Short Expository Papers.

Isaiah liii. 9, 11.

I. VER. 9. The Authorised Version has, "And He made His grave with the wicked, and with the rich in His death"; while the Revised Version substitutes "they" for "He," and both give the marginal note "Heb. *deaths*." One is at once struck by the fact that the "rich" are thus made almost synonymous with the "wicked," if the passage be regarded as an instance of Hebrew parallelism. We also notice, that if we regard the passage as clearly Messianic, and look for a fulfilment in the circumstances of the crucifixion, serious differences between the prophecy and the supposed fulfilment are found. Our Blessed Lord did not "make His grave with the wicked," for Joseph of Arimathea was a "just man," and, moreover, the rocky tomb was one in which "was never man yet laid"; and certainly the two thieves were not, as far as we know, "rich."

The difficulty is overcome if we combine the two suggestions of Lowth and Kay. The latter takes יתן as impersonal, "And His grave had been appointed," as in Gen. xli. 14; "and they brought him in haste," for, "and he was brought" (cf. Gesenius, sec. 137).

Lowth followed Aben Ezra, and some Christian commentators, in taking the ב במותי as radical, and not as the preposition. The only other occurrence of מות is said by Kay to be in Ezek. xxviii. 10, where it denotes, he says, a violent death. Gesenius (Roediger and Davies' edition) seems to support Lowth, calling attention to the parallelism of "tumulus, or burial mound," with "grave." I should also take the ו in ואת as adversative: "but."

These changes in translation would give us the passage in the following form: "His grave had been appointed with criminals, but with the rich (was) His tomb." Then follows, in the prophecy, the reason for this change, "*because* He had done no violence, neither was deceit in His mouth." A person condemned as a criminal would in the ordinary course be thrown, with the two robbers, into a hasty common grave. But Pilate, who had already asserted Christ's innocence of the charges brought against Him, granted His body to Joseph, a "rich man," because He had not, like Barabbas

and the two robbers, done violence, and because His remarks about "the truth" had convinced Pilate that "there was no deceit in His mouth."

II. VER. 11. I would take מ in מַעַל in the sense of "out of and looking beyond," and interpret the verse in the light of Heb. xii. 2, "Who, for the joy that was set before Him, endured the cross, despising the shame," etc. מַעַל is always hard, painful labour (κόπος or πόνος—rather than ἔργον). Christ during His humiliation—the sufferings of His earthly life as well as those immediately connected with His death—saw the results of His travail, and was satisfied. We might also, as to His human nature, say, with all reverence, that He showed faith, by which He saw beyond the temporal to the eternal.

GEORGE FARMER.

Hartlip Vicarage, Sittingbourne.

Romans vi. 7.

THIS verse furnishes us with a kind of key to the apostle's meaning in the subsequent, as well as in the previous passage. Godet's interpretation of it as an illustration is that one which, perhaps, most conduces to clearness of thought. Two great facts seem to be present to the apostle's mind—the death of Christ and the death of the sinner. What is the precise meaning of "dying with Christ"? The apostle in this verse virtually says—think what death itself means. Every one knows what he means when he speaks of *death*; every one knows what the nature of an inward experience must be before he will be able to say, "it was death." ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανών evidently means simply, "he that is dead," referring only to the physical meaning. The apostle seems to intend the reader to transfer what this means in the physical world into his spiritual experience. The reference will then be to a certain experience which the believer in Christ has in his first step from the state of sin into the state of righteousness. This experience is of such an ethical kind that it can only be named as corresponding to what death is in the physical sphere. The statement is perhaps

