


7.1.02.

From the Library of  
Professor William Henry Green  
Bequeathed by him to  
the Library of  
Princeton Theological Seminary

BS1151

.H818

v.4





# BIBLICAL CRITICISM

ON

THE FIRST FOURTEEN

HISTORICAL BOOKS

OF

## THE OLD TESTAMENT;

ALSO

ON THE FIRST NINE

PROPHETICAL BOOKS.

✓  
BY

SAMUEL HORSLEY, L.L.D. F.R.S. F.A.S.

LATE LORD BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. ~~II~~ IV

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, & BROWN,  
AND F. C. & J. RIVINGTON.

---

1820.



# CRITICAL NOTES

UPON

## HOSEA.

---

### CHAP. I.

(A) —“ UNTO Hosea,” אל הושע. —“ by Hosea,” בהושע. —“ unto Hosea,” אל הושע.

To speak *to* Hosea and *by* Hosea (אל and ב) are phrases of different import. To speak *to*, expresses, that to him the discourse was immediately addressed. To speak *by*, that through him it was addressed to others. And that the speech, so addressed to others, was not the prophet's own, but God's; God using the prophet as his organ of speech to the people. The different import of these two constructions, so manifest in the Hebrew text, has been very judiciously preserved in the LXX, according to

the Vatican, in the Vulgate, in the Chaldee, in Luther's Latin translation, in Calvin's, in our Public Translation, and in Archbishop Newcombe's; but neglected by Castalio, Jun. and Trem. and by Houbigant. It must be confessed, that in some instances the prefix  $\beth$  seems used as equivalent to  $\aleph$ . But its most proper meaning is indisputably a mean between the opposite senses of  $\beth$  and  $\aleph$ , *from* and *towards*, denoting 'rest, residence, or continuance in.' Hence it is the proper preposition of the instrument, as that in which the active power of the first efficient is placed. And in such studied change from one mode of expression to another, as occurs in this passage, it is reasonable to suppose, that each is used in its distinct and appropriate meaning. Some passages indeed have been alleged, in which  $\beth$  after verbs of speaking to, might be rendered by the Latin 'cum,' or the English 'with.' As in Numbers xii, 8. "With him [ $\beth$ ] will I speak mouth to mouth." But in this, and every instance of the same kind except one, the parties in the discourse, or the supposed discourse, are God and the prophet. And in every discourse of God with a prophet, much more is intended than the prophet's information; the prophet is always the vehicle of a



divine message to the people. Even in this text of Hosea, where what is said by God seems immediately to concern the prophet individually, being a command of something to be done by him in the economy of his domestic life; yet the act commanded being of public interest and importance, as it was typical of the case between God and the people of Israel; being commanded for that very reason, as a method of public admonition and denunciation; even in this instance, which in the first face of it has much the appearance of a private affair of the prophet's, it was rather *by* than *to* Hosea that Jehovah spake; and the change in the original from לָא to בְּ, and back again, is not immaterial, and ought to be preserved in the translation.

Some imagine, that בְּ, in this and similar passages, describes the manner of the divine communication with the holy prophets, not by an audible voice, but by internal suggestions. “Loqui in aliquo dicitur Deus, cum ea, quæ agi vult, ejus cordi, ut agantur, inspirat.” Eucher. de quæst. V. et N. T. If this be the force of בְּ, it renders neither ‘to’ nor ‘by,’ but ‘within.’ “The beginning of the word of Jehovah within Hosea.”— But I cannot but think, that in all this extraordinary intercourse

which God vouchsafed to hold with man, the internal suggestion must always have been accompanied, not perhaps with an audible voice, but with some external sign, by which the prophet might with certainty distinguish the revelations of the Holy Spirit from thoughts arising in his own mind: and I very much doubt, whether internal suggestion alone was a method of communication. I have no doubt, therefore, that ‘by,’ rather than ‘within,’ is the proper rendering of ב in this passage.

(B) —“ was in this manner.” This I take to be the force of the copula ו prefixed to יאמר. And so it is taken by Castalio and Houbigant. The ו is often to be taken as a particle of specification, equivalent to *scilicet*, *nempe*, or *nimirum*. A very remarkable instance of this use of it we find in Job’s memorable confession of his faith in the Redeemer to come. Job xix, 23—27.

23 Oh that my words were now written!

Oh that they were inscribed in a register!

24 That, with a pen of iron or lead,

For everlasting they were graven on a rock!

After this wish, ו prefixed to אני, at the beginning of the next verse, very ill rendered ‘for,’ in our

Public Translation, specifies the words, which Job would have recorded; the matter of the inscription.

25 וְאֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי, Namely, [these words,] I know the Living One is my Redeemer, &c. to the end of ver. 27.

Vide Nold. not. 1208.

(C) —“ is perpetually playing the wanton,” זֶנָּה תֹנֶנָּה. —“ to whore whores.” This construction, in which the finite verb is connected with its own infinitive, for the most part expresses the perpetual repetition of the action, as a matter of daily practice and habit.

Buxtorf’s distinction, that when the infinitive is put first, this construction expresses the greater certainty and evidence of the thing;\* but when the infinitive follows, the continuance and frequent practice, seems to me to have no foundation. I think that, in either position of the infinitive, greater certainty, or greater frequency may be expressed, as the subject matter may require.

---

\* See Thes. Gram. Lib. II. cap. 16. Reg. 2.

(D) —“ I will visit the blood of Jezraël upon the house of Jehu.”

Jezraël, the mystical name of the prophet's son, must be familiar to all who are conversant in the Holy Scriptures, as the name of a city in the tribe of Issachar, and of a valley or plain, in which the city stood: the city, famous for its vineyard, which cost the rightful owner, the unfortunate Naboth, his life; and, by the righteous judgment of God, gave occasion to the downfall of the royal house of Ahab: the plain, one of the finest parts of the whole land of Canaan, if we may judge from the partiality of the kings of Israel for the spot, who all fixed their residence in one or other of its numerous cities. Modern expositors, entirely forgetting the prophet's son, have thought of nothing in this passage but the place; the city, or the plain. A mistake into which perhaps they have the more easily fallen, by reason of the explicit mention of the place at the end of the subsequent verse. But if the word Jezraël be taken here as the name of a place, the threat of “ avenging, or visiting, upon the house of Jehu the blood of Jezraël,” will signify, that the family of Jehu was to be punished for

blood shed by Jehu, or by his descendants, in that place.

Jehu himself shed the blood of Ahab's family, with unsparing hand, in Jezraël. But this was an execution of the judgment, which God had denounced by his prophet Elijah against the house of Ahab, for the cruel murder of Naboth. And it may justly seem extraordinary, that this should be mentioned as a crime of so deep a dye, as to bring down vengeance upon Jehu's house. It is true, that when the purposes of God are accomplished by the hand of man (which is the case indeed in some degree in every human action), the very same act may be just and good, as it proceeds from God, and makes a part of the scheme of providence; and criminal in the highest degree, as it is performed by the man, who is the immediate agent. The man may act from sinful motives of his own, without any consideration, or knowledge, of the end to which God directs the action. In many cases the man may be incited by enmity to God and the true religion to the very act, in which he accomplishes God's secret, or even his revealed, purpose. The man, therefore, may justly incur wrath and punishment, for those very deeds, in which, with much evil in-

tention of his own, he is the instrument of God's good providence. But these distinctions will not apply to the case of Jehu, in such manner as to solve the difficulty arising from this interpretation of the text. Jehu was specially commissioned by a prophet "to smite the house of Ahab his master; to avenge the blood of the prophets, and the blood of all the servants of Jehovah, at the hand of Jezebel." \* And however the general corruption of human nature, and the recorded imperfections of Jehu's character, might give room to suspect, that in the excision of Ahab's family, and of the whole faction of Baal's worshippers, he might be instigated by motives of private ambition, and by a cruel sanguinary disposition; the fact appears from the history to have been otherwise; that he acted through the whole business with a conscientious regard to God's commands, and a zeal for his service: inasmuch, that when the work was completed, he received the express approbation of God; and the continuance of the sceptre of Israel in his family, to the fourth generation, was promised as the reward of this good and accepted service. "Jehovah said

---

\* 2 Kings, ix, 7.

unto Jehu, because thou hast done well, in executing that which is right in mine eyes, and hast done unto the house of Ahab according to all that was in my heart; thy children of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel.”\* And it cannot be conceived, that the very same deed, which was commanded, approved, and rewarded, in Jehu, who performed it, should be punished as a crime in Jehu’s posterity, who had no share in the transaction.

To avoid this difficulty, another interpretation is mentioned with approbation by the learned Pocock, in which “the blood of Jezraël” is still understood of the blood of Ahab’s family, shed by Jehu in Jezraël: but, by a particular acceptation of the verb פקד, this is understood not as the object, but as the standard, or model, of the punishment. And the words are brought to this sense; that God will execute vengeance upon the wicked house of Jehu, in slaughter abundant as the slaughter of Ahab’s family and kindred in Jezraël. But in this way of taking the words, a punishment is denounced for a crime not specified; which is not after the manner of the denunciations of holy writ. Besides, although the

---

\* 2. Kings, x, 30.

Hebrew words in themselves might not be incapable of this construction, if this were the only passage in which the phrase occurred; the truth is, it is a very common manner of expression. And wherever the phrase is used of 'visiting any thing upon a person,' the thing, which is the object of the verb transitive (without any preposition or prefix) is always to be understood as some crime, to be punished upon the person. And to take the phrase in any other manner here would be a mode of interpretation, which would tend to bring upon the style of the sacred writers the very worst species of obscurity—that of uncertainty; divesting the most familiar expressions of a clear definite meaning.

For these reasons, I am persuaded, that Jezraël is to be taken in this passage in its mystical meaning; and is to be understood of the persons typified by the prophet's son; the holy seed; the true servants and worshippers of God. It is threatened, that their blood is to be visited upon the house of Jehu, by which it had been shed. The princes descended from Jehu were all idolaters. And idolaters have always been persecutors of the true religion. In all ages, and in all countries, they have persecuted the Jezraël unto death, whenever they



have had the power of doing it. The blood of Jezraël, therefore, which was to be visited on the house of Jehu, was the blood of God's servants, shed in persecution, and of infants shed upon the altars of their idols, by the idolatrous princes of the line of Jehu. And so the expression was understood by St Jerome and by Luther.

(E) “ And this shall be in that very day, when I break,” &c. I suggest it to the learned to consider, whether the phrase so frequent in the prophets, **והיה ביום ההוא** is not to be differently taken, according as it is connected, or not connected, with the subsequent clause by the copula **ו**. I am much inclined to think, that when it is not so connected, **יום ההוא** is to be understood of a time described, or marked, by some event already mentioned; and the force of the expression is to notify, that the event of the subsequent clause is to take place at that time. But when these three words are connected with the subsequent clause by the copula **ו**; then I conceive, that the event of the subsequent clause affords the marks of the time, and gives the date of the event previously mentioned. So that in both cases a synchronism is described, but with this

difference; that in the first case the event previously mentioned gives the date of the other; in the second case, the other event gives the date of that previously mentioned. And the nominative understood of the verb substantive, should be rendered, in the first case, by the pronoun 'it;' in the second, by the demonstrative, 'this.' Thus, in chapter ii, verse 16. (18 Heb.) **וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא נֹאֵם יְהוָה תִּקְרָאֵנִי אִישִׁי**, "And it shall be in that day (saith Jehovah) thou shalt call me Ishi," *i. e.* in the day when Jehovah shall do the things mentioned in the preceding verse. These things make the date of the time; and the calling of Jehovah Ishi, is the event referred to that date. But in this passage, **וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא וְשִׁבַּרְתִּי**, "And this shall be in that very day and I break," &c. *i. e.* And this shall be [the thing last mentioned, the demolition of the kingdom of Israel, shall take place] in that very day when I break, &c. Here the breaking of the bow is the event that marks the date; and to that date, so marked, the threatened excision of the kingdom of the ten tribes is referred. I presume not to lay this down as a rule of interpretation, which will invariably hold. But I think it will, and I propose it to the learned, as a matter that deserves an accurate inves-

tigation. Whether the rule hold invariably or no, I cannot but think that the supposed distinction has led me to the true sense of this text; which, taken the contrary way, as I think it has been generally taken, as a denunciation, that, when the monarchy should be abolished, its military strength should be broken, appears to be of less importance. For how should the military strength survive the monarchy? But it was of moment to give the people warning, that the advantages, which the enemy would gain over them in that part of the country, would end in the utter subversion of the kingdom. For, had this timely warning produced repentance and reformation, the judgment, no doubt, would have been averted.

