard the vexed clause from the usual standpoint, its words seem to need elaboration before a suitable sense can be extracted from them.

Translation of the sixty-ninth Psalm³.

1. Save me, O God : for the waters are come in, even unto my soul.
2. I am sunk in deep mire, where no ground is : I am come into deep waters, so that the floods run over me.
3. I am weary of my crying (my throat is dry : mine eyes have failed) while I wait upon my God.
4. They that hate me without a cause are more than the hairs of my head : they that would destroy me⁴, being mine enemies wrongfully, are many in number : when I had not robbed I must restore.

¹ 'Ist für *ספרו* deutlich (auch nach LXX. *προσέθηκαν*) *ספיו* zu lesen, die dichterische form von *ספה = ספ*; denn dass sie bloss von den göttlichen strafen erzählen hat bei weitem nicht die sträfflichkeit als wenn sie, wie hier der zusammenhang schon fordert, durch eigne thätliche angriffe und schläge jene noch aufs fühlbarste vermehrten.'

² 'Ad dolorem eorum qui a te sunt sauciati annumerant;' is the reading of

Rosenmüller, who testifies to the want of an accusative after *ספרו*, by adding, '*scil. plures alios.*'

³ In this translation (which is inserted chiefly for convenience of reference) departures from the familiar phraseology have been avoided, in many doubtful cases. So with the translation of Ps. cix. in the following chapter.

⁴ For, '*my destroyers,*' some read, '*more than my locks,*' as suggested by

5. O God, Thou knowest my foolishness : and my trespasses are not hid from Thee.

6. Let not them that trust in Thee, O Lord God of hosts, be ashamed through me : let not them that seek Thee be confounded through me, O God of Israel.

7. For for Thy sake have I suffered reproof : shame hath covered my face.

8. I am become a stranger unto my brethren : and an alien unto my mother's children.

9. For the zeal of¹ Thine house hath eaten me : and the rebukes of them that rebuked Thee are fallen upon me.

10. And I fasted, and wept sore² : and it was made a reproach unto me.

11. I made sackcloth also my clothing : and became a by-word unto them.

12. They that sit in the gate speak against me : and the drunkards make songs upon me.

13. Yet is my prayer to Thee in an acceptable time³ : O God, in the abundance of Thy loving-kindness, answer me with Thy sure salvation.

14. Deliver me from the mire, that I sink not : let me be delivered from them that hate me, and out of the deep waters.

15. Let not the water-flood overwhelm me, neither let the deep swallow me up : and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me.

16. Answer me, O Lord, for Thy loving-kindness is good : turn Thee unto me according to the abundance of Thy mercies.

the parallelism. So Mendelssohn : 'Fester als gewund'ne Locken.' Ewald (after the *Peschito*) : 'Zahlreicher als meine Knochen ;' a reading which, 'gibt zugleich ein wortspiel.' Cp. 'all my bones' (Ps. xxxv. 10).

¹ That is, 'zeal or longing for the temple and its services,' from which the Psalmist is cut off. A noteworthy use

of the genitive occurs in Jer. l. 28 ; li. 11 : 'the vengeance of His temple.'

² This rendering [Ewald and others] gives the general sense, but probably not the construction. Rosenmüller : 'Et quum fleui et in jejuniis anima mea est.' The difficulty is merely grammatical.

³ 'And this was my prayer, viz. O God, &c.' (*Aben Ezra. Kimchi.*)

17. And hide not Thy face from Thy servant ; for I am in a strait : O haste Thee, and answer me.

18. Draw nigh unto my soul, and save it : O deliver me because of mine enemies.

19. Thou hast known my reproach, and my shame, and my dishonour : mine adversaries are all in Thy sight¹.

20. Reproach hath broken my heart and I am full of heaviness² : and I looked for some to have pity, but there was no man, and for comforters, but I found none.

21. And they mixed gall with my portion³ : and gave me vinegar for my thirst.

22. Let their table before them become a trap : and a snare⁴ when they are at peace.

23. Let their eyes be darkened, that they see not : and make their loins continually to shake.

24. Pour out Thine indignation upon them : and let the furiousness of Thine anger overtake them.

25. Let their habitation be desolate : and let none dwell in their tents⁵.

26. For⁶ whom Thou hast smitten, they have persecuted : and to the grief of Thy plagued ones do they talk⁷:

27. Add iniquity to their iniquity : and let them not come into Thy righteousness.

28. Let them be wiped out of the book of the living⁸ : and not be written among the righteous.

¹ May not this verse rather mean : 'Thou knowest my reproach on Thine account from all mine enemies?' i. e. more fully expressed ; 'the reproach which I suffer on Thine account ; a reproach wherewith all mine enemies assail me.' Cp. ver. 7. From one point of view the construction resembles that of Ps. lxxxix. 50 : 'How I do bear in my bosom [the reproach of] all the mighty people.'

² Aben Ezra takes אַנְשֵׁה as 1 pers. fut. from אָנַשׁ, with א for ל, as in הָאֲנָשִׁים. Ex. xviii. 26.

³ See p. 117, note 2.

⁴ מִקְשָׁא would seem to mean properly a *lure* or *decoy*, leading into destruction, not itself consummating it. So in 1 Sam. xviii. 21 : 'that *she* may be a snare to him, and that the hand of the Philistines may be against him.' In the Psalm, the food is not distasteful, but insidiously grateful ; calculated to stupefy, and thus prepare for destruction.

⁵ On St Peter's application of this, together with Ps. cix. 8, see Chap. xii.

⁶ See note B. p. 242.

⁷ 'They talk, *sc.* as follows, *Add iniquity to their iniquity, &c.*'

⁸ See note C. p. 243.

29. But afflicted as I am and pained¹ : Thy salvation, O God, shall set me up on high.

30. I will praise the name of God with a song : and magnify it with thanksgiving.

31. And it shall better please the Lord than ox : than bullock horned and hooped².

32. The humble shall see this, and be glad : and your heart shall live that seek God.

33. For the Lord heareth the poor³ : and hath not despised His prisoners.

34. Let heaven and earth praise Him : the sea and all that moveth therein.

35. For God will save Zion, and build the cities of Judah⁴ : that men may dwell there, and have it in possession.

36. And the seed of His servants shall inherit it : and they that love His name shall dwell therein.

IV. On the Subject of the Psalm.

In ambiguous cases, where words might grammatically be attributed to one or other of two personages, it is well to inquire into the characteristics of the speakers, and hence to gather, as far as may be, from whose mouth the disputed utterances would the more naturally proceed. In the case before us, who and what are the speakers? What is the subject of the Psalm?