not so much "because He is dead" as simply "when He is dead." The apostle aims at making clear the subjective meaning to each individual of the great objective fact of Christ's death. The practical test for every individual will be, Have I any experience that can be honestly called "death unto sin," "old man crucified"? But what then is the meaning of "justification"? In this illustration the word *δεδικαίωται* seems to mean merely "is freed," "like a dead slave who can no longer execute the orders of his wicked master." But *death* must be before there can be freedom. In spiritual experience, then, the death to sin must be prior to the effects of justification. Therefore, while we hold to the "forensic sense," we are cleared from any superficial application. The act of will by which a sinner trusts in Christ's death as the atonement for his sin is the "dying with Christ," the condition in which he enters into the benefits of Christ's righteousness. But what is involved in this "act of will"? No mere assent on the part of the sinner is sufficient; he must deliberately and consciously turn to Christ with a full apprehension of, and submission to, the consequences, breaking finally with sin, remorselessly crucifying the old man, resolving to trust God for all, as Christ in His death did—all this surely is involved in the act of "faith in Christ," which is the condition of justification.

CONATUS.

Daniel iii. 5.

I FEEL grateful to Professor Whitehouse for expending so much time and scholarship in answer to me. Waving the question of my "right" to take Canon Driver's words in what seems to me their natural meaning, I am glad I have Professor Whitehouse on my side in believing קְהָרִים not to be of Greek origin. If it has come from Hellas, it has come from the Homeric form *κήραρις*, therefore presumably earlier than 400 B.C. For my own part, I think the intercourse between Greece and Assyria and Babylonia was much greater than Professor Whitehouse will admit. He must himself feel the argument *e silentio* specially hazardous in regard to the annals of Nebuchadnezzar and Nabonidus, seeing these are so scanty. I must apologise for not having noticed his article in the *Critical Review*.

He has failed to observe the point of my argu-

ment in regard to סִמְפִּיָּא. I contend that it is a marginal note that has got into the text. I am glad Professor Whitehouse agrees with me that *συμφωνία* is not necessarily an instrument of music, as Mr. Bevan assumes.

With regard to פֶּסֶס טָרִי, I am not so impressed with the paucity of intercourse between Egypt and Assyria as is Professor Whitehouse. The example he gives from Strack of the interchange of λ and γ is not so conclusive as he thinks from the reduplication of the syllables in קִנְקִנְחֹס. The printer evidently had in his mind the more common interchange of λ into γ, and hence printed wrongly קִרְקִנְחֹס. Further, not only is there reduplication, but קִנְקִן is a new Hebrew word meaning "a pitcher" and "a ploughshare." It would be unsafe to argue that in transferring Latin into English, we had a tendency to change *u* into *ra*, because greengrocers and market-gardeners call *asparagus* "sparrow-grass"; they do so because "sparrow" and "grass" are intelligible.

Even if I grant Professor Whitehouse his contention that all three words are Greek, and that all occur in the original text, which I do not, yet from the fact that they are musical terms, I hold his deduction that the books in which they occur must have been written under the Hellenic domination to be certainly hazardous. Musical terms are notoriously words that are transferred from one language to another totally apart from any political domination. We should regard it absurd did any one deduce that Britain was under Italian domination because we speak of *piano* and *violoncello*, or under French supremacy because we sometimes speak of a *cornet-à-piston* or a *trombone*. He recognises that the Greeks borrowed *κινύρα* and *νάβλα*, not to speak of *κιθάρα*. Is he prepared to assert that the Hebrews, in the age of the Babylonian captivity, would not go afield for their musical terms? Had the terms been military terms, as מִלְחָמָה, a general (*στρατηγός*), or מִלְחָמָה, war (*πόλεμος*); or legal terms, נִימוֹ, a law (*νόμος*), דִּבְרֵי נִימוֹ, a decree (*διάταγμα*), all which and many more became well known in Aramaic and new Hebrew, his contention would have had some weight.

Further, I for my part regard all stress laid on isolated words in the Book of Daniel as peculiarly liable to be misplaced from the present state of the text and the evident corruptions it has under-

gone. Ancient and obsolete terms might easily have their place taken by those that were more recent and intelligible. The text of the Book of Daniel did not enjoy the protection which so many other books of the Bible had in being regularly read in the synagogues.