(F) —“insomuch as to be perpetually forgiving them.” So I render with Jun. and Trem. Lively, and Houbigant, and with the approbation of Drusus. The words will not bear the sense, in which they are taken by Arias Montanus; although it is adopted by Calvin, Castalio, Diodati, in our Public Translation, and by Archbishop Newcombe. For the verb  $\text{שׁוּב}$ , in the sense of taking away, never governs its object by the prefix  $\text{ל}$ .

(G) —“ in the place where.” So I render the words במקום אשר, and for thus rendering we have the authority of LXX, Jerome, Vulg. Syr. and Chald. and, it must be added, of St Paul himself.\* It seems, therefore, to have been without due consideration, that a different rendering has been adopted, upon the authority of some of the later Jews, by Jun. and Trem. Castalio, Grotius, Wells, and Houbigant. As if במקום אשר might be equivalent to תחת אשר, “ instead of what,” *pro eo quod*; a sense which I believe cannot be supported by a single instance. Junius objects to the other rendering, that to bear that sense the word מקום ought to have had the emphatic article prefixed. But Mr Livelye well remarks, that in other places this self same expression, in the self same form, is taken by that learned interpreter himself, in the very sense which in this place he rejects. Namely, in Lev. iv, 24. Jer. xxii, 12. and Ezek. xxi, 35. Indeed, in those places it can be taken in no other. I agree with Mr Livelye, that this sense, confirmed by all the antient versions, and by St Paul, is indeed the only true and certain sense of the phrase.

---

\* Rom. ix, 26.

(H) 10, 11. By the exposition which I have given of the several parts of this passage, I hope I have shewn that it is an express prophecy of the final conversion and restoration of the Jews, not without manifest allusion to the call of the Gentiles. The word Jezraël, though applied in this passage to the devout part of the natural Israel, by its etymology is capable of a larger meaning, comprehending all of every race and nation, who, by the preaching of the gospel, are made members of Christ and the children of God. All these are a seed of God, begotten of him, by the spirit, to a holy life, and to the inheritance of immortality. The words Ammi and Ruhamah, and their opposites, Lo-ammi and Loruhamah, are capable of the same extension; the two former to comprehend the converted, the two latter the unconverted Gentiles. In this extent they seem to be used in chap. ii, 23, which I take to be a prophecy of the call of the Gentiles, with manifest allusion to the restoration of the Jews. Accordingly, we find these prophecies of Hosea cited by St Paul to prove, not the call of the Gentiles solely, but the indiscriminate call to salvation both of Gentiles and Jews. He affirms that God “has called us [*i. e.* us Christians] vessels of mercy, afore-prepared

unto glory," οὐ μόνον ἐξ Ἰουδαίων ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἔθνων,  
 "not of the Jews only, but moreover of the Gentiles  
 too." \* And it is in proof of this proposition that  
 he cites the prophecies of Hosea; and the manner  
 of his citation is thus. First, he alleges two clauses,  
 but in an inverted order, from the 23d verse of  
 chapter ii, which seem to relate more immediately  
 to the call of the Gentiles. "I will call them my  
 people," &c. "and her beloved," &c. And to these  
 he subjoins, as relating solely to the restoration of  
 the Jews, that part of this prophecy of the first chap-  
 ter, which affirms, that "in the place where it was  
 said unto them, Ye are not my people, there they  
 shall be called the children of the living God."  
 From these detached passages, thus connected, he  
 derives the confirmation of his proposition concern-  
 ing the joint call of Jew and Gentile to the mercy  
 of the gospel. †

The allusion, which is made to these prophecies  
 by St Peter in his First Epistle, ‡ is not properly a  
 citation of any part of them, but merely an accom-  
 modation of the expressions, "not my people;"  
 "my people;" "not having obtained mercy;"

\* Rom. ix, 24.

† Rom. ix, 25, 26.

‡ Chap. ii, 10.

“having obtained mercy;” to the case of the Hebrews of the Asiatic dispersion before and after their conversion.

It is surprising, that the return of Judah from the Babylonian captivity should ever have been considered by any Christian divine as the principal object of this prophecy, and an event in which it has received its full accomplishment. It was indeed considered as an inchoate accomplishment, but not more than inchoate, by St Cyril of Alexandria. The expositors of antiquity, in such cases, were too apt to take up with some circumstances of general resemblance, without any critical examination of the terms of a prophecy, or of the detail of the history to which they applied it. The fact is, that this prophecy has no relation to the return from Babylon in a single circumstance. And yet the absurd interpretation, which considers it as fulfilled and finished in that event, has of late been adopted. —“*et erit numerus filiorum,*” &c. ver. 10. “*Quando impleta est hæc prædictio?*” says a learned expositor; and answers the question, “*in reditu Babylonico.*” But what was the number of the returned captives, that it should be compared to that of the sands upon the sea shore? The number of the returned, in compa-

riſon with the whole captivity, was nothing. “Then Judah and Iſrael ſhall appoint themſelves one head.” Zorobabel, ſays Grotius. But how was Zorobabel one head of the reſt of Iſrael, as well as of Judah? A later critic answers, “After the return from Babylon, the diſtinction between the kingdoms of Iſrael and Judah ceaſed.” But how was it, this diſtinction ceaſed? In this manner, I apprehend. The kingdom of Iſrael had been aboliſhed above 180 years before; Judah alone exiſted as a body politic; and the houſe of Judah returned under their leader Zorobabel, with ſome few ſtragglers of the captivity of the ten tribes. And no ſooner were the returning captives reſettled in Judea, than thoſe of the ten tribes, joining with the mongrel race, which they found in Samaria, ſeparated themſelves from Judah, and ſet up a leader, and a ſchiſmatical worſhip of their own. Was this any ſuch incorporation, as the prophecy deſcribes, of Judah and the reſt of Iſrael under one ſovereign? To interpret the prophecy in this manner is to make it little better than a paltry quibble; more worthy of the Delphic tripod, than of the Scripture of Truth. Very judicious upon this ſubject are theſe remarks of the learned Houbigant: —“The prophet,” he ſays,



“ in the 10th verse, passes from threatenings to promises, which is the manner of the prophets, that the Jews might not think, that after the accomplishment of the threatenings, God would concern himself no more about their nation. Those promises seem to respect the final condition of the Jews, when they should collect under one head, the Messiah; that it might properly be said of them, ‘ Ye are children of the living God.’ It is difficult to accommodate the words of this passage to the return from the Babylonian captivity. Those Jews, who returned from Babylon, were not so much as one hundredth part of the whole Jewish race; so little were they to be compared with the sands of the sea: nor did they appoint themselves one head. Zorobabel was indeed their leader, but not their single leader; and their form of government henceforward was not monarchical, but an aristocracy. Nor had they kings till the very last, when they were become unworthy to be called ‘ children of the living God.’ ”

## CHAP. II.

(A) The verb **אמר** is comparatively so seldom used otherwise than as equivalent to the English verb ‘ to

say,' with a declaration subjoined of what was said, that I hesitated long about the translation which I venture to give of this passage, in which I take the verb as equivalent to the English word 'to speak,' without immediate mention of the words spoken. But, consulting the concordances, I find many unquestionable instances of this use of it. See Psalm iv, 5, and lxxi, 10; Gen. xliii, 27, 29; Ezek. xxxiii, 10; Ezra viii, 22; Psalm xxix, 9; Esth. iii, 4, iv, 10, and vi, 4; Psalm lxxxix, 19, clxv, 6; Exod. xix, 25; 2 Chron. xxxii, 24; 2 Sam. xiv, 4.

(B) The verb פשט signifies properly 'to flay the skin.' Hence, when applied to garments, it signifies 'to strip to the bare skin,' to divest even of the garments next the skin. ערום is a more general word, and expresses a less degree of denudation. And the two joined together express 'to strip perfectly one already half naked.' פן אפשרונה ערמה. *Ne nudam eam plane denudem.* This is confirmed by a similar expression in the book of Job : \* — "thou hast stripped the naked of their clothing;" *i. e.* thou hast even divested the beggar, thinly clad, of that

---

\* Chap. xxii, 6.

poor covering. The verb יצ׳ sometimes signifies ‘to fix, or leave remaining in its place.’ But properly, I think, it denotes ‘to present openly to view.’ Hence the full sense of the passage is, that the disgraced discarded wanton should be stripped stark-naked, and in that situation exposed to public view. To express this clearly in the English language, I have found it necessary to transpose the Hebrew words, which stand in this order: “Lest I strip-her-to-the-skin, naked, and-set-her-up-to-view as the day when she was born.” But it is evident that the circumstance in which the condition of the disgraced adultress resembles that of the day of her birth, is perfect nakedness.

(C) —“hath caused shame.” I take the verb הובישה actively, as it is taken by the LXX, and Archbishop Newcombe. It is evidently the third person singular feminine preterite in Hiphil.

(D) —“her ways.” For ררכו, I read, with the Syriac, ררכיה, the noun plural in regimine, instead of the singular, and with the suffix of the third person feminine singular, instead of the second. The LXX render the pronoun in the third person, in-

stead of the second ; but the noun they give in the singular, as if they read דרכה : which reading is adopted by Houbigant and Archbishop Newcombe.

(E) —“ a stone fence.” גדר is properly ‘ mace-  
ria ;’ a low wall of loose stones, laid one upon an-  
other, without any cement or mortar. Such inclos-  
ures are very common at this day in Gloucestershire,  
and other parts of this island, where quarries of the  
stone, fit for the purpose, abound.

(F) —“ her outlets.” נתיבות are paths worn by  
the feet, often passing and repassing upon the same  
line. I think that here the word signifies ‘ gaps’ in  
a bramble hedge, or stone fence, made by clamber-  
ing over repeatedly at the same place. The text  
alludes to a double inclosure, an inner fence of loose  
stone, a bramble hedge on the outside ; both damag-  
ed and broken in many places. The hedge is to be  
made, the stone fence repaired, the gaps in both  
closed, and all made so firm and strong, that it will  
be impracticable to find any way out. This inclos-  
ure is an admirable image of national difficulty and  
distress, from which no human policy or force can  
extricate.

(G) —“ her shame.” נבלתה. Considering the connection of this menace with that immediately preceding, of carrying off the wool and the flax, the materials of the woman’s clothing, I have some suspicion that this word may signify the parts of the person which modesty conceals. In Lev. v, 2, and in other passages, נבלה, *in regimine* נבלה, is used for a putrid carcase.

(H) —“ her vineyards and her fig-tree orchards.” I cannot but think the words גפן and תאנה are used here, by a synecdoche, for plantations of vines and fig-trees. Certainly it cannot be said of a single tree that it is laid waste, or made a forest.