¹ Mr Perowne writes on this clause: 'BUT AS FOR ME, placing himself emphatically in contrast to those who had been the object of his imprecation.' But does not עָנִי give *distinctness* rather than *emphasis*? the construction would be incomplete without it. Emphatic contrast is scarcely so suitable in Ps. xl. 17, as: 'Mean though I am, let not the LORD neglect me.' Cp. Ps. lxx. 5. In lxxxvi. 1; lxxxviii. 15; cix. 22; the order is different.

² That is, *of fit age for sacrifice*: 'not over small' (*Aben Ezra*). The

exaltation of praise over sacrifice favours the view that this is a Captivity Psalm.

³ עֲנִיִּים *pauperibus*, uti עָנִיִּים *afflictis*, ver. 32, sæpe in Psalmis Hebræi *exilii* miseriis oppressi designantur. *Rosenmüller*.

⁴ 'Non dubitamus adstipulari iis interpretibus, qui et hunc Psalmum ex persona Judæorum, qui in Babylonem fuerant abducti, dictum putant, præsertim quum *captivorum, urbiumque Judææ dirutarum* diserta fiat mentio.' *Rosenmüller*.

The opinion that it relates to a time of captivity is advocated by Rashi, who takes Israel—'As the *lily*¹ among thorns'—for the speaker, and explains, 'waters' (ver. 1), by 'the nations:' Aben Ezra concludes, that an allusion to the captivity gives the best sense² in ver. 33; and Kimchi explains the singular, 'Save *me* &c.,' as used, either collectively or distributively, by the captive people. The initial imagery is not unsuited to this hypothesis. The evil plight of the Psalmist is made a reproach to the God of Israel, who seems to the heathen persecutor to have cast off His people (ver. 6, 7): the temple is inaccessible (ver. 9), but thanksgiving shall find acceptance, and 'please the LORD better than ox or bullock that hath horns and hoofs' (ver. 31): the final deliverance is to be of world-wide interest: 'Let the heaven and earth praise Him...For God will save Zion, and will build the cities of Judah' (ver. 34, 35).

We may conclude then, provisionally, that the Psalm deals with two characters:—

(a) A captive Israelite, recording his individual experience of the national calamity; conscious that what befel him was devised against others too, and expectant of no merely personal deliverance.

(b) Heathendom, plotting the subversion of the Jewish polity.

To which of these are the imprecatory utterances of ver. 22—25, and of 27, 28, best referred?

1. It is usual to explain the connection of ver. 21, 22, as follows. 'They had given him gall and vinegar for his food: let their food, their table, with all its sumptuousness and all its luxury, become a snare to take them;' where 'vinegar' is regarded as unwholesome, or at least distasteful. But it is granted that 'vinegar' is well suited to quench thirst³; nor does it stand for a thing distasteful *e.g.* in Ruth

¹ This refers to the title: 'upon Shoshannim.' the received theory about these imprecations, urges that the meaning, *acetum*, must be rejected: '*nihil enim melius promptiusque sitim restinguit aceto.*'

² ואם על בני הגלות יותר נכון.

³ Rosenmüller, attempting to apply

ii. 14: where 'Boaz said unto her, At meal-time come thou hither, and eat of the bread, and dip thy morsel in the vinegar.' In Psalm lxix., it must not be assumed arbitrarily that the 'vinegar' is distasteful. Why may it not there too be a thing grateful to the palate of one athirst? tending, it may be, to inebriation¹; but perhaps altogether harmless.

2. It is hard to determine precisely the nature of the 'gall.' Gesenius citing, 'papaveris *capita*' (Liv. I. 54), supposes it to be the poppy; which favours the hypothesis that it was calculated to induce stupefaction. 'Water of gall' denotes a stupefying drug in Jer. viii. 14; 'The LORD our God hath put us to silence, and given us *water of gall* to drink;' and a like meaning of 'gall' seems not inappropriate in Ps. lxix. 21. The *vinegar*, insidiously grateful to the palate, is drugged with *gall*, and thus proves a snare to the unsuspecting. The sufferer,—one of many²—receives drugged potions from the enemy; who would have '*their*' table become a trap to them in their security. Reft of sense and power, may they prove an easy prey. 'Let their habitation be desolate; and let none dwell in their tents.' So plot they, 'For they persecute [them] whom Thou hast smitten; &c.'

3. The enemy devise evil, not against an individual, but against the whole chosen people. The Psalmist, in the character of one of them, describes the outrage heaped upon himself, in the execution of their general plan; and hence the change from the singular ver. 21, to the plural in the following verses is accounted for. If this transition does not take place at the beginning of the first series of cursings, it must take place at its conclusion; or else, as seems still less suitable, in the middle of ver. 26. 'The plural in the second clause of the verse,' writes Mr Perowne, 'passes from the individual instance to the general conduct of these men, but implies at the same time that there are some few others exposed to the like treatment with himself.' Few or many, they are spoken of in

¹ Numb. vi. 3.

² He speaks as an ordinary Israelite: the calamity was national: the plot is

not laid against him personally, but he comes within its range, and describes what he himself undergoes.

the plural, till in ver. 29 the one sufferer stands out as before, and then again is lost sight of finally in ver. 32.

V. *Other points in the Imprecations calling for Special Notice.*

1. In ver. 22, those on whom the curse lights are represented as *at peace*¹, if not *men of peace*. In Ps. lv. 20, the same word is applied to inoffensive sufferers, and it is said of the enemy: 'He hath put forth his hands against *such as be at peace* with him: he hath broken his covenant.' Elsewhere, the notion of *peace*, implies not unfrequently a certain moral excellence, thus:

Mark the perfect; behold the upright:

For there is a futurity to a man of *peace*.

Whereas the futurity of the wicked shall be cut off (Ps. xxxvii. 37, 38). The Psalmist is '*peace*,' in Ps. cxx. 7; his enemies, 'for war.' 'They speak not *peace*: but they devise deceitful matters against them that are quiet in the land' (Ps. xxxv. 20). In accordance with such usages as the foregoing, it is more natural to apply the description, *at peace* (Ps. lxix. 22), to the persecuted Israelites, than to their heathen persecutors. In other words, it is natural to suppose the first series of imprecations uttered *against*, not *by*, the Psalmist.

2. An objection to this view may be thought to arise from ver. 24. Is it likely that the heathen persecutors would curse the suffering Israelite in the form of an address to JEHOVAH? thus: 'Pour out thine indignation upon them: and let the furiousness of thine anger overtake them.' It may be granted that it is not likely. But the Psalmist is not giving the actual words of his enemy: the representation is subjective: the ills brought about by heathen instrumentality are referred to their first cause, and viewed as a Divine infliction; and the enemy, while compassing what is viewed as a manifestation of God's anger, may well be represented as praying that *the furiousness of that anger* may be displayed. A like remark applies to ver. 27, 28. The form of the curses

¹ לְשָׁלוֹם, '*tranquillis*.'

is here too that in which they present themselves to the mind of the Psalmist, in whose view sin goes hand in hand with punishment; and whereas the enemy curses in *deed*, by striving to aggravate the calamities of Israel, the Psalmist—with his vivid conception of sin as necessarily involving punishment—depicts the enemy as praying that the LORD would add to his people's iniquities.