I am sorry that Professor Whitehouse has not entered more fully into the other matters I have brought under his notice. The question of Belshazzar I consider much more important than that of the musical terms. I do not suppose Professor Whitehouse regards as an argument his own inability to see any "insuperable difficulty in the preservation of the name and history" of Belshazzar. If Professor Whitehouse would give any parallel instance, then I could see the force of his statement. Traditions of individuals lost to history have been preserved in the locality associated with them. The memory of an individual who either markedly benefited or horribly oppressed a race might survive their migration. In the case before us, neither of these conditions is satisfied. On the critical hypothesis the Book of Daniel was written in Palestine about 168 B.C. Belshazzar neither oppressed the Jews specially, nor benefited them. Berosus had no reference to Belshazzar, else Josephus would not have been under the necessity of identifying Belshazzar with his father. Eusebius professes to draw from Berosus, and in his summary there is no mention of Belshazzar. Berosus was a Babylonian, a priest of Bel. What source of information, traditional or preserved in records, could be open to an obscure Jew living in Palestine about 170 B.C. which would not be familiar to a Babylonian priest of Bel, who began life something like a century and a half before the critical date of Daniel? Southern Spain is full of traditions of the last Moorish sovereign of Granada, but the son of the last king of Babylon had been forgotten in his native country by the lapse of two centuries and a half. Is it conceivable that this man so forgotten in his native country should be remembered in Palestine? But not only is the knowledge of this obscure Jew singular, but his ignorance also. He must be totally unaware of the complete oblivion that has fallen upon Belshazzar, else he would have explained something about him. Many of what are deemed his accurate references to Babylonian manners and customs are explained by the accurate deductions he has made from obscure passages in Kings and

Jeremiah. A writer who had studied with the minuteness implied the Books of Kings would not fail to know that the name of Nebuchadnezzar's son was not Belshazzar, but Evil-Merodach—a fact communicated to the Greek world independently by Berosus. Why did he take pains to give an appearance of contradiction with his authorities which was utterly needless? A contemporary writer, assuming that every one of his readers knew the events of the preceding quarter of a century, might easily omit all reference to Evil-Merodach, Neriglissar, and Nabunahid, and, addressing the young deputy-monarch, speak of the real founder of the Chaldean dynasty as his father, the more so as not impossibly he was his ancestor. With his intimate and accurate knowledge of the prophecies of Jeremiah, he could not fail to know that the kingdom over the nations was promised to Nebuchadnezzar, his son, and his son's son. Had the writer been drawing on his imagination, guided by Kings and Jeremiah, he certainly would have made Belshazzar son of Evil-Merodach. A writer, contemporary with the events of which he writes, would naturally be careless of any conflict with the vaticinations of prophets, however esteemed. He would know how fact and prophecy harmonised, and would assume his readers did so also. A writer inventing history long centuries after the date in which he puts events would be necessitated to give some explanation, else his apparent contradiction of accredited records would condemn him to utter disbelief. The only alternative to the orthodox hypothesis that the book was written by a contemporary of the events he narrates, is that the writer, while himself intimate with the contents of Kings and Jeremiah, was profoundly ignorant of the fact that anybody else knew anything about them. Even that would fail to explain the instant acceptance of the book.

The difficulty Professor Whitehouse sees in there being no reference to Nabunahid does not seem of much importance. The father of Nebuchadnezzar is not referred to, nor the father of Cyrus. Moreover, not improbably, at the very time when Daniel appeared before Belshazzar, Nabunahid was in seclusion in Tema, and all the government was resting on the shoulders of the king's son (*Mār šarri*). Professor Whitehouse does not take any notice of the fact that while all the historians which have come down to us tell of a siege of Babylon, Daniel alone makes no

mention of a siege at all. What strange providence guarded this obscure Jew from a blunder into which even Berosus, usually so accurate, fell? In a contemporary his conduct is natural.