(I) —“ my pay.” אתנה, the fee of prostitution. Compare chap. ix, 1.

—“ her necklace.” See Appendix, No. II.

(K) —“ Ishi—Baali.” The words איש and בעל are both applicable to a husband, and sometimes simply as a husband. But taken strictly, the latter signifies ‘ a severe,’ the former ‘ a kind indulgent husband.’ —“ Vox בעל proprie sonat ὁ ἐχων habens quamcumque rem in suâ potestate; quare ad mari-

tum refertur per ellipsin, qui integrè dicitur בעל אשה, Exod. xxi, 3. Sed vox sumitur in sacris hoc sensu geminâ significatione; vel simplice, pro marito absque alterius qualitatis respectu, ut Gen. xx, 3; Joel i, 8; vel ἐμφατικῶς pro viro imperioso, qui uxorem severe habet tanquam Dominus, et omni suo in eam jure utitur; quomodo τῷ אִישׁ, viro leni et benigno, contradistinguitur; ut apud Hos. cap. ii, 15, et Jer. xxxi, 32." Vitringa ad Jes. cap. liv, 5.

(L) —“ armour,” מלחמה. I think the word is used here for every accoutrement of battle, all offensive weapons, and defensive armour.

(M) —“ betroth thee with justice,” &c. A noun substantive after the verb אָרַשׁ, with כ prefixed, denotes the dowry, or that which the man gives to obtain his spouse of her parents.\* Christ gave for the espousal of the Church his bride, צֶדֶק, his own justice; מִשְׁפָּט, his perfect obedience to the law; חֶסֶד, exuberant kindness; רַחֲמִים, tender love; אֱמוּנָה, faithfulness, steady adherence to his part in the covenant between the Holy Three.

---

\* See 2 Sam. iii, 14.

—“ Ubi diligenter expendi loca scripturæ, in quibus usus est vocis אַמִּינָה, ubi Deo aut Regi tribuitur; observavi convenientissimam ei esse significationem, fidei, sive fidelitatis, veracitatis, constantiæ in repræsentandis promissis: et est vere propria hæc et genuina vocis significatio, ubi de Deo usurpatur.”  
Vitringa ad Jes. xi, 5.

“ To myself I say,” &c. The copula ׀ in the original expresses all this emphasis of reiterated asseveration.\*

(N) —“ I will perform my part,” &c. אַעֲנֶה. The primary and most proper meaning of the verb עָנָה I take to be ‘ to re-act;’ when B re-acts upon A, in consequence of a prior action of A upon B. But more largely it predicates reciprocal, correspondent, or correlate action. Thus it signifies the proper action of one thing upon another, according to established physical sympathies in the material world; or, among intelligent beings, according to the rule of moral order. It has always reference to a system of agency; and may be applied to any individual agent, in a system of agents, whose action regularly

---

\* See Appendix, No. III.

excites, or is excited by, the actions of the rest. Thus it may be applied to the act of the first mover, which sets all the rest a-going, as well as to the acts of the subordinate agents: as in vocal music, it is applicable to the singing of the first voice, as well as to the inferior performers, who follow him. And in this passage it is applied, first, to the action of God himself upon the powers of Nature; then, to the subordinate action of the parts of Nature upon one another; and last of all, to the subservience of the elements and their physical productions, to the benefit of man, and ultimately by the direction of God's over-ruling providence, to the exclusive benefit of the godly. In short, it expresses generally one agent performing its proper part upon another. And to this general notion all the particular senses of the word are reducible.

(O) —“ I will sow her as a seed for myself.” Thus the learned Vatablus: —“ Et seminabo eam, Hebraismus, pro spargam eam instar sementis super terram.” And Mr. Livelye: —“ Ad ecclesiæ multiplicationem hoc pertinet.”



## CHAP. III.

(A) —“addicted to wickedness.” I adopt the rendering of the LXX and Syriac, which nothing opposes but the Masoretic pointing.

(B) —“I owned her.” וְאָכַרָהּ, from the root נָכַר. See Parkhurst under הָכַר. This was not a payment, in the shape of a dowry; for the woman was his property, if he thought fit to claim her, by virtue of the marriage already had: but it was a present supply of her necessary wants, by which he acknowledged her as his wife, and engaged to furnish her with alimony, not ample indeed, but suitable to the recluse life which he prescribed to her. Calvin observes, that the parsimonious gift, a sum of money which was but half the price of a female slave, and a pittance of black barley bread, typified the hard fare which the Israelites were to expect at the hand of God in their state of exile. See App. No. II.

(C) —“without statue, and without ephod and teraphim.”

An Ephod seems to have been a garment, like a cloak without sleeves, covering the body as low as

the pit of the stomach before, and as low as the shoulder-blades behind. It seems to have taken its name from the straitness of its collar, and the manner in which it was fastened about the person. The ephod of the high priest was of costly materials, and the richest embroidery; and it made a very principal part of his robes of office. But something of a similar shape, and of the same name, but made of plain linen, was worn by the inferior priests,\* and occasionally at least by other persons.† But it appears also, that idolaters, at least the idolatrous Israelites, sometimes dressed up the images of the deities they worshipped, in a gorgeous ephod, resembling that of the high priest, and made perhaps in imitation of it. And this was so principal, and so sacred a part of the idol's robes, that the word was sometimes used as a name for the idol itself. Thus certainly we must understand Gideon's ephod; when it is said, "that he set it up (עָשָׂה) in his own city, in Ophrah, and that all Israel went a whoring after it; which thing became a snare unto Gideon and his house."‡ This ephod was made, according

---

\* 1 Sam. xxii, 18.

† 1 Sam. ii, 18.

‡ Judges viii, 27, 28.

to the sacred historian, of the spoils of the slaughtered Midianites, the purple robes of their kings, the gold of their ear-rings, and other ornaments. Insomuch that, in the costliness of the materials, it much resembled the sacred ephod of the high priest. But when it is said, that it "was set up in Ophrah, and that all Israel went a whoring after it," the robe is certainly put for an image, which was adorned with it, and drew so much admiration, that, whatever the original intention of the maker of it might be, in process of time it became an object of idolatrous adoration. The ephod, therefore, appears to have been a principal ornament both of the true and of the false worship. And when the word is used, in the figurative language of prophecy, as it is in this passage, to express in general the external grandeur of public institutions; it is in itself of ambiguous import, and its connections in the context must determine, whether it refers to the approved forms of a pure service, or to idolatry. That it refers to the latter in the text, is evident from the connection with statues mentioned next before, and teraphim next after the ephod. For both these will be found to be produced here, as principal articles of the furniture of idolatry.

We find the teraphim among the faithful, in the patriarchal ages, and among idolaters afterwards. For Laban, who was a worshipper of Jehovah, had his teraphim,\* and Nebuchadnezzar had his.† They seem to have been images, made in some general resemblance of the person of a man.‡ The teraphim of the idolaters were probably corrupt imitations of those of the true worshippers; for the ancient idolatry was in every thing a mimickry and misapplication of the patriarchal symbols. The teraphim of idolaters were magical images, used for the purposes of divination; as appears in particular from Ezekiel in the place quoted. But the patriarchal teraphim were probably emblematical figures, like the cherubim; like those I mean of the simpler sort, which were seen in the ornaments of the more open parts of the tabernacle, and of the temple. The teraphim I take to have been figures of the like mystic import; but of materials less costly, of coarser work, and certainly upon a smaller scale: though not of so diminutive a size, as to be carried about by the high priest, according to Dr Spencer's wild notion,

---

\* Gen. xxxi, 19.

† Ezek. xxi, 21.

‡ 1 Sam. xix, 13 and 16.

concealed in the folds of the sacred breast-plate. For it appears, that one of these images was big enough to personate a sick man in bed.\* I imagine they were used, as most sacred ornaments of consecrated chapels, or oratories, in private houses. The use of them was certainly allowed before the law; and whether it might not be tolerated occasionally for some time afterward, when, by reason of the depressed situation of the Israelites, the tabernacle at Shilo might not be accessible to the greater part of the people, is a question, that may deserve consideration. For my own part, I would not take upon me to pronounce, that Micah, the man of Mount Ephraim, of whom we read in the book of Judges,† was an apostate, and an idolater. The circumstances of the story incline me indeed to the contrary opinion; though his worship seems to have been, in a considerable degree, corrupt. But however that may be, however innocent the use of these images might have been in the patriarchal ages, and however it might be tolerated (which, however, I assert not) upon particular occasions in the earliest periods of the Jewish history, when the public worship was

---

\* 1 Sam. xix, 13 and 16.

† Chap. xvii and xviii.

interrupted by the tyranny of the heathen nations, who were permitted from time to time to hold the Israelites in subjection; it is very certain, that in process of time they were so much abused, to superstitious purposes, that the use of them was absolutely forbidden to God's people; and, long before the time of the prophet Hosea, they were considered as a part of the worst rubbish of idolatry, which it became the duty of the faithful to destroy. Just as the brazen serpent, which Moses had erected by God's express command, a sacred symbol, as our Lord himself expounds it, of the redemption, became so much an object of superstitious adoration, that it is recorded as one of the good acts of Hezekiah, that he brake it in pieces, calling it in contempt Nehushtan, "the brazen thing."\* When the prophet Samuel would represent to Saul the enormity of his crime, in not having executed the command of God; he could find nothing worse, with which he could compare it, than the sin of witchcraft and teraphim.† The teraphim are numbered among the abominations in the land of Judah

---

\* 2 Kings xviii, 4.

† 1 Sam. xv, 23.

and in Jerusalem, which Josiah put away.\* From all this I cannot but conclude, that the teraphim, in the text of Hosea, are to be understood of nothing but implements of idolatrous rites, images consecrated to the purposes of magic and divination. If the reader wishes for fuller information upon this subject, from which he may form an opinion for himself, let him consult Dr Spencer's Dissertation on Urim and Thummim. Information he may derive from the various and profound erudition of that work, which will make him amends for the disgust, which the extravagance (not to give it a worse name) of the opinion which the author would sustain, if he has any reverence for the mysteries of the true religion, must create. Let him also consult the learned work of Franciscus Moncœius, *De Vitulo Aureo*, particularly the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th; the 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, and 20th chapters of the 1st book: Mr Hutchinson, on "The Names and Attributes of the Trinity of the Gentiles," in the section, entitled אלהים תרפים: the learned Julius Bate's "Inquiry into the occasional and standing Similitudes of the Lord God:" the same learned writer's "Critica

---

\* 2 Kings xxiii, 24.

Hebræa," under the roots רפה and פסל: Vitringa, upon Isaiah ii, 8. and xl, 19. But, above all, let him consult the judicious Pocock upon this place. In these writers he will find great variety, and contrariety indeed, of opinions; and none perhaps that he will think proper, in every particular, to adopt. But he will collect much information from them all; and upon the whole perhaps will see reason to acquiesce in the opinion, which I venture to uphold; that the teraphim were originally emblematical figures, of patriarchal institution; afterwards mimicked and misapplied by idolaters; and at last, generally and so grossly abused to superstitious purposes, that they became unfit for the use of God's people, and were absolutely prohibited and condemned. And this had taken place before the days of Samuel; consequently long before Hosea, in whose time they must have been considered as purely idolatrous and profane.