3. It is unnatural to say of heathens, *qua* heathens, 'Let them not come into *Thy righteousness*;' for God's 'righteousness' was the especial hope of the chosen people. God's 'righteousness' may include (or stand in parallelism with) salvation and deliverance, from *Captivity*, as from other evils. The following passages serve to illustrate this usage. 'Deliver me in *Thy righteousness*, and cause me to escape: incline Thine ear unto me, and save me...My mouth shall shew forth *Thy righteousness* and thy salvation all the day; for I know not the numbers thereof' (Ps. lxxi. 2, 15). 'Deliver me in *Thy righteousness*' (xxxii. 1). 'In Thy name shall they rejoice all the day: and in *Thy righteousness* shall they be exalted. For Thou art the glory of their strength: and in Thy favour our horn shall be exalted. For the Lord is our defence; and the Holy One of Israel is our king' (lxxxix. 16—18). 'Quicken me, O LORD, for Thy name's sake: for *Thy righteousness*' sake bring my soul out of trouble. And of Thy mercy slay mine enemies, and destroy all them that afflict my soul: for I am Thy servant' (cxliii. 11, 12). 'Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgement and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is the name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS' (Jer. xxiii. 5, 6). 'They shall come, and shall declare *His righteousness*' (Ps. xxii. 31). In this last passage, the primary reference is to *restoration from captivity*, as that whereby God's 'righteousness' displays itself. In Ps. lxix. 27 we have then, it might be conjectured, curses not against Gentiles but against Jews, for:

(a) Gentiles, as such, would not have been thought of at all as having hope to enter into God's righteousness.

(b) Another possible explanation is unnatural; for to say, 'Let them not come into Thy righteousness;' in the sense, 'Let them not be converted, and become objects of Thy mercy,' is out of harmony with the conclusion of the Psalm itself (ver. 34), not to say, with Psalms xxii., cii., &c. Whereas, on the other hand, a complete consistency is given to the Psalm, if the imprecations proceed from the enemy. They had plotted how their unsuspecting prey might be treacherously disabled:—'Let their habitation be desolate. Let them not experience the salvation of Thy righteousness, but be blotted out of the book of the living.'—In ver. 29 comes the assurance that these plots will fail. 'Poor as I am and sorrowful, Thy salvation shall set me up on high. For Thou wilt save Zion, and build the cities of Judah, and they that love Thy name shall dwell therein.'

VI. *Imprecations cited by St Paul from Psalm lxix.*

Some verses of this Psalm are quoted by St Paul, in Rom. xi. 9, 10, in his argument against the inference that God had cast away His people which He foreknew. The case of Elias leads up to the citation from the Psalm. 'Wot ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace....What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for: but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded (according as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day. And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompense unto them: Let their

eyes be darkened that they may not see, and bow down their back alway. I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy' (Rom. xi. 2—11).

If we might argue back from the Apostle's citation of Ps. lxix. 22, 23, to the primary allusion of the verses cited, two considerations would suggest themselves.

1. Whether these imprecations proceed from the Psalmist or from his enemies, it takes away from their *prima facie* virulence, to note that they are not only temporal but *temporary*, in their nature. It is not the total ruin of persons cursed which, in St Paul's application of them, is contemplated, but the removal of an obstruction which opposes itself to the attainment of an all-important end. 'Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid.'

2. 'According to Rom. xi. 9, 10,' it has been said, 'the rejection of Israel may be best described in the words of Ps. lxix. 22, 23.' This being granted, it might be inferred, as not improbable, that the Psalm deals with those historical¹ circumstances which are most closely analogous to the rejection of the Jews, and the admission of the Gentiles to the Gospel covenant; and hence arises a retrospective argument in corroboration of the view already propounded, that Ps. lxix. refers to the Captivity. Between the Captivity and the later casting-off of Israel there is the intimate correspondence of type and antitype. The Jews were not, argues the Apostle, cast off for ever; but their rejection was for the reconciling of the world; and finally, by their restoration, there should be as life from the dead. In the season of captivity, it is notorious that their minds were opened to the spirituality of their religion and the non-essentiality of its external rites. Then, more distinctly than before, they contemplated the universality of the inheritance, which they had counted

¹ Other references in the context might be surmised that the reference in (e. g. that to Elias) being *historical*, it the Psalm is in like manner *historical*.

theirs alone; and to the hope of national restoration they added the loftier aspiration that all the ends of the world might turn to JEHOVAH, and all the kindreds of the nations bow before Him. Thus was the fall of them the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of Gentiles.

3. The word *κατάνυξις*¹ (Rom. xi. 8) is used to describe the effect of a *stupefying draught*; the same word being used by the LXX. in connection with *ποτίζω*. In the original passage cited, the corresponding word is that for 'a deep sleep'; but, at the same time, there is an explicit contrast between the condition described with that of the *drunkard*. 'Stuporise yourselves, and wonder: cry ye out, and cry: they are drunken, but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink. For the Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep' (Is. xxix. 9, 10). In Ps. lx. 3, *κατάνυξις* is again used with *ποτίζω*. 'Thou hast made us to drink the wine of astonishment.' By St Paul, this *πνεῦμα κατανύξεως* is represented as taking away sight and hearing (ver. 8), and as, in fact, working out the curse of Ps. lxix. 23, 'Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their backs alway.' It would seem then, so far as may be argued from St Paul's citation, that the darkening of eyes, &c. spoken of in Ps. lxix. was such as would result from a stupefying draught and this seems to corroborate the opinion that a stupefying draught is described in the verse: 'They gave me also gall for my meat (?); and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.' *i.e.* they drugged my food, contriving that my table might become a snare to take myself withal, &c. The objection to this explanation, which arises from the use of the plural (*their* table) rather than the singular, has been already adverted to. In its favour is its avoidance of an abrupt transition in the tone of the Psalmist, and the lack of any parti-

¹ *κατάνυξις* h. l. notat *πῶτος* ex frequentissima *punctione* in stuporem desinens' (Bengel). See Wratislaw, *Notes and Diss.* But may it not denote a

throbbing and confusion of the brain indicative of intoxication; or the internal *pricking* sensation which accompanies some forms of numbness?

to mark such transition. It may be well to reiterate, in conclusion, that the application of these curses is to be discussed independently of the *second* series, in ver. 27, 28; and that if the former proceed from the Psalmist, this of itself is no argument for assigning to him the latter also. The question of the application of the latter is mainly grammatical, and *not dependent upon any hypothesis with regard to the subject of the Psalm*. A certain phrase introduces these imprecations. The phrase is used once more, and once only, viz. in Ps. ii. 7. If this phrase is to be applied analogously in the two cases, then the imprecations of Ps. lxix. 27, 28 must be attributed to the Psalmist's enemies, and the Psalmist himself be taken as one against whom they are imprecated.