In regard to Professor Whitehouse's difficulty about Gobryas being possibly Darius the Mede, I confess I do not feel the weight of it. From the omission of the title "King of Babil" from the earlier contract tables of Cyrus, I fancy he did not assume the title till the third year of his reign as king of nations. He might make Gobryas his governor "king" for sacred purposes during that period. I need not tell Professor Whitehouse that often, during the domination of Assyria, a deputy ruled in Babylon and was called king. As to the appointment of Satraps, on the authority of Mr. Pinches I find that it is recorded that Gobryas appointed governors in Babylon (vide *Criticism of Holy Scripture*: Theo. Pinches, p. 5).¹ Professor Whitehouse has to explain how a writer, who was so accurately informed in so many points, did not know that Darius was *not* a Mede, but a Persian, and was *not* the son of Ahasuerus, but of Hystaspis. By the beginning of the eleventh chapter of Daniel, we see the writer knew accurately the succession of the Persian monarchs from Cyrus to Xerxes. What sudden fit of oblivion can have seized him to lead him to transpose Darius Hystaspis from the third place after Cyrus, and place him before that monarch, and change him from a Persian into a Mede? Professor Whitehouse does not get over the difficulties of the situation by assuming Darius the Mede to be Darius Hystaspis.

J. E. H. THOMSON.

Stirling.

Kautzsch's New Edition of the Psalter.²

V.

KAUTZSCH looks upon the Hebrew of xvi. 3 as incomprehensible, and leaves it untranslated. The attempts that have been made to deal with it have been so many and so diverse that in the resulting confusion one cannot but sympathise with his unwillingness to come to a definite decision. Three of these attempts, however, are at least worth pondering. The first, Delitzsch's, is mentioned in

¹ For the use of this pamphlet, I have to thank the kindness of Mr. James Brown, Ampthill.

² See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, October 1893.

Kautzsch's notes. In it וְאֵלֶּיךָ is removed from before וְאֵלֶּיךָ and prefixed to וְאֵלֶּיךָ ; and וְאֵלֶּיךָ becomes the subject of the second half of the verse. The Psalmist has said something to Yahweh in ver. 2; now he says something to the servants of the Lord—

"And to the saints who are in the earth [I say],

'These are the excellent, in whom is all my delight.'"

The obvious criticism³ is: "But this could be said of the saints rather than *to* them, and the suggested change in the text is not warranted by the result. For the sense thus gained does not seem sufficiently elevated and important to correspond with the preceding address to Jehovah." De Witt, who thus criticises Delitzsch, agrees with him in considering the וְאֵלֶּיךָ of וְאֵלֶּיךָ to be parallel to that of וְאֵלֶּיךָ , but he takes the וְאֵלֶּיךָ of וְאֵלֶּיךָ as expegetic, and, most important of all, he finds in ver. 4 the declaration which the Psalmist makes to the saints. Here is his rendering—

"I say to Jehovah, 'Thou art my Lord;

I have nought that is good beside THEE.'

And I say to the holy tribes of the land,

To the eminent nation in which I have all my delight,

'Many their woes that pay dowry to idols;

I will not pour out their libations of blood,

Nor lift up their names on my lips.'"

More than one topic of discussion could be found in the wording of this, but it must be confessed that if De Witt has found the real address to the saints it is one full of matter, and worthy of their hearing. The third and most recent attempt is that of Dr. Wildeboer in the current number of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* (November 1893). The determining consideration with him is the dependence on Isa. lxii. 4, which he believes himself to have found in Ps. xvi. 1-4. In accordance with this, he substitutes וְאֵלֶּיךָ for וְאֵלֶּיךָ , and renders vers. 2 and 3 as follows:—

"I said to Yahweh, 'Thou art my Lord,

The treasure of her whom Thou hast married.'

To the holy ones that are in the land [I said],

'They are the excellent ones of whom [the saying is true]

All my delight is in them.'"

³ Kautzsch suggests a mode of rebutting this. He proposes the alternative rendering of in place of "to the saints," forgetting that it would then be necessary to render "of Yahweh" in ver. 2.

Winchcombe.

JOHN TAYLOR.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.