I come now to the statue, the first word of the three; which will require no long discussion. This, like the teraphim, had been in use among the true worshippers in early ages; but was so much abused, before the giving of the law, that it was absolutely prohibited by Moses. A statue, מצבה, signifies any



thing, more especially of stone, erected or set up as a monument or memorial; but particularly as a religious monument. That consecrated pillars of stone were in use among the patriarchs, we learn from the history of Jacob. Idolaters, instead of simple pillars, set up images carved in the human, or other form, to represent the object of their worship. This abuse was certainly antient, and gave occasion to the strict prohibition of the Mosaic law, “Ye shall make you no idols, nor graven image; neither rear you up *מַצֵּבָה*, a standing image [statue, or pillar].” \* “After this prohibition,” says Dr Pocock, “we cannot look on any such used in religious worship, but as a part, and so a sign, of the falseness of that worship. And so here, therefore, [in this text of Hosea] to say, the children of Israel shall be without such; is as much as to say, that they shall not have free exercise of their former ways of idolatry.”

If I may offer a conjecture, concerning the difference between these idolatrous statues and the teraphim; I would say, that the statues were of large dimensions, set up in public, as objects of popular adoration: the teraphim were of a smaller size, and

---

\* Lev. xxvi, 1.

for different purposes; kept in the most sacred recesses of the temples, or consecrated chapels, for magical rites, and rarely, if ever, exposed to public view.

Thus, since it appears, that both the statue and teraphim of Hosea were implements of idolatry; no doubt can remain, that the ephod, which is mentioned between the two, is to be understood of the idolatrous ephod, not of that which belonged to the holy vestments of the high priest. As it is put between the statue and the teraphim, it may seem, that it may be connected with either: connected with the statue, it will denote the robe, with which the idol was clothed: connected with the teraphim, the ephod of the priest of the teraphim. And in this connection (to which indeed the structure of the sentence in the original seems to point in preference) I would choose to take it. For thus we shall have idolatry described, by the three principal features in its external appearance: the statue, the public object of popular adoration: the teraphim, the images of the more secret rites of incantation: and the sorcerer, or Hierophant, conducting the ceremonies, and propounding to the consulters of the oracle the answers he pretended to receive, repre-

sented by the ephod, the most remarkable of his robes of office.

(D) —“ and adore” — **ופחרו אל**. The construction of **פחר**, governing its object by the preposition **אל**, I take to be singular. I apprehend, that when a verb, expressing any affection of the mind, governs its object by this preposition, that construction expresses the motion or effort of the mind, so affected, towards that object. The force of this construction here is to denote, that the converted Israelites will make Jehovah, and his goodness, the object of religious awe and admiration. The phrase is well paraphrased by the LXX; — *και ἐκστησονται ἐπι τῷ κυρίῳ και ἐπι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς αὐτοῦ*. The English word ‘adore’ expresses the motion of the mind towards Jehovah and his goodness. Aben Ezra, Dru-sius, and Livelye, take the verb **ופחרו** here as equivalent to **יחררו**, cap. xi, 11, rendering “ and hasten to.” —“ Nam verba pavendi et trepidandi festinare et properare quandoque significant,” says Livelye. The observation is true; but as no instance occurs in which the verb **פחר** is actually so used, after much hesitation between the two, I prefer the former exposition.

## CHAP. IV.

(A) —“burst out,” פִּרְצוּ. A metaphor taken from rivers exundating the banks, and bearing down every obstacle to the impetuosity of the waters. The version of the LXX and the Vulgate retain the image of the waters, but fail in expressing the violence of the eruption. —*αεχεται ἐπι της γης*. LXX. —“inundaverunt.” Vulg.

(B) “By no means.” This is the force of כִּי, urging and pressing the prohibition.

(C) —“like those who will contend with the priest.” This is the natural rendering of the Hebrew words, and the sense agrees well with the context. The objections raised by Rivetus, and adopted by Houbigant, though they seemed of so much weight to Archbishop Newcombe, as to induce him to alter the text upon the authority of a single MS, are entirely founded upon a misapprehension of the prophecy, and a misconception of the passage: upon a misapprehension of the prophecy, as if the ten tribes exclusively were the object of it: upon a misconception of the passage, according to the usual

acceptation of it, as if litigation with the priests were the crime charged: whereas it is only a simile.

(D) The word **בֵּית** signifies a principal city.\*

(E) —“for lack of knowledge.” The Hebrew verb **יָדַע**, and the nouns **דָּעַ** and **דַּעַה** are applied not only to every endowment and acquisition of the mind, which falls under the general notion of knowledge of any kind, but to that sort of conduct also, which may be referred to knowledge and understanding as its proximate cause, or motive. And they more frequently answer to the Greek words *συνεναί* and *συνεσις*, than to *ἐπιστάσθαι* and *ἐπιστημη*; signifying rather the voluntary application of the mind to the consideration of the practical good, than the mere possession of speculative knowledge. The English words ‘to know’ and ‘knowledge,’ by the constant use of them in our public translation to render the Hebrew words in all their applications to spiritual subjects, have acquired the same extent of meaning, and the same peculiar force; and have become familiar even to the English reader, in what

---

\* 2 Sam. xx, 19.

may be called their Hebrew sense. It has been thought fit therefore to retain them in many instances, as in this, where other words might be more conformable to the habits of modern speech.

But in this place, “lack of knowledge” signifies a lack of this practical knowledge, arising from lack of instruction. The priests are taxed with negligence of their duty, in not teaching the people, and in suffering a general ignorance to prevail; and for this crime they are threatened with the abolition of their order.

In this part of the discourse, some obscurity has arisen from the sudden turnings of the speaker from the people in general to the priests in particular, and back again from the priests to the people; and from the difficulty of catching the exact places where these transitions are made. In the 8th verse, it is manifest the priests are in question; for of no other persons it could be said, that “they ate the sin-offerings of the people.” And St Cyril of Alexandria thinks, the first transition to them is in this place. Calvin, with more judgment, thinks they are first accosted at the beginning of this 6th verse. But in the 7th verse he thinks the discourse returns again to the people; and what follows he applies to

the people generally, though not without particular allusion, as he supposes, to the priests. But his exposition is embarrassed, and obscure. I am persuaded that the discourse turns short upon the priests at the beginning of this 6th verse, with the complaint of the people's lack of good teaching; and turns away from the priests again to the people at the 12th, and not before; and I have the satisfaction to find that in this I have the concurrence of that great critic Drusius; who, upon "lack of knowledge," in verse 6, says, "*Hoc autem accidebat culpâ sacerdotum—Nam ordinarium munus sacerdotum erat enarrare legem, et populum ex eâ erudire. Mal. ii, 7; Deut. xxxi, 9; et xxxiii, 10.*" And at the end of verse 11, he says, "*Hactenus sacerdotum mores propheticâ libertate insectatus est.*" This division of the matter of the discourse makes the whole perspicuous.

—"I will also reject thee," &c. Since the person threatened was to be rejected from being a priest, he was a priest at the time when he was threatened; otherwise he had not been a subject of rejection. The person threatened therefore must have been the head, for the time being, of the true Levitical priesthood, not of the intruded priesthood of Jero-

boam. This is a proof that the metropolis threatened with excision is Jerusalem, not Samaria; and that the ten tribes exclusively are not the subject of this part of the prophecy.

(F) —“magnified,” **גָּדַל**. The word is applicable to increase in any way, either in size, numbers, power, or wealth, &c. See Drusius and Luther on the place. But as the priests were greatly magnified in dignity and power, and there is no reason to suppose that they were multiplied by natural increase in a greater proportion than the rest of the people, I think the thing intended here is the elevation of the order in civil rank and authority.

(G) —“every one of them lifts up his soul.” **נִפְשׁוּ**. All the antient versions give the pronoun plural; and eight of Dr Kennicott's MSS, among which are some which he esteemed of high authority, with others of De Rossi's, read **נִפְשׁוּ**. Archbishop Newcombe adopts this reading, which seems indeed entitled to the preference. If the singular suffix be retained, it must be taken in that distributive sense in which Junius and Tremellius understand it.



(H) From Archbishop Secker's note upon this passage, it appears to have been the opinion of that acute and wary critic, that the public translation, "because they have left off to take heed to the Lord," was not to be brought by any usual and natural construction out of the Hebrew words **כי את יהוה עזבו לשמר**. He moves two questions, 1<sup>st</sup>, Whether the verb **עזב** can govern its immediate object by the prefix **ל**? 2<sup>dly</sup>, Whether **יהוה** can be the object of the verb **שמר**? Upon both he seems himself inclined to the negative. "Vix puto **עזב** infinitivum cum **ל** regere; vel hominem dici Deum, sed Dei mandata, servare." With respect to the second point, it is certain that **יהוה** never once occurs as the object of the verb **שמר**. Drusius refers to Zech. xi, 11, where the personal pronoun **אתי** is the object of the participle **משמרים**, as a passage which may warrant this construction. But in that passage **Jehovah** is not the speaker, to whom the personal pronoun belongs; nor is the participle used in the sense of obeying, or serving, but of observing, or remarking. "The poor of the flock which observed me, or watched me;" *i. e.* watched my actions. See Archbishop Newcombe and Dr Blaney on that place.

In the book of Proverbs, however, we find a text, which affords an instance of a construction of this verb so similar to that which our public translation supposes here, that if the connection of Jehovah, as the object, with the verb were the only difficulty, it might seem removed. In Proverbs xxvii, 18, the noun Adonai, not indeed as a title of Jehovah, but in the sense of a master, is the object of the participle Benoni of the verb שמר in the sense of 'waiting upon,' in the capacity of a servant. But the other difficulty seems insuperable. After a nice examination, I scruple not to assert, that the verb עזב never governs its immediate object, the person or thing forsaken, abandoned, or left off, with the prefix ל. It follows of necessity, that the order of construction cannot be that which our public translation demands, namely, this, כי עזבו לשמר את יהוה; for in this order, the sentence, לשמר את יהוה, is the object of the verb עזב, and connects with the verb by the prefix ל.

The verb עזב always governs its immediate object without any prefix. But when a noun, following this verb, is connected with it by ל, the noun expresses either the person to whom, *i. e.* to whose posses-

tion, use, and advantage, or the thing in return for which, as a more desired object, or the end and purpose for which (the *το ἐνεκα του*), or, the time for which, the dereliction is made. Thus Psalm xlix, 11; *ועזבו לאחרים חילם*, “and leave their wealth to others;” *i. e.* to the possession and use of others. So Is. xviii, 6; *יעזבו יחדו לעיט הרים ולבהמת הארץ*, “they shall be left together to the bird of prey of the mountains, and to the beasts of the earth.” And Mal. iv, 1, (Heb. iii, 19); *לא יעזב להם שרש וענף*, “shall not leave them root or branch.”

Josh. xxiv, 16. “God forbid *מעזב את יהוה לעבד*, that we should forsake the Jehovah to serve other gods;” *i. e.* to take up with the service of other gods as a preferable service.

2 Chron. xxxii, 31. *עזבו האלהים לנסותו*, “God left him to try him;” *i. e.* for the end or purpose of trying him.

Ps. xvi, 10. *לא תעזב נפשי לשאול*, “thou wilt not abandon my soul to hell.”

Lam. v, 20. “Wherefore *תעזבנו לאורך ימים* dost thou forsake us so long time.”