VII. *Further Citations from Psalm LXIX.*

'When it is said (Joh. xv. 25), that the enemies of Jesus hated Him without a cause, and this is looked upon as a fulfilment of Scripture, the reference,' writes Mr Perowne, 'is probably to ver. 4, though it may be also to xxxv. 19. To Him, and the reproach which he endured for the sake of God, St Paul refers the words of this Psalm (ver. 9), when he writes: For even Christ pleased not Himself; but, as it is written, *The reproaches of them that reproached Thee fell on me*' (Rom. xv. 3). The Cleansing of the Temple brings to the disciples' remembrance those other words of ver. 9: 'The zeal of *Thine house hath eaten me up*' (Joh. ii. 17). The 'zeal of &c.' in the Psalm, may have a similar meaning to, 'vengeance of &c.' above cited from Jer. l. li.; or it may mean more generally 'zeal for the honour of...'; 'zeal for God's service and worship.' Perhaps the former meaning of '*indignation*,' is the more appropriate; but, in any case, the profanation of the Temple by heathen violence which the Psalmist deplored, presents an analogy to its later profanation, which stirred the righteous 'zeal' of JESUS. 'In ver. 12,' continues Mr Perowne, 'we have a foreshadowing of the mockery of our Lord by the soldiers in the prætorium (Matt. xxvii. 27—30); in ver. 21, the giving of the vinegar and the gall found their counterpart in the scenes of

the Crucifixion¹ (Matt. xxvii. 34). In Joh. xix. 28, there is an allusion, probably, to ver. 21 of this Psalm, and to xxii. 15. The imprecation in ver. 25 is said, in Acts i. 20, to have been fulfilled in the case of Judas Iscariot, though, as the words of the Psalm are plural, the citation is evidently made with some freedom.' Some MSS. however read '*their* (for *his*) habitation' in Acts i. 20, and with reference to this Dr Henry Owen writes in his *Modes of Quotation*:—'There is in this quotation, it must be acknowledged, some difficulty. And this difficulty I know not how otherwise to solve, than by observing that Judas is not here specified as the only traitor, though the chief and most infamous; but as the *guide of them* that took Jesus. And as the prophecy was now singularly fulfilled in Judas, the head; so, with reference to its plural construction, it was a plain presage, that the rest, the body of the Jews, would surely meet with the like fate—which fate they wofully experienced not long after.'

NOTES ON CHAPTER XI.

A. The rendering of Ps. ii. 7: 'I will declare *for* (i.e. so as to be) a decree,' is well supported. [With this use of אל חק, compare אל נכון, '*for* certain;'¹ אל חנם '*to* no purpose.'] But whether this, or the usual rendering be right, it may be argued, that, as in Ps. ii., אל חק, 'I will declare &c.' is followed by the actual words of the speaker's declaration; so in Ps. lxix., אל מנאוב חלליך יספרו, '*they* declare &c.,' might be expected to be followed by the actual words of the Psalmist's enemies, who are there represented as the speakers. It is more usual to render אל, *concerning*. Gesenius and Fuerst bring *one* example (Ps. xxii. 31) to prove a like meaning for ל, following ספר. But it may be suggested in passing, that יספר לאדני *perhaps* means, 'He shall be accounted for, or as, LORD [to

¹ See pp. 114—119.

that generation].’ Thus, the verse may be freely rendered: ‘A seed shall serve Him; the generation to come shall own Him for their LORD.’

B. It might appear that the received interpretation of this clause is more natural: this makes ver. 22—25, curses uttered by the Psalmist against his enemies. ‘Let their table &c. *For*, or *because*, they have persecuted those whom Thou hast smitten.’ Ps. xxxv. 7 might be quoted to support this:—‘*For*...without cause have they digged a pit for *my soul*.’ Perhaps the next verse in Ps. xxxv. should be attributed to the Psalmist’s enemies, as Mr Mason suggests, thus:—‘*saying*, Let destruction come upon him at unawares...’ ‘But *my soul* [שׁוּבָה],’ continues the Psalmist, ‘shall exult &c.’ The change to the singular, ‘upon *him*,’ favours this transference. The analogy of Ps. xxxv. thus explained, would favour the attributing of Ps. lxix. 22—26 to the Psalmist, and ver. 27, 28 to his enemies. But though the first imprecations in the two Psalms are not unlike [‘Let their way be dark and slippery,’ xxxv. 6; lxix. 23], there are some special arguments (*supra*) for supposing the persecutors to be the speakers in Ps. lxix. 22—26.

C. Let them be wiped out of the book *of the living*, or *of life*. ‘The figure is borrowed,’ as Mr Perowne notes, ‘from the civil lists or register in which the names of the citizens were enrolled. To be blotted out of this denotes exclusion from all the blessings and privileges of the theocracy, and therefore from all hope of salvation, as is evident from the next clause...the *righteous* being the true *Israelites* as in Hab. ii. 4.’ This text has been much discussed with reference to predestination. [See Poole *in loc.*] But as regards the form of representation, the names of the persons spoken of would seem to be actually written in the book of life. They are not thought of as heathens, but as Israelites. Thus the argument of § 3, p. 237, is confirmed.

CHAPTER XII.

The Imprecations of Psalm CIX.

BEFORE referring to the original of this Psalm, it may be well to note some of the most striking features of the familiar English versions, from which the subjoined translation differs only in details, and those comparatively unimportant for our present purpose.

The Psalmist's enemies have overwhelmed him with false accusations (ver. 2), and rewarded him evil for good; but in his unmerited sufferings, he gives himself wholly and unreservedly to prayer¹. 'Deliver me, for I am helpless and poor; and my heart is wounded within me. I go hence like the shadow that departeth; and am driven away as the grasshopper . . . *Though they curse, yet bless THOU*; and let them be confounded that rise up against me, but let Thy servant rejoice' (ver. 21—28). The Psalmist is 'helpless and poor,' and an object of derision to his enemies; who are described in ver. 20, as 'those that speak evil against my soul.' If, then, they are expressly styled his cursers, and his resource is prayer to JEHOVAH for deliverance; it would seem *a priori* natural to assign the curses specified, not to the Psalmist as speaker, but to his enemies. This distribution of its parts seems to give to the Psalm a more complete structural consistency than do the usual renderings, which assume a sudden change of tone at ver. 6, and a return, at ver. 21, after a series

¹ ואני תפלה might be rendered idiomatically: 'but I [am all] prayer.'

of distinct imprecations, to the resigned prayerfulness of the opening verses. But with the proposed rearrangement, we have 1. An appeal to God against the malice and the false accusations of his adversaries. 2. A specification of the curses which they utter, and of the false charges (ver. 16—18) which they bring against him. 3. A contrast between the treatment which the persecuted man trusts to experience at the Lord's hand, and that which his adversaries desire for him. The concluding verses, whether imprecatory or predictive, express the Psalmist's joyful anticipation of his adversaries' discomfiture, and would thus seem to exclude any necessity for regarding him as the utterer of the former curses¹. The curses, moreover, are directed against an individual; while—to except the disputed verses—there is no trace of any individual adversary, who stands out from the main body; not even, as before noticed, in ver. 20, which sums up the imprecations. In this verse, be it observed moreover, there is no direct expression of a wish; as the Bible version shews by its significant arrangement of the type. '*Let this be* the reward of mine adversaries &c.' The words in italics not occurring in the original, a more exact rendering would be: 'This [*is*] the reward &c.' This verse, which will be considered more at length below, constitutes the main objection to the proposed transference of the Imprecations; but, on examination, it will be found to be ambiguous in itself, and dependent, therefore, upon the context for its interpretation, as regards those of its words which contain the ambiguity. A general view of the Psalm being required to complete the argument, a version of it, amended in some particulars, is subjoined.

I. *Translation of the hundred-and-ninth Psalm.*

1. Hold not Thy tongue, O God of my praise.
2. For the mouth of the ungodly, yea the mouth of the deceitful is opened upon me : and they have spoken against me with false tongues.

¹ The Psalm being supposed structurally complete and symmetrical, the fact that the Psalmist's curses are found

in one place serves (*pro tanto*) for a proof that they are not to be sought in another.

3. They compassed me about also with words of hatred : and fought against me without a cause.

4. For my love they are mine adversaries : but I [am all] prayer.

5. And they have rewarded me evil for good : and hatred for my love.

6. Set Thou a wicked man over him : and let Satan¹ stand at his right hand.

7. When he shall be judged, let him be condemned : and let his prayer be faulty.

8. Let his days be few : and let another take his office.

9. Let his children be fatherless : and his wife a widow.

10. Let his children wander continually (to beg and to seek *bread*²) out of their desolate homes.

11. Let the extortioner consume all that he hath : and let strangers spoil his labour.

12. Let there be none to extend mercy unto him : neither let there be any to favour his fatherless children.

13. Let his posterity be cut off : and in the next generation let his name be blotted out.

14. Let the iniquity of his fathers be remembered with the LORD : and let not the sin of his mother be blotted out.

15. Let them alway be before the LORD : that He may cut off the memory of them from the earth.

16. Because that he remembered not to shew mercy : but persecuted the afflicted man and needy, and the broken in heart, to death³.

17. And he loved cursing, and it came unto him⁴ : and he delighted not in blessing, but it was far from him.

18. And he clothed himself with cursing, like as with

¹ "In Zech. iii. 1 : 'and he shewed me Joshua the High Priest standing before the angel of Jehovah, and the adversary (or, the Satan) *standing at his right hand* to be an adversary unto him,' Satan himself is doubtless meant. ...On the whole I prefer the more general word *adversary*,...especially as

the same root occurs several times in the Psalm." (*Perowne*).

² *Lit.* : 'and let them seek and beg : ' a semi-parenthetical sequel to *יָנוּעוּ*, which is taken with *מַחֲרֹבוֹתֵיהֶם*.

³ *לְמוֹתוֹת*, to slay.

⁴ Cursing was familiar to him, and he to it.

his garment : and it came into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones¹.

19. Let it be unto him as the cloke that he hath upon him : and as the girdle that he is alway girded with.

20. This is the reward of mine adversaries from the LORD² : and of those that speak evil against my soul.

21. But THOU, God, the LORD³, deal-with-me according unto Thy name : because Thy mercy is good, O deliver me.

22. For I⁴ am afflicted and needy : and my heart is wounded within me.

23. I am gone like a shadow when it declineth : I am shaken off⁵ as a grasshopper.

24. My knees are weak through abstinence⁶ : my flesh is dried up for want of fatness.

25. And I⁷ am become a reproach unto them : when they look upon me they shake their head.

26. Help me, O LORD my God : O save me according to Thy mercy.

27. That they may know that this is Thy hand : that Thou, LORD, hast done it.

28. Though they curse, yet bless⁸ THOU : and let them

¹ He drank it in thirstily (that is), and grew sleek upon it.

² זאת פעלת שטני מאת יהוה. 'Diess wirkten gern vom Herrn mir meine Feinde aus, Die meiner Seele Untergang geschworen. Aber du Herr! Ewiger! 'Thu' mir um deines Nahmens Willen.' (Mendelssohn.)

³ Or, 'God my LORD' [Ps. xxxv. 23; xvi. 2]. 'This they imprecate against me from the LORD: but Thou art my LORD, &c.'

⁴ Perhaps (in contrast with ver. 16): 'It is I that am afflicted...' The full form אנכי is used.

⁵ 'Also I shook my lap, and said, So God shake out every man from his house, and from his labour, &c.' (Neh.

v. 13.)

⁶ If צום (Esth. v. 16) denotes abstinence in general—being לשון קיבוץ (Kimchi)—there may be a double contrast, in צום [cognate with צמא], and שמן; with the 'water' and the 'oil' of ver. 18.

⁷ In ואני הייתי, the emphasis may be: 'Far from revelling in oppression, as they say, I am become a reproach unto them.'

⁸ But perhaps it is better to make this an expression of trust, and not an imperative. 'Thou wilt bless, and (mine adversaries having been put to confusion) Thy servant shall rejoice.' See ver. 30, where the verbs are likewise futures.

be confounded that rise up against me : but let Thy servants rejoice.

29. Let mine adversaries be clothed with shame : let them cover themselves with their own confusion as with a cloke¹.

30. I will greatly praise the LORD with my mouth : yea, I praise Him among the multitude.

31. For He shall stand at the right hand of the poor : save him from those that condemn his soul².

II. In seeking to determine the true application of the curses in ver. 6—19, we shall consider :—

a. The introductory formula of ver. 5.

b. The retrospective summation of them, in ver. 20.

The collective Psalm will then be analyzed, and its corresponding parts compared one with another.