These seven texts are the only instances in the Bible, in which a noun, or what stands as a noun,

following the verb עִיב is connected with the verb by ל.\*

I have therefore adopted a division of the Hebrew; received by some learned rabbin, and confirmed by a much higher authority, that of the Syriac version, and not contradicted by the LXX. I make a stop equivalent to a comma at עִיבו, and expunging the soph-pasuk at לְשֹׁמֵר, I take that word in immediate connection with the following words; so that וְנֹת, וְיִין, and תִּירוֹשׁ, are accusatives after the infinitive שֹׁמֵר, and I suppose an ellipsis of the pronoun אֲשֶׁר rehearsing the nouns וְנֹת, וְיִין, and תִּירוֹשׁ, (than which ellipsis nothing is more frequent in the prophetic style), as the nominative of the verb יִקַּח. Thus, according to this division, “to give attention to chamberings,” &c. is either the end to which, or the object of preferable choice for which, they forsake Jehovah; and, as such, is connected with the verb עִיב by ל. Thus the construction is regular and natural, and the sense perspicuous, and well suited to the context. The learned reader will perhaps be the more easily reconciled to this exposition and rendering of the text, if he remarks the similitude

---

\* See App. No. II.

of phraseology in this passage, and another in the book of Jonah, chap. ii, 10; משמרים הכלי שוא חסדם; יעובו, “They who attend the vanities of deception,” (*i. e.* the vain rites of the false religions), “forsake their gracious benefactor.”

(I) —“give them answers,” יגיד לו. נגר as a verb in Hiphil (for in that conjugation, and in Hophal alone, the verb is used), is ‘to tell, relate, make publicly or manifestly known,’ by words, or other signs and tokens, of certain interpretation; also ‘to foretell.’ And in this sense it is almost an appropriate word of oracular prediction; and so it is used here.

(K) “Since thus it is”— This I take to be the force of על כן. The phrase is more emphatical than ‘therefore’ in the English language, or than the simple copula in the Hebrew. It refers distinctly to what has gone before concerning the manners of the people, as the ground of God’s dealing with them in the manner declared in what follows.

(L) —“Israel is rebellious like an unruly heifer.” בפרה כררה כרר ישראל. I restore the rendering of

the Bishop's Bible and the English Geneva. It was changed into what we now read in the public translation, "Israel slideth back as a backsliding heifer," upon a supposition, that the actions of the restive beast, refusing the yoke, are literally expressed in the original by the word סדרה, and that the disobedience of the Israelites is represented under the image of the like action; a notion which the apparent affinity of the roots סרר and סור might naturally suggest.

The version of the LXX too is evidently founded upon a similar notion of the original, as literally describing the actions of the animal; but actions of a very different kind, not those of restiveness, but the involuntary running about of the heifer stung by the gad-fly. Διοτι ὡς δαμαλις παροιστρῶσα παροιστρησεν Ἰσραηλ. But there is certainly no ground at all for this particular interpretation in any use of the verb סרר, or of סור, among the sacred writers; and our public translation is much more, than this of the LXX, to the purpose of the context.

The fact however is, that the verb סרר, or the participle, is in no one passage in the Bible, except this, applied to a brute. It is true, in Lam. iii, 11, we find the word סורר applied to a brute: but not

to a domestic brute, in a restive or a frisky mood ; but to a wild beast, sprung from his lair, and crossing the way of the traveller : and not to the wild beast immediately, but to Jehovah, in wrath and taking vengeance, represented under the image of the wild beast. And in the phrase in this passage, דִּרְכַי סוּרָה, I take סוּרָה to be another word, not from the root סָרָה, but the Poel form of the verb סוּר. "He turned aside my ways." That is, he scares me out of the strait path, and compels me to take a new direction. In the fifteen other passages (and no more) in which the word סָרָה occurs, it invariably signifies the perverse disposition, or disorderly conduct, of a moral agent ; without any express allusion to any brute. It seems therefore at least doubtful, whether, in this passage of Hosea, the figure is not rather in the application of the participle to the heifer, than of the verb to Israel. And it seems safer to give what is indubitably the sense of the passage in plain terms, after the example of the author of the Syriac version, and the majority indeed of interpreters, than to affect to retain metaphors of the original, which may be merely imaginary.

It is worthy of remark, that in many passages of

Scripture besides this, we read in our English Bible of “backsliding Israel,” and of “Israel’s backslidings.” But the Hebrew word, in all these other passages, is very different, and from quite another root. And that other word, in the sense of ‘backsliding,’ is never, any more than this word סרר, applied to a brute.

(M) —“feed them in a large place.” במרחב. This word מרחב is never used but in a good sense, and, for the most part, figuratively, as an image of a condition of liberty, ease, and abundance. I agree therefore with Grotius, that this is said with bitter irony: —“Est hîc *γλευασμος*, *irrisio acerba*; *ex ambiguo*. Latè pascere amant agni: Deus Israelem disperget per totum Assyriorum regnum.”

(N) —“a companion of idols,” חבר עצבים. See Psalm cxix, 68; Isaiah i, 23.

(O) —“their strong drink is vapid,” סר סבאם. The verb סר, with an accusative after it, with a preposition or prefix, will not bear the sense of ‘going after,’ which some have given it in this place. Nor



can I think with Houbigant, that the verb in the Kal form is to be taken in the Hiphil sense, the noun סכא being its subject, and the pronominal suffix attached to the noun its object. I agree with those interpreters, who take the noun סכא as the nominative of the neutral verb; which makes the construction natural, and the sense most apposite. It is well remarked by Drusius and Livelye, that wine, in that state which the Hebrew words describe, is called in Latin ‘vinum fugiens.’ —“ Si quis vinum fugiens vendat sciens, debeatne dicere.” Cic. de Off. lib. iii.

(P) The construction is certainly uncommon; but I see nothing in it so harsh and obscure as to make an alteration of the text necessary. I give the sense which the learned Pocock approves, which seems to me to arise easily from the Hebrew words. It must be observed however, in justice to Houbigant and Archbishop Newcombe, that their omission of הכו has the authority of three MSS of Kennicott’s, of the Syriac version, and the LXX, and was suggested by Archbishop Secker.

(Q) —“ (O shame)” — For a long time I thought myself original and single in this way of rendering. But I have the satisfaction to find, that the learned Drusius was before me in it. He renders thus: “*Scortando scortati sunt, amant date (O Dedecus) protectores ejus.*” And he makes this note upon O Dedecus, “*Primus ita exposui; an rectè, judicent periti harum rerum, καὶ οὐκ ἀπειροὶ τῶν κριτικῶν.*”

#### CHAP. V.

(A) —“ Prickers” — שָׁטִיִּים, from the verb שָׁטַח, circumire, discurrere, obambulare, lustrare, latè per campos quaquaversum discurrere.\* It is applied, Num. xi, 8. to the people scattered over the plain to gather up the manna.

Hence the noun שָׁטִיִּים, in this place, may naturally render those horsemen, whose office it was in the chase to spread themselves on all sides of the plain, to drive the wild beasts, roused from their lairs or coverts, into the toils. Such persons, in our old English language, were called “prickers,” as I conceive, from the verb ‘to prick,’ *i. e.* to shew off

---

\* See Appendix, No. II.

on a mettlesome horse;\* because their office required, that they should be well mounted, and they were always galloping across the country in all directions. The noun is not yet become quite obsolete. For the yeomen that attend the king, when his majesty hunts the stag, whose duty it is to keep the animal within convenient bounds, are at this day called the ‘Yeomen Prickers.’ I take שטים here in this sense, as the nominative of the verb העמיקו, and שחטה as the accusative after the verb. ‘Cursores profundam ediderunt cædem.’ In the Latin expression, ‘profunda cædes,’ cædes is properly the blood shed; and the great number of murders is represented under the image of a great depth of that blood. The imagery of the Hebrew in this place is the same. But it is a figurative chase. The wild beasts are men,

\* A gentle knight was *pricking* on the plain,

Yclad in mighty arms and silver shield,

.....

.....

.....

His angry steed did chide his foming bit,

As much disdaining to the curb to yield.

*Spenser, Fairy Queen.*

not influenced and restrained by true principles of religion: the principal hunters, the kings and apostate priests, who, from motives of self-interest, and a wicked and mistaken policy, encouraged idolatry, and supported its institutions: the prickers, the subordinate agents in the business: the slaughter, spiritual slaughter of the souls of men.

(B) —“ their perverse habits.” מעלליהם. I take this as the nominative case to the verb יהני, as it is taken by the Syr.

There are few words in the Hebrew language less reduced to any one precise meaning, than this very common one, מעללים. The true sense of which we shall therefore endeavour to ascertain. It is very obvious, that it is immediately derived from עלל, which the Lexicons give as a root, signifying, as a verb, ‘ to do, perform, effect,’ in any manner; and, as a noun, any sort of deed, work, performance, action, &c. good or bad. And under this imaginary latitude of meaning, the lexicographers have contrived to cover their ignorance of the real definite meaning of the word.

The two words על and עלה, are distinct roots in the Hebrew language; and each has an עלל descend-

ing from it, differing as much in sense, as in etymology, from the ללע derived from the other.

The first of these two roots עלע, signifies, ‘to oppress, defraud, injure, to be unjust.’ This seems to be the primary meaning of the root, though the verb occurs but once in Kal, or rather, if the Masoretes be right, in Piel; namely, in Isaiah xxvi, 10. But as a noun rendering, ‘injustice, fraud, iniquity, unrighteous dealing, or an unjust or wicked man,’ it occurs frequently.

In the Poel form, this verb signifies, ‘to treat very harshly, to treat injuriously, contumeliously,’ and in this sense it is applied to inanimate things, ‘to disfigure, to mar external beauty.’\* Also, ‘to glean,’ because the vineyard, that is gleaned, is treated harshly, divested of its rich clothing, and marred in its external beauty. In this sense both the verb, and the nouns deriving from it, are sometimes written defectively, without the ך after the ע; as, ויעללהו; † for ויעללהו. But in all these passages we find the ך in a great number of the best MSS, and in our common printed text the absence of the ך is marked by the cholem point.

---

\* Job xvi, 15.

† Judges xx, 45.

As a noun substantive, the word עַיִל signifies ‘a little boy, a child;’ because the age of childhood is obnoxious to injury and ill usage. Some of the lexicographers would have it ‘a sucking child.’ But for this there is not the least authority. The place where the notion of sucking would be most to the purpose is Isaiah xlix, 15. But even here it is not necessary, and it is not expressed in any one of the antient versions.

With this noun substantive עַיִל the feminine plural עליות, rendering, according to some, ‘females of the herd or flock giving suck;’ according to others, ‘pregnant females, or females that have just dropped their young,’ but more properly, I think, females that are ‘bringing up’ their young, has no sort of connection. We never find the word עליות with a ם between the ע and the ל, or with a cholem point to mark the absence of the ם in that place. It has no connection, therefore, with the root עַיִל. Its connection, in the sense of ‘bringing up,’ with the other root עלה, ‘to rise, or raise,’ is evident. There is another very remarkable difference between the masculine עַיִל and the feminine עליות. The former is never applied to the young of any other species than man; the latter to brutes only, never to the

human species: notwithstanding that Calasio says, that the plural עולים signifies 'lactentes, parvuli hominum et bestiarum,' and that עול as a verb sometimes signifies 'lactare.' Both which assertions are erroneous.

To this same root the noun substantive עול or על, in the sense of a yoke, is to be referred.

From the Poel form of the verb, two nouns, עולל and מעולל, are derived, both signifying, 'a little child.' The former is sometimes written עלל. But the majority of the best MSS give it every where complete, with the ם between the ן and the ל, and in the printed text the absence of the ם is marked by the cholem point. The latter noun occurs only in one place, namely, Isa. iii, 12.

If this noun מעולל had any plural, it would be מעוללים, which might be written defectively מעללים. But with this word, our noun מעללים, the immediate subject of this disquisition, has no connection.

Our noun מעללים is found in 38 different passages; or in 39, if in Zech. i, 4. וממעלליכם, which some MSS give instead of ומעליליכם, be the true reading. But it is not once found with ם between the ן and ל, nor with the cholem point to mark the absence of a ם in that place. There is nothing

therefore, in the form of the word, to indicate any connection with the root עיל. We must therefore refer it to the עלל of the other extraction.