(*a*) As in Ps. xxii. 7, 8 a quotation is introduced with the introductory formula :—

All they that see me laugh me to scorn :
They shoot out the lip, they shake the head,
'He trusted on the LORD that He would deliver him :
Let Him deliver him, seeing He delighted in him.'—

So it would be quite grammatical to refer Ps. cix. 6, &c. to the adversaries before spoken of, thus :

And they have rewarded me evil for good :
And hatred for my love,
'Set Thou a wicked man over him :
And let Satan stand at his right hand, &c.'

More than this, the reference to an individual ['over him, &c.'], not to mention the lack of any adversative or transitional particle [e.g. 'Therefore set Thou,' &c.], seems to make the above as the obvious and *prima facie* meaning of the verses cited. The objection to this view, which will be ne-

¹ Contrast ver. 19.

² Contrast ver. 6, 7.

considered, is extraneous to the passage itself, being drawn from the supposed exigencies of a subsequent verse.

(*b*) The verses immediately following the imprecations are rendered in the Prayer-Book in a way commonly supposed to be a more or less faithful paraphrase of their meaning :—

‘Let it thus happen from the Lord unto mine enemies : and to those that speak evil against my soul. But deal Thou with *me*, O Lord God, according unto Thy name : for sweet is Thy mercy.’

The more literal : ‘This *is* the reward &c.’ *as explained by Mr Perowne and others*, differs little from the preceding ; for, in each case, the Psalmist has been represented as imprecating direct curses upon an enemy ; and the distinction between : ‘Let this be the reward &c.’ and ‘This is, or shall be, the reward ;’ seems, under the circumstances, little more than formal. If, however, the order of the words (ver. 20, 21) and their natural emphasis be attended to, the possibility of a very different explanation suggests itself. Mr Perowne preserves (*infra*) the order of the Hebrew :

This is the reward of mine adversaries from Jehovah,
And of them that speak evil against my soul.
But THOU, O Jehovah Lord, deal with me for Thy Name's
sake,
For Thy loving-kindness is good : deliver Thou me.

From this it would seem that the contrast is not between ‘mine adversaries,’ and ‘me,’ but between those adversaries and evil speakers, and ‘THOU, O Jehovah Lord :’ not between their destruction and the Psalmist’s deliverance, but between the curses which they imprecate and the loving-kindness of the Lord. Mr Perowne’s form of words being retained, the required meaning may be elicited, by understanding ‘the reward *of mine adversaries*’ as a subjective genitive. This is mine adversaries’ award unto me : this the sentence that they would procure against me from Jehovah, when they pray : ‘Set Thou a wicked man over him. Let the iniquity of his fathers be remembered with Jehovah ;

and let not the sin of his mother be blotted out ; but let them always be before the Lord.'

That a person's wages or reward may mean not what he receives but what he bestows, is illustrated by the following passages. 'The wages *of* Sin¹ is death ; but the gift *of* God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord' (Rom. vi. 23). 'Lo, children are an heritage *of* the Lord : and the fruit of the womb is *His* reward' (Ps. cxxvii. 3). 'Behold, I come quickly ; and *my* reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be' (Rev. xxii. 12).

III. *Isaiah xl. 10 ; lxii. 11, compared with Psalm cix. 20.*

In these verses of Isaiah, the word for '*reward*,' in Ps. cix. 20, is rendered '*work*.' 'Behold, the LORD God will come with strong hand, and His arm shall rule for Him : behold His reward is with Him, and His *work* before Him' (xl. 10). 'Behold, the LORD hath proclaimed unto the end of the world, Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy salvation cometh ; behold, His reward is with Him, and His *work* before Him' (lxii. 11). This meaning '*work*' is indeed primary, but the meaning '*reward of labour*' is well authenticated, and is by some applied in the verses quoted from Isaiah. Thus, Rosenmüller's rendering of the last clause of Is. xl. 10 is : '*et operæ pretium ejus coram facie sua ;*' and Dr Henderson has in the same place : 'and His *recompense* before Him.'

I. If *recompense* be the true rendering, the verses in question seem to illustrate the construction which is required in Ps. cix. 20 ; '*His recompense*' being not what He is to receive, but what He is to bestow. So Rosenmüller, who explains the second hemistich, in each case, as a declaration that Jehovah has a recompense in store for His pious worshippers, and continues : 'Sistitur autem hic Deus ut imperator, cui, victori e bello reduci, præferuntur præmia inter probatæ fidei milites ab ipso dividenda.' Dr Henderson

¹ Sin being personified (ver. 16).

indeed remarks, on the other side, that 'The reward and recompense following are not those which the Messiah would bestow on others, but his own—what he himself had merited;' and affirms that this is the only sense of which the Hebrew word in question will admit. The question however is about the use of the pronoun '*His*.' Does He receive or bestow the recompense¹? If the latter, then 'my enemies' recompense' might mean analogously the recompense to be bestowed by them; and, as in Isaiah it is said, 'His reward is with Him,' so here in Ps. cix. the recompense proceeds from (lit. *from-with*) Jehovah. From Him would they procure it for me.

But it introduces no essential variation, to take the primary meaning of the word for *recompense*, in Ps. cix. 20, and to explain the verse accordingly: 'This is my enemies' treatment of me;' *i.e.* the treatment which they would procure for me, from Jehovah. This meaning is, in a measure, favoured by the contrast: 'But THOU, *deal*, or *do*, with me &c.'

IV. *Outline of Psalm cix.*²

The foregoing explanations develop an intimate correspondence between the various portions of the Psalm.

It opens with an invocation of Divine help by one assailed with imprecations (ver. 3), and false charges (ver. 2), which are yet insufficient to rouse in him feelings of revenge, or to extinguish the memory of his former love (ver. 4).

Now follow

[i] The words of hatred (ver. 6—15, 19).

[ii] The false accusations (ver. 16—18).

'Thus,' writes the Psalmist, 'would my evil speakers have it done unto me. But Thou, Lord God, deal mercifully.'

We have next a refutation of the calumnious charges (ver. 22—25); and lastly, a deprecation of curses, with specific allusions to the several imprecations, superadded to a

¹ See note A, p. 258.

² See note B, p. 258.

general prayer (or expression of trust) that the curses may turn to blessings (ver. 28, 30, 31); the discomfiture of the enemy being contemplated only as a necessary prelude to the Psalmist's deliverance (ver. 29).

V. *Comparison of ver. 16—18, with 22—25.*

1. They say that I remembered not to shew mercy; but persecuted the *afflicted and needy* to the last extremity. But it is I that am *afflicted and needy*; my heart is wounded within me: I go hence like the shadow that declineth; I am shaken off like a grasshopper.

2. They say that I revelled in oppression: that cursing was as water to my thirsty soul; as marrow and *fatness* to my bones. Alas! my knees are frail through abstinence: my flesh is dried up for want of *fatness*. Far from being the lordly contemner of others, I am a reproach, and an object of derision to them.

The Prayer-Book rendering of ver. 16, 17, is, indeed,

‘His delight was in cursing, and it shall happen unto him: he loved not blessing, therefore shall it be far from him. He clothed himself with cursing, like as with a raiment: and it shall come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones.’

But (a) all the verbs must be rendered in the same tense, thus: ‘He loved cursing, and it came unto him. He delighted not in blessing, and it stood aloof from him: &c. &c.’

And (b) the received explanations of the similes, ‘like water,’ ‘like oil,’ are scarcely accordant with the certain well-known biblical usages. *Water* is more commonly the symbol of something delicious; and *oil* is used in a good sense, even in such expressions as, ‘smoother than oil,’ applied to the words of the wicked; for it is the attractiveness of the words which is there described. In Job xv. 16, it is said: ‘How much more abominable and filthy is man, which drinketh iniquity like water?’ *i.e.* with delight, and greedily. And again, in Job xxxiv. 7: ‘What man is like Job, who drinketh up scorning like water?’ With the clause, ‘and like oil into his

bones ;' may be compared, Prov. iii. 7, 8 ; xv. 30 ; and, by way of contrast, Prov. xvii. 22 : 'Be not wise in thine own eyes ; fear the Lord, and depart from evil. It shall be health to thy navel, and marrow to thy bones.' 'The light of the eyes rejoiceth the heart : and a good report maketh the bones fat.' 'A merry heart doeth good like a medicine : but a broken spirit drieth the bones.' See too Ps. lxxiii. 6, 7, 10.

VI. *Comparison of ver. 6—15, 19, 20, with 26—31.*

In ver. 20 it is said, with reference to the preceding curses : 'This is the reward of mine adversaries from the Lord ;' and in ver. 27, by way of contrast : 'Let them know that *this* [*i.e.* this salvation¹] is Thy hand. Though they curse, yet bless Thou.' Instead of an early grave, desolation, and oblivion, grant me to praise Thee among the multitude. Leave me not comfortless, but give me the comfort of Thy *grace* (ver. 12, 21). Appoint thou no wicked one to have charge over me. Let God, not Satan, stand at my right hand.

VII. To recapitulate some of the chief arguments in favour of this transference of the imprecations :

1. It is at least as natural, grammatically, to assign ver. 6 &c. to the Psalmist's enemies as to himself.
2. The persistent use of the singular, 'over *him*, &c. &c.' is thus explained ; whereas, according to the more commonly received theories, there is some difficulty in accounting for it. In certain cases indeed, and those not rare, a collective or distributive singular may replace a plural ; but such substitutions are not made altogether at random. In the present instance, although it is not affirmed that the singular is incapable of being explained in accordance with the usual hypothesis ; it may be said that its explanation is less easy when that hypothesis is retained, than when it is rejected.
3. The verse (20) wherein lies almost the only difficulty in the way of accepting the view here adopted, is found upon examination to depend for its emphasis upon a contrast be-

¹ Aben Ezra. Kimchi.

tween the *animus* of the Psalmist's adversaries, and the mercy of the LORD. Moreover, it describes those adversaries in express terms as *speakers of evil*, which makes it more natural to attribute the preceding curses to them, than to one who was all 'prayer.'

4. Lastly, not only are violent transitions in tone and feeling thus avoided, but an intricate antistrophic correspondence is developed. After some prefatory verses, come specifications of

- (a) The words of hatred.
- (b) The false charges.

Next in order (ver. 20, &c.) there is a contrast between 'mine adversaries,' and 'Thou, God the LORD.'... Then follow, in inverse order,

- (β) An answer to the false charges.
- (a) A deprecation of the curses.

The concluding prayer corresponds to the initial curses; and, in general, (a) to (a), and (β) to (b); while at the turning point of the Psalm (as it may be called), to ver. 20 corresponds ver. 21.

VIII. *St Peter's citation from Psalms lxix; cix.*

In Acts i. 16, &c. we read that 'in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said . . . Men and brethren, this Scripture must needs have been fulfilled¹, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus. For he was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry. Now this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out. And it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem; insomuch as that field is called in their proper tongue, Aceldama, that is to say, The field of blood. For it is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habita-

¹ ἔδει πληρωθῆναι.

tion be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: and his bishopric let another take. Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that He was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of His resurrection.'

1. There is a difficulty in explaining the import of ὅτι, in the clause: 'For he was numbered with us.' Some commentators have resorted to the expedient of rendering it, *although*. The Scripture must needs have been fulfilled in Judas, although he was among the chosen twelve.

2. Dr Wordsworth writes as follows:

ὅτι.] *Because* he was their ὁδηγός, or leader; *because*, being one of us, 'he knew the place' (Joh. xviii. 2) where, and the time when, He might be taken: and *because* it had been prophesied that one of His familiar friends should betray Christ (Ps. xli. 9).

3. 'There may be,' writes Dean Alford, 'an ellipse:—*guide to them that took Jesus: but this was not his only character—*; or the ὅτι may have reference to the substance of the prophecy, and serve to explain, ἡ ἔπαυλις αὐτοῦ, and ἡ ἐπισκοπή αὐτοῦ.' This last view leads to a plausible explanation, if the ὅτι be taken as explanatory, not of πληρωθῆναι τὴν γραφήν, but of προεῖπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. How, it may be asked, come the words cited to be applied to Judas? of whom, at first sight, they seem to make no mention. It might, indeed, be said that St Peter's application of them is a sufficient answer to the enquiry; but, the allusion to Judas, independently of Apostolic authority, being by no means obvious, it might have been expected that St Peter—arguing for instant action, and speaking to be understood—would explain the words cited, where ambiguous, and remove the difficulties, which to his hearers might appear to beset his application of those words. Nor does such an expectation rest upon mere surmise. In the following chapter of the Acts, another address by the same Apostle is recorded; and therein he is careful to explain in what way it comes to pass that a certain

Psalm (xvi) from which he quotes is applicable to the Messiah. 'The patriarch David being dead and buried, his words: *Neither wilt THOU suffer Thine holy one . . .*; were unfulfilled in him, &c. ;' and hence, they are to be applied to Christ¹. In like manner, we may, perhaps, explain the clause, ὅτι κατηριθμημένος ἦν κ.τ.λ. How is 'this Scripture' applicable to Judas? *Because* (ὅτι), by being numbered with us, he came into possession of an ἐπισκοπή. 'Ratio, sub qua Judas hic memoratur, quia habuerat munus.'