From the root עלה, ‘to ascend, mount upwards, to go or come up,’ we form the reduplicate verb עלל, by dropping the final ה of the primary root, and doubling the middle radical. In which way, however it may displease the Masoretes and their disciples, many verbs doubling Ain are formed from verbs quiescent Lamed He. Of which כלל from כלה, קלל from קלה, רבב from רבה, are indubitable instances. To this עלל, from עלה, the learned Mr Parkhurst would reduce the verb, which signifies, ‘to glean.’ עלל, he says, is, to ‘ascend repeatedly.’ He adds, “it is used for a repeated, or second ascending of vines, in order to gather all the grapes, and may be rendered to glean.” But in every one of the passages, which he cites, the verb is manifestly the Poel form of עיל. And I cannot find, that the verb עלל, from עלה, occurs in any other than the Hithpael form. And in this form it carries no marks, in its orthography, of a descent from עיל, but in its sense manifests its extraction from עלה. For it signifies, ‘to exalt or raise one’s self up, to



assume and display superiority in a good or bad sense,' with or without just grounds.

From this verb עלל, which as a verb is found only in Hithpael, I derive our verbal מעללים. This noun is used only in the plural number. It denotes, therefore, something which is in its nature plural. And if it denotes actions of any sort, it must signify not any individual act, but a set or system of actions. And because it must connect with the sense of the primary root עלה (with which the verb most evidently connects), it must express some set, or system of things, which naturally ascend, mount, get uppermost. Upon these grounds I am persuaded, that the word מעללים denotes the moral or immoral habits of a man, as things coming over him, growing up, and, in the vulgar phrase, 'getting the upper hand.' The learned reader will judge for himself, upon a critical examination of the 38 or 39 passages in which this word occurs, whether this sense be not well adapted to the context in every one of them; and whether every other sense, which expositors have offered, be not positively excluded by the use of the word in some one or other of them.

As the ascendancy of habit is the principal cir-

cumstance, which this noun expresses, it is applicable to all habits possessing that ascendancy, good or bad. This indifference of the natural meaning of the word appears evidently from the use of it in Prov. xx, 11. That evil is not necessarily implied in it, appears from the application of it, in two other places,\* to the works of God. For the most part, however, it denotes evil habits.

It may seem, that the application of it to the works of God, in the two passages in the psalms just mentioned, excludes the sense of habits entirely. For in God, philosophically speaking, there can be no habit. But the sacred writers, in speaking of God, confine themselves not to a philosophical style. They are studious rather of a manner of speaking, which may convey what is to be understood of God to the minds of men in general, even of those the least improved by science and philosophy. Hence it is that they speak, of the works and actions of God, in figures taken from the actions, not only of men, but even of wild beasts. The works of God, intended in the two texts cited, are not indeed those, which are daily, and every where, seen in

---

\* Ps. lxxvii, 12. and lxxviii, 7.

the ordinary proceedings of his providence; but those wonderful works of mercy, which he was performing in favour of his chosen people for many years, indeed for ages, from the very beginning of the history of the Israelites to the Psalmist's own times; which, proceeding from the unmerited goodness of God, may be called, in the accommodating style of holy writ, works of habit. And however unphilosophical the manner of speaking may be, as it certainly is, the philosophical Greeks could find no terms, in their distinct and copious language, by which they could so well describe the immutability of God's perfections, as by words literally rendering 'habit, or character fixed by habit,' *μενων ἐν ἑαυτου ἡθει.*

This interpretation of the word *מעללי* as rendering 'habits,' is much confirmed by the antient versions. In one passage, indeed,\* the LXX render it by *ἀνομια*. In three others,† by *διαβουλια*. In six‡ others,|| by *ἔργα*. In another,§ by *πραγματα*. In

\* Isa. iii, 8.

† Hos. iv, 9. v, 4. vii, 2.

‡ See Appendix, No. II.

|| Ps. lxxvii, 12. lxxviii, 7. Isa. iii, 10. Jer. xxi, 12--14. xxvi, 13.

§ Jer. xliv, 22.

the remaining 28 of the 39 passages in which the word is found, they render it ἐπιτηδεύματα; which is the word of the Greek language exactly rendering ‘habits.’ And by the same word ἐπιτηδεύματα it is rendered by Aquila, in four of the eleven passages in which the LXX give another word;\* and in a fifth of those eleven by Theodotion.†

‘Habits,’ therefore, is the true English rendering of the word. For which, in some instances, ‘manners,’ or ‘practices,’ may be used. But some epithet will generally be wanted, in English, to express the ascendancy, and, in the case of evil habits, the malignant ascendancy, implied in the notion of the original word.

(C) —“the excellency of Israel.” גאון ישראל.

From the verb גאה, ‘to rise, swell, grow higher and higher, to be exalted in power, honour, glory,’ come three nouns; two masculine, גאה and גאון; and one feminine, גאורה, in regimine גאורת. The first גאה makes its plural regularly גאים, and sometimes, even in the singular, drops its final ה. It renders the adjective ‘proud, or arrogant,’ and in one

---

\* Isa. iii, 8. Hos. v, 4. vii, 2. Jer. xxi, 14. † Jer. xxi, 12.

passage\* the noun substantive ‘pride, or arrogance,’ and is used in no other sense, or for no other sort of swelling, than that of pride. The feminine noun substantive גאווה (which sometimes drops the ם and becomes גוה) and the masculine גאון express the action of swelling, in all the various ways in which the verb may signify to swell. And they are used with so little discrimination, that two very able critics in the Hebrew language have said, that they knew not what the difference is between them. Both are used for ‘swelling,’ in the literal sense; for an increase in bulk or quantity. They are both applied to the swelling of the sea. The feminine גאווה, in Ps. lxxxix, 10. The masculine גאון, in Job xxxviii, 11. And either of them is used to render figurative swellings; excellence in general, in power, rank, wealth, &c. But with this distinction, that the feminine גאווה often signifies ‘pride,’ properly so called, as an internal quality and a vice. The masculine גאון is never used for pride, in a bad sense, and as an internal quality; though it has been taken in that sense in this passage, and in many others, by our own translators

---

\* Prov. viii, 13.

and other interpreters. But גאון expresses rather condition, or external appearance, than character: great elevation in rank and power; brilliant prosperity; splendour and gaiety of ornamental dress; majesty, pomp, stateliness; any thing in condition, which, in the degenerate mind, may engender pride; any thing in external deportment, which may be a symptom of it; and any thing grand and majestic in outward appearance, without any imputation of pride to the person to whom it belongs. The feminine גאורה, besides every thing to which גאון is applied, extends also to the moral internal swellings of the heart, and renders the vice of 'pride,' which גאון never expresses. In Prov. viii, 13. גאון is rendered, in our Public Translation, 'arrogancy.' In Isa. xvi, 6. the word occurs twice, and is repeatedly rendered 'pride.' But in a parallel passage,\* where the word occurs again twice, our translators first rendered it by 'pride,' and the second time by 'arrogancy.' But in every one of these passages גאון is joined with the feminine גאורה, which is the proper word for pride. It may signify therefore something, in some way connected with pride, but not

---

\* Jer. xlvi, 29.

pride itself. I would render it ‘stateliness;’ preserving the reference to external deportment or appearance, which I take to be essential to the word. —“pride and stateliness, and the evil way, and the mouth of inconstancy, I hate.”\* “We have heard of the stateliness of Moab (he is very proud), of his pride, and his stateliness, and his fury, not in just proportion to his ability.”† Or, as the passage might be rendered, “We have heard of the stateliness of Moab; extravagantly proud is his pride. And his stateliness and his fury not in just proportion to his ability.” In this rendering, the adjective נָגַד, in the second clause of the sentence, is taken as the predicate of גִּאֲוֹתָיו, and the verb substantive is understood. Again, “We have heard of the stateliness of Moab; his haughtiness is exceedingly supereminent. His stateliness also and his pride, and the towering ambition of his heart.”‡ The rendering of the middle clause of this sentence is from Dr Blaney’s translation; which first suggested to me the translation, which I propose, of the corresponding clause in the parallel passage of Isaiah.

\* Prov. viii, 13.

† Isa. xvi, 6.

‡ Jer. xlviii, 29.

גאה is taken as a verb, of which גברו is the subject. The word גאון occurs in scripture above forty times. But these three are the only passages, in which elevation of rank or power, grandeur and majesty externally displayed, are not more to the purpose of the context, than pride, or any internal affection of the heart. And in these three passages the internal affection is mentioned by its proper name; and stateliness of deportment, as the effect or symptom of the affection, connects well with it.

The words ‘pride,’ in the English language, and ‘superbia,’ in the Latin, are sometimes used abusively, to express an affection of the mind not criminal. As, ‘sume superbiam quæsitam meritis.’ That satisfaction and complacency, which we naturally feel in conscious superiority, either in mental endowments, bodily strength, or in rank and condition, is in itself not criminal. It is natural to the mind of man; and, when it is accompanied with a due sense of thankfulness to God, as to him by whose only gift one man differeth from another, and is not mixed with an arrogant assumption of merit to ourselves, or with contempt of others, it is indeed a virtuous feeling. The word גאון however is never used to express even this honourable inoffensive



pride. But, like the words pride and *superbia*, it is often applied to the external thing, which produces this internal affection. In our English Bible, we read in three passages\* of the “swelling of Jordan.” In the original גֵּאוֹן הַיַּרְדֵּן. But the swelling of the waters of the Jordan cannot be the thing intended. For, it appears, from a fourth passage† where the same expression occurs in the original, that this גֵּאוֹן הַיַּרְדֵּן was something that might be the subject of devastation; for, it is said of it, that it ‘is spoiled.’ It could be nothing but the thicket of trees and bushes, which adorned the banks of the river. It is very properly rendered in this place, “the pride of Jordan,” in our Public Translation, and “*superbia Jordanis*,” in the Vulgate. It is properly called the pride of Jordan, as an ornament of which the river, could we ascribe to it sense and intelligence, might justly be proud. *Superbia Jordanis* is the rendering of the Vulgate in the three other passages; and “the pride,” instead of “the swelling of Jordan,” would be the true rendering in English. See Dr Blaney, upon Zech. xi, 3.

\* Jer. xii, 5. xlix, 19. 1, 44.

† Zech. xi, 3.

It is now evident, in what sense, and with what propriety, the temple at Jerusalem, in two passages,\* and God himself, in a third, † as resident in that temple, is called, “the excellency of Jacob;” and God himself again, in this passage, “the excellency of Israel.” The temple, by the magnificence of the structure, the costliness and splendour of its furniture and ornaments, and the pomp and awefulness of the rites performed in it, but, above all, by the tokens of the divine presence in the sanctuary, was the great ornament of the city of Jerusalem, and the boast and pride of the whole nation. A temple, in which the glory of Jehovah was visibly displayed, and the immediate communication of God with the Israelites thus manifested, was the circumstance, in their external condition, which raised them above all the nations of the earth; and this temple, and this God, ought to have been their pride. But pride being too common and ambiguous a word to be applied to such holy subjects, I adopt the well chosen word of our Public Translation in another place, ‘excellency.’

---

\* Ps. xlvii, 4. Amos vi, 8.

† Amos viii, 7.

(D) —“ a month.” חרש. The change of חרש into החסל, proposed by Houbigant, stands upon the single authority of the LXX (if indeed upon that), unsupported by any MS, and contradicted by the Chaldee, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, St Jerome, and the Vulgate, who all represent the received reading חרש.

(E) —“ rulers.” שרי. I prefer the word ‘ rulers ’ to ‘ princes, ’ by which our Public Translation here, and in most other places, renders the Hebrew word; because, in the modern acceptation of the word princes, royalty, or, at least, royal blood, is included in the notion of it. But these שרים of the Old Testament, were not persons of royal extraction, or connected by blood or marriage with the royal family; but the chief priests and elders, who composed the secular as well as the ecclesiastical magistracy of the country.

(F) —“ self-willed, walking after a commandment.” According to the antient versions, “ going after idols.” Instead of the word צי, ‘ a commandment, ’ it should seem that these antient interpreters read some word signifying idols, and describing

them either as vanities, or as objects of contempt and disgust. The versions of the LXX and the Syriac suggest שׁוֹא, ‘vanity;’ St Jerome and the Vulgate נֶאֱ, ‘filthy ordure;’ which might also be the reading of Jonathan, who has a rendering of his own: —“their judges have turned themselves to go a-whoring after the mammon of iniquity.” But as no trace of either of these readings, or of any other variety, appears in any one of the numerous MSS collated by Kennicott and De Rossi, and the present text gives a striking and apposite meaning, I have thought it my duty to adhere to it: declaring, however, that I consider שׁוֹא, נֶאֱ, and עֵשׂ, as three various readings, each of high authority, among which the learned reader is at full liberty to make his own choice.

(G) —“a moth in the garment—a worm in the flesh.” עֵשׂ—רֶקֶב. Rabbi Tanchum, as he is quoted by Dr Pocock upon this place, says, that עֵשׂ is a worm breeding in clothes, and eating them; רֶקֶב, a worm breeding in old rotten wood. But the learned Drusius says of the latter word, that it may be understood of a worm that breeds either in wood or in the bones. That it signifies some kind of

worm or maggot, I have no doubt ; because the rule of the parallelism demands some gnawing insect, that may correspond with  $\psi\epsilon$ , the moth. But from the effect ascribed to it in the following verse, which is a sore running with corruption, I think it must be understood of a worm, bred indeed within the human body, but eating through the flesh. I have taken the liberty to add the words, ‘ in the garment,’ ‘ in the flesh,’ to mark the distinction of the species expressed by the two words, and to present the image of the original more adequately to the English reader.

(H) —“ his holes,” חליו, made by the fretting of the moth. I take the word as a noun, from חלל, ‘ to perforate, or make a hole’ of any sort.

(I) —“ his corrupted sore.” מורו. Or according to many of the best MSS, מורו. I see no necessity for making מור the root, and going to the Arabic for the sense of it. The noun מור comes regularly from the Hebrew root מור, ‘ to compress or squeeze,’ and signifies something that wants squeezing or compressing ; and thus a purulent sore, which wants to have the matter squeezed out, or perhaps to be com-

pressed with a bandage : but the first notion I prefer. See Bishop Lowth upon Isaiah i, 6.

(K) —“ the king who takes up all quarrels.” **יֵרֵב**, no proper name either of man or place, but clearly a noun, from the verb **רִיב**, put here in apposition with **מֶלֶךְ**, and characteristic of the king, in the manner expressed in my translation. So Aquila, *ὁ καταλαμβάνων*. Symmachus, St Jerome, and the Vulgate, ‘ultorem.’ Theodotion, *εὐχριστὸν*. **לְמַלְכָּא דִּיּוּתִי לְאַתְפָּרַע** **לְרֵחִין**, —“ ad regem ut adventaret ultum eos.” Jonathan. See Appendix, No. II.

(L) —“ repair the damage—make a cure of.” The words **רָפָא** and **יָגִרָה** refer respectively to the moth-eaten holes in the garment, and the sore in the flesh. **רָפָא** is properly ‘to restore whatever is damaged to a sound and whole condition; to repair a decayed or ruined building, to mend a damaged cloth.’

## CHAP. VI.

(A) —“ His coming forth is fixed as the morning.” —“ coming forth.” For **מוֹצֵאוֹ**, 37 MSS, and some of the oldest printed texts, give **מוֹצֵאוֹ**.

—“fixed as the morning.” —ὡς ὀρθρος βεβαια ἡ ἐπιφανεια αὐτου. Symmachus.

(B) —“pouring shower.” The word גשם is not simply a shower, but a hard pouring shower.

(C) —“harvest-rain——rain of seed-time”——  
 מלקוש—יורה. Our Public Translation gives “latter rain——former rain;” but the Hebrew nouns have nothing of ‘latter’ or ‘former’ implied in their meaning; and the English expressions convey a notion, just the reverse of the truth, to the English reader. For what it calls the latter rain, fell in the spring, which we consider as the former part of the year; and what it calls the former rain, fell about the end of our year, namely, in the autumn. מלקוש is literally the ‘crop-rain;’ that which fell just before the season of the harvest, to plump the grain before it was severed. And the beginning of the season of the harvest in Judea being the middle of March, according to the old style, this rain fell about the beginning of that month, and may properly be called the ‘harvest-rain.’ The other יורה, is literally the ‘springing-rain,’ or rather ‘the rain which makes to spring;’ that which fell upon the

seed, newly sown, and caused the green blade to shoot up out of the ground. This fell about the end or middle of October. I call it the ‘rain of seed-time;’ for the springing-rain might turn the thoughts of the English reader to the spring. These rains of seed-time and harvest are the *ἔτος προΐμιος καὶ ὄψιμος* of St James.\* But the apostle’s epithets have reference to the order of the husbandman’s expectations, not to the civil division of the year.

(D) —“piety.” חסד. The various senses of this word are well enumerated by Vitringa upon Isaiah xl, 6. But the general radical meaning of the word is by none so well developed as by Mr Parkhurst. Exuberance is included in the notion of it, in all its applications. The exuberant kindness of God to man; overflowing piety of man towards God; exuberant kindness of man to man; exuberant prurency of inordinate lust;† exuberance of wrath, and of reproachful language. In its good sense, the word ‘mercy’ is inadequate in the application of it either to God or man. As from God to man, ex-

---

\* Chap. v, 7.

† Lev. xx, 17.



uberant or abundant kindness is in general the best English word. As between man and man, 'exceeding kindness.' In many passages in which it is rendered 'mercy,' it properly signifies 'philanthropy,' displaying itself in a general mildness and gentleness of manners. This is clearly the sense in Prov. xi, 17, and, I think, in many other passages, in which it is not applied to any individual act. As from man to God, 'piety,' swelling in the heart, and displaying itself in acts of devotion. In this place I think it signifies that sudden flow of piety which occasionally comes upon men of very loose lives, if they are not wholly lost to all sense of religion; particularly under afflictions, which produce a momentary penitence.

Munster pertinently remarks, that the Jewish nation had its transient fits of reformation, cutting down the groves, killing the priests of Baal; but they soon returned to their abominations.

(E) — "belaboured by the prophets." חֲצַבְתִּי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. The LXX and the Syriac certainly take the prophets for the object of the verb חֲצַבְתִּי. And the prophetic order was indeed deeply implicated in the national guilt; insomuch that many of them

were promoters of it; and as such are frequently reprov'd and threaten'd by Hosea, and by all the faithful prophets that were true to their commission. But I cannot find that this verb, in any instance, governs its object by the prefix **ב**. I take the prefix therefore for the preposition of the instrument; and I take Ephraim and Judah, rehears'd by the suffix **ם**, in the verb **הרגתים**, for the object of both verbs. And to this Jonathan, St Jerome, and the Vulgate, agree.

—“belaboured;” the image is that of a hewer of wood, laying on heavy strokes, with the axe, upon a piece of hard timber.

(F) —“the precepts given thee.” So I understand the word **משפטיך**. The learned reader will find the various senses, or applications rather, of this word distinctly exhibited by Vitringa, upon Isaiah, vol. ii, p. 422. It signifies a fixed principle, or rule, in any thing, to which principle and rule can be applied. Here I take it for the practical rules of a moral and godly life, as delivered by the prophets. And so Calvin expounds it: —“Significat hic Deus se regulam piè et sanctè vivendi monstrâsse Israeli-

tis.—*Judicia tua, hoc est ratio piè vivendi.*” \* It is certain indeed that the Syriac and Jonathan read וּמִשְׁפָּטֵי לְאֹרֶךְ יָצָא. But none of the MSS give this reading, or any variety; except that one, of no great authority, has מִשְׁפָּטֵךְ in the singular; which seems to have been the reading given in St Jerome’s Septuagint; though the Septuagint, as we now have it, agrees with the Syriac and Jonathan: but St Jerome and the Vulgate are with the printed text, though they render it but ill.

(G) —“charity.” I think, with Calvin, that the word חֶסֶד is used here in a comprehensive sense, signifying both piety towards God, and philanthropy. I can find no single word to answer to it but charity; for charity, in the evangelical sense, is the love of man founded upon the love of God, and arising out of it.

(H) —“even in these circumstances.” This I take to be the force of the adverb שָׁם, as it is used here, referring neither to place nor time, but to a state of things. The Latin ‘ibi’ might in some de-

---

\* Calvin ad locum.

gree express it, but we have no one word for it in our language.

(I) The very learned Drusius says, in his notes upon this place, that he once conjectured that Gilead was put here by a sort of abbreviation for Ramoth Gilead, as Aven is sometimes put for Bethaven; but that he abandoned this conjecture, when he found mention, as he thought, in Eusebius, of a city called simply Gilead, in the mountainous region of the same name. Then he produces a passage from Eusebius, *De Locis Hebraicis*, as translated and altered by St Jerome, in which, after a general description of the mountain Galaad, or Gilead, it is said, “from which mountain, a city also, built in it, took its name; which city Gilead, the son of Machir, the son of Manasseh, took from the Amorites.” \* It is evident that, in these words, the author, whether Eusebius himself or St Jerome, refers to the fact recorded in *Numb. xxxii, 39, 40*; and understands the Gilead, which the children of Machir, the

---

\* —“ A quo monte et civitas, in eo condita, sortita est vocabulum; quam et cepit de Amorræorum manu Galaad filius Machir, filii Manasse.”

son of Manasseh, are there said to have taken from the Amorites, of a city of that name; in which I have no doubt that he is right. But I see no reason to suppose that this was any other than Ramoth Gilead itself. It is to be observed, that although it is said that “Moses gave Gilead unto Machir, the son of Manasseh, and he dwelt therein;” yet the conqueror of the Amorites in this quarter could not be Machir himself, the son of Manasseh; nor could he dwell in Gilead, or any of his sons; for they must have been dead long before the Exodus. If I might offer a conjecture upon a point, which, from the imperfection of history, is of so much uncertainty, I should say that Gilead, a grandson probably of the son of Machir of that name, having taken a principal city of the Amorites, in the mountainous country, fortified it for himself, and gave it his own name. That from the city the name passed to the district, which was allotted to that conqueror; and from that district, to the whole of a large tract of mountainous country, which made part of the settlement, not only of the half tribe of Manasseh, but moreover of the tribes of Reuben and Gad. But the name Gilead having thus been transferred from the city to a country comprehending many cities; the city, for

distinction, took the name of Ramoth-Gilead; the word Ramoth probably alluding to the lofty turrets, raised by Gilead for defence against besiegers.\*

(K) —“ to Sichein.” In taking שכימה for the name of the city with the local paragogic ה, I am supported by the Syriac, the LXX, and Symmachus; and by the Vulgate, in taking שכום for the name of the place, though not in the construction of the paragogic ה.

(L) In the original I remove the soph-pasuk at עשו to ישראל, so connecting the two words בבית ישראל with the 9th verse, and making the 10th verse begin with the word ראייתי. This is the only alteration of the printed text, which I make or admit, in this passage; and this is supported by the version of the LXX.†

(M) That the harvest in Joel iii, 13, is the fruit of the vine, is confirmed by the versions of the Syriac and the LXX, and by the use of the word קציר in Isaiah xvii, 11, where it is used for the ripe fruits

---

\* Vide App. No. III.