4. How, again, is ἔδει πληρωθῆναι to be understood?

Perhaps its *prima facie* meaning would be, that 'this Scripture' *ought to have been*² fulfilled, but was not—'ἔδει dicitur de eo quod fieri *debet*, nec tamen fit'. But there is a reading δέι, for ἔδει, which is not indeed comparable with the received reading in weight of MS. authority, but leads to an explanation which is in some respects simpler than that of ἔδει πληρωθῆναι. If δέι were the original reading, it would be easy to account for the change into ἔδει, as brought about by *assimilation* to the construction of Luke xxiv. 26; where our Lord, conversing with the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, demands, whether Christ *ought not to have suffered*? οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν;

5. Before proceeding to apply the foregoing variation, it should be remarked, that the Citation from the sixty-ninth Psalm is in the *singular*, whereas the original is *plural*: 'Let *their* habitation be desolate, &c.' It might occur to the commentator that perhaps, the Apostle here cites in its primitive form a passage which in the present Hebrew text is corrupt: but there is no ground for the surmise that the Hebrew text errs as regards the *plural* which it exhibits; for, whatever view of Citations generally, and of their relations to the original passages, be adopted, this same passage is cited again, viz. by St Paul in his Epistle to the Romans⁴, and the *plural* (as

¹ See p. 148.

² ἔδει σε οὖν βαλεῖν (Matt. xxv. 27):
ἔδει μὴ ἀνάγεσθαι (Acts xxvii. 21).
With *relative* sentences the case is dif-

ferent. See Luke xxii. 7.

³ This is very frequently implied.
But see Joh. iv. 4. *Winer*.

⁴ See § vi. p. 238.

in the Hebrew) there occurs. We may assume then, that St Peter has substituted the singular for the plural, on some principle of adaptation, which remains to be determined. One solution of the difficulty presented is, that the words cited, not without modification, from the sixty-ninth Psalm, are but preparatory to the words next cited, viz. from the hundred-and-ninth Psalm: 'His bishopric let another take.' On the assumption, that these last words are the *characteristic* of St Peter's citation, the argument may be stated as below.

The Ordination of St Matthias.

'That the disciples should have proceeded to this election after the departure of Christ, and before the coming of the Holy Spirit, is a proof that in the interval they felt no sense of desertion, no want of guidance for their own internal economy.' This remark of Mr Humphry contains a clew to the right understanding of St Peter's first address. The disciples, not yet 'endued with power from on high,' might well shrink from the grave responsibility of choosing a successor to fill up the number of THE TWELVE. The Apostle's advice is to proceed at once with a task from which they would fain draw back, and he urges, accordingly, as the most potent of incentives, that 'the Scripture must be fulfilled'; *δεῖ πληρωθῆναι τὴν γραφὴν*. The argument is not without its parallels. The Apostle contends *a priori* for a certain course of action, because the Scriptures must needs be fulfilled: so, JESUS had addressed them *a priori*: 'How then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled that so it must be?' (Matt. xxvi. 54). Attention is arrested by St Peter's opening words: their explanation follows. What saith the Scripture on this matter? It has indeed an application to Judas, seeing that 'he was numbered with us', &c.: from that estate he has fallen: the divine decree is *λάβοι ἕτερος*, 'his bishopric let another take.' This being the case, there must needs be chosen one to take his place, and

¹ 'It behoueth that the Scripture be fillid.' *Wiclif*.

² Compare Ps. xli. 9.

witness with us to the Lord's Resurrection¹. The argument at once prevails: they choose out two: and the lot falls upon Matthias.

NOTES ON CHAPTER XII.

A. 'Is. xl. 10—his reward and the recompense of his work] That is, the reward and the recompense which he bestows, and which he will pay to his faithful servants: this he has ready at hand with him, and holds it out before him, to encourage those who trust in him, and wait for him.' *Lowth*.

B. To the same effect Green, Keate, Partridge and others.

1. Sykes, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, Introduction, p. xxxii:—

'Psalm cix.] Take this Psalm as containing a recital of the curses and imprecations of very slanderous men against the Psalmist himself, from ver. 5th to the 20th, and all is clear. David says, ver. 3, that they compassed him about with words of hatred; and, ver. 2, the mouth of the wicked and the mouth of the deceitful are opened against him, They have spoken against me with a lying tongue. And when he had urged his love and good actions to these enemies of his, ver. 4, 5, then follow the evil wishes they expressed against him to ver. 20. And at length, ver. 27, he says, Let them curse, but bless thou.'

2. Kennicott, *Remarks on Select Passages in the Old Testament*:—

'Psalm cix.] 'The thanksgiving of an innocent man, against whom an accusation had been brought by his adversaries for some capital crime, and whose ruin was thought so certain, that they already began to triumph over him as if condemned; when, by some remarkable interposition, his innocence is made to appear, the falsity of the accusation is manifested, and his adversaries are clothed with shame and disgrace.

¹ Compare δὲ πληρωθῆναι, δὲ οὖν μάρτυρα γενέσθαι (ver. 16, 21, 23); λαβέτω, λαβεῖν (ver. 20, 21).

‘ver. 5] I render with the Arab. version, *imprecati sunt*, Arab. **סוּם** or **שׁוּם**, *flagitavit*. This rendering makes the Psalm consistent; the curses being put in the mouth of the enemies of the Psalmist, to whom they certainly belong.

‘ver. 20] The literal rendering is, *hæc est actio adversariorum meorum apud Jehovam*. For **פַּעֲלָה** signifies *actio, molimen*. This is the subject-matter of their prayer.’

[Another rendering may be proposed for consideration. If, ‘from the Lord,’ could mean, ‘with the Lord’s permission,’ then ver. 20 might signify: ‘This, God willing, is the reward of my adversaries...’ i. e. *This would be their award, if He permitted.*]

3. Dr Sykes was answered by Dr Randolph, who lays chief stress upon the exigencies of ver. 20, but does not allude to any such proposed interpretation thereof as that adopted by Mendelssohn (p. 247, note), and in the text of the present Chapter.

4. Mr Perowne, who adopts the more usual explanation, writes on the Imprecatory Psalms :—

‘An uninstructed fastidiousness, it is well known, has made many persons recoil from reading these Psalms at all. Many have found their lips falter when they have been called to join in using them in the congregation, and have either uttered them with bated breath and doubting heart, or have interpreted them in a sense widely at variance with the letter... But after all, whatever may be said of particular passages, the general tone which runs through the two covenants is unquestionably different. To deny this is not to honour Moses, but to dishonour Christ (Matt. v. 43, xix. 8). On the other hand, we must not forget that these imprecations are not the passionate longing for personal revenge: the singer undoubtedly sees in his enemies the enemies of God and His Church. They that are not with him are against God. And because the zeal of God’s house even consumes him, he prays that all the doers of iniquity may be rooted out. The indignation therefore is righteous, though it may appear to us wrongly directed, or excessive in its utterance.’