† Vide App. No. II.

of a *grafted plantation*. See Bishop Lowth's translation. Whence it should seem that, although by its etymology it most properly signifies corn reaped, mowed, or cut down, yet it is used as a general word for the severed fruits of the earth of whatever kind. And the word קציר by itself being capable of this general meaning, קציר קמה is a specific name for the corn-harvest, (Isaiah xvii, 5); and קציר חטים a still more specific name for the wheat-harvest.

## CHAP. VII.

(A) “When I would have healed.” ברפאי. At the very time when I was about to heal. ‘Dum in eo essem ut sanarem.’ This is the force of the prefix ב, which would be very ill changed into כ; an alteration for which there is no authority, but that of a single printed edition, not of any MS.

(B) —“carried on.” פעלו. The verbs עשה and פעל are not perfectly equivalent. The verb עשה is simply ‘to do, or make,’ ‘facere,’ in any manner, without reference to the length of time, degree of labour or thought, necessary to the performance. But the verb פעל is applied to those operations only,

which require some continued labour of the hand, or long application of the mind, or both. The thing meant here seems to be the carrying on of a premeditated plot or scheme for the subversion of the true religion, and the establishment of idolatry.

(C) —“ let them not say unto their heart, that I have remembered all their doings.” To the same effect Aquila: —*και μηποτε ειπωσι ταις καρδιαις αυτων, πασαν κακιαν αυτων εμνησθην.* St Jerome also, the Vulgate, and Abarbanel, take the negative **ל** as a prohibitory particle; though neither he, nor St Jerome, expound the prohibition exactly in the sense expressed in my translation. See Pocock, p. 289.

(D) —“ unto their heart.” **ללבבם**. The change of the prefix **ל** into **ב**, though supported by the reading of the Complutensian edition, and seven or eight MSS of Kennicott's, and seven or eight more of De Rossi's, would be much for the worse. When a man thinks within himself what he is afraid, or ashamed, or unwilling, to utter aloud, or declare openly, then he speaks *in* his heart; and this is expressed by **ב**. But when a man pursues his own thoughts without utterance, but without any desire



of concealment; more especially when he soothes and consoles himself with hopes and expectations well or ill founded, when he encourages and incites himself to action; then he speaks *to* his heart.

—προς ὃν μεγαλητορα θυμου and this is expressed by ל.

(E) —“ their perfidies.” I think the word כחש, as a noun substantive, renders not so properly ‘a lie,’ in the sense of a false assertion, as ‘a failure’ in the truth of a promise or engagement; a failure in any point of duty, or natural obligation; in particular, in loyalty to the rightful sovereign, and above all to the Sovereign of sovereigns.

(F) —“ the stoker.” מעיר, a noun substantive, regularly formed from the Hiphil of the verb עיר, ‘excitator,’ the man whose business it is to stir up the fire in the oven. This I take as the nominative case of the verb ישובת.

(G) —“ until the fermentation of it be complete.” All this I take to be expressed in the words ער המצתי. And St Jerome’s rendering, which is also that of the Vulgate, is to the same amount: —“ donec ferment-

taretur totum.” The noun חמצה properly renders the act, or passion rather, of fermentation ; the being fermented.

(H) An oven, in which the fire is raised to such a pitch, as to continue burning fiercely for a long time by its own internal fury, when no further means are used to stir it up ; in which the heat is so intense, as to be too strong for the baker’s purpose, insomuch that it must be suffered to abate, before the bread can be set in ; is certainly a most apt and striking image of the heart of the sensualist, inflamed with appetite, by repeated and excessive indulgence so wrought into the ordinary habit and constitution of the man, that it rages by the mere lust of the corrupted imagination, even in the absence of the external objects of desire, that might naturally excite it ; and works itself up to an excess, which is even contrary to the purpose, for which the animal appetites are implanted ; in such sort disordering the corporeal frame, that till the passion has spent itself in a great degree, it is incapable of enjoying its proper object.

To apply the images severally, I take the oven to be the heart : the burning fire, the animal appetites

in act: the stoker, or fire-stirrer, the external objects of desire, considered as present to the senses, and exciting the appetites. The dough, the sensitive animal frame, or nervous system, considered as the proper object of the immediate action of appetite: the baker, who ought to manage the oven, regulate the heat, superintend the stoker, and conduct every thing aright for the baking of the bread, is reason or intellect; which ought to be the governing faculty in the human soul. The fire always gets a-head, when this baker takes too long a sleep. As in the 6th verse.

The sensuality however here is, that of which sensuality is the constant scriptural type, the absurd and wicked passion for idolatry.

(I) —“our king.” מלכנו. I think there is irri-  
sion in the suffix. “This rare king of ours.”

(K) —“to scorers.” So the Bishop’s Bible, and the English Geneva. And to the same effect Calvin. —“*extendit manum suam ad illusores.*” “*Dicit regem manum suam protraxisse illusoribus; nempe in signum societatis.*” Instances of the use of the particle אֲדָ in the sense of the Latin *ad*, or,

which would come to the same thing here, as a sign of the dative case, are to be found in Noldius. Perhaps the passages cited by him are not all to the purpose; but some among them seem decisive.

(L) “Truly, in the inmost part of it, their heart is like an oven.” I take the order of construction thus: **כי לבם קרבו** [היה] **כתנור**. I take the suffix **י** in the word **קרבו**, as rehearsing the noun **לב**; which I understand as the nominative case of the verb substantive understood: and thus I bring out the sense, which I have given in my translation.

(M) —“put themselves in a stir about corn and wine.” In the Hebrew I place the soph-pasuk at the word **יתגוררו**, in the 14th verse; and I make the 15th begin with the word **יסורו**. Then at the word **בי** (the second word of the 15th verse, according to this division), I place rebhia; and at **יסרתי**, athnach; rebhia again at **זרועתם**; and the soph-pasuk at **רע** I leave undisturbed. These corrections of the stops are the only alterations I make in the printed text.

—“put themselves in a stir.” **יתגוררו**. This can be nothing but the third person plural of the future in Hithpael of the verb **גור**. There are four distinct

roots, יגר, גור, גרה, גרר, each of which has its proper signification. יגר, ‘to fear, to be in consternation.’ גור, ‘to sojourn,’ as a foreigner. גרה, ‘to excite or stir up,’ particularly war or strife; or, neutrally, ‘to be in a stir.’ גרר, ‘to saw.’ יגר is evidently the leading word; but all the four, especially the three first, have an intercommunity of secondary senses. גור, in a secondary sense, takes the sense of יגר, ‘to fear;’ and, in another secondary sense, agrees with גרה, ‘to be in a stir.’ Even the fourth גרר, ‘to saw,’ seems not entirely unconnected with גרה, ‘to excite;’ for the first effect of sawing is the excitation of small light dust, that flies about in the air, and is in perpetual stir. The Lexicons, among the senses of גור, give ‘to assemble, or collect.’ But I agree with the learned Mr Parkhurst, that this sense belongs not to this root, nor to any of the four roots; and where the Hithpael is rendered in our Public Translation, as in this place, of ‘persons assembling themselves,’ it is to be understood of ‘putting themselves in a vehement stir, or commotion.’ סער מתגורר, in Jer. xxx, 23, is “a whirlwind stirring itself up.”

(N) —“turned against me.” יסורני. From the

root סור, not from סרר, which forms the third person plural future יסרו.

(O) “ They fall back into nothingness of condition.” ישובו לא על. For the elucidation of these difficult words, I observe, first, that the verb שוב signifies either ‘ to return,’ or ‘ to turn away from,’ or ‘ to turn towards.’ But properly and most frequently ‘ to return,’ in reference to a former place, or condition. 2. In the sense of returning, or of turning towards, it usually governs the place to which, by the detached preposition אל, or the prefix ל. But either of these may be omitted; and the verb will appear as a verb transitive, governing the place, or condition, ‘ to which,’ as its object, without a preposition; like some verbs of motion, in particular connections, in the Latin language. Urbem adii. Domum redii. Romam profectus sum. This construction, in the Hebrew language, is very rare; but this passage is one clear instance of it. For על לא (whatever it may mean) stands as the place ‘ to which,’ and as the accusative after the verb transitive שוב; and it is by no means necessary to correct the text by conjecture, with the learned Houbigant, to supply the supposed omission of the

prefix. Although, if any emendation were necessary, his conjecture, לָלֵא for לֵא, might seem very plausible.

II. The word עַל has been very differently taken by different interpreters; whose various opinions are stated at length, by the learned Pocock upon the place. I consider none of them as deserving of attention, but those which attempt to ascertain the meaning of the word as it stands, without the aid of conjectural emendation. And these all take the word in one or other of three different ways: 1. As a noun adjective. 2. As a noun substantive. 3. As an adverb. But, which ever way it is to be taken, עַל לֵא is something described by privation of the thing signified by עַל, whatever that may be.

1. As a noun adjective, the word עַל is supposed to be an epithet of God, describing him as the High One, or the Highest. The learned Drusius, who adopts this sense, thinks the word an abridgment of עֲלִיּוֹן by apocope. And for this he may have the authority of some learned rabbin. Nevertheless, I scruple not to deny, that a single instance of a similar apocope is to be found in the Hebrew language. The word אֵל is no such instance, by apocope from אֱלֹהִים; for אֵל and אֱלֹהִים are two distinct

roots. The word יה is no such instance, by apocope from יהיה : for the latter is a compound of the former, with the benoni of another root. Nor is any unexceptionable instance to be found, in which the word על is used as an adjective rendering ‘high.’ This interpretation, therefore, though it is adopted by our English translators, being rejected, as founded on an irregular formation of the noun, and an unexampled sense of the noun so formed; it remains, that the word על must be either a noun substantive, or an adverb. As a noun substantive it may render either ‘a yoke,’ or ‘height;’ as an adverb, ‘on high,’ sursum. The Vulgate takes it in the sense of ‘a yoke,’ understanding, figuratively, “the yoke of the Mosaic law.” For the rendering of the Vulgate is, “Reversi sunt, ut essent absque jugo.” Which is well expounded by Grotius, “De novo voluerunt esse absque jugo. Per jugum intelligenda lex.” Symmachus, and the 6th Greek, render to the same effect. ἀνεστρέψαν εἰς το μὴ ἔχειν ζυγον. Sym. ἀπεστήσαν ἵνα διαγῶσιν ἀνευ ζυγου. E. This sense the Hebrew words will certainly bear; and of all that have been proposed it seems the best sense, next after that which I have given in my transla-



tion; which is R. Tanchum's, and, in my judgment, the best of all.

According to this interpretation, על is taken either as a noun substantive, rendering 'height;' or, as an adverb, rendering 'on high;' and it is not material, which way it be taken. For if it be an adverb, still לא על stands as a noun, after the verb שויב, and expresses that which is the privation of height. But the height, whether expressed by the noun, or by the adverb, is to be understood figuratively, of height of rank or condition. In which sense the adverb is used, 2 Sam. xxiii, 1. הגבר על רקם. "The man who was settled in a high degree;" *i. e.* established on the throne of Judah, which was made the inheritance of his family in perpetuity, and raised, in his own person, to be the type of his great descendant. The Israelites also were placed in a high degree, to be worshippers of the true God; which high degree they relinquished by their defection to idolatry, and returned to the low level of the heathen.\* The versions of the LXX, and the Syriac, rightly understood, convey the same meaning, and give it in words exactly

---

\* See R. Tanchum ap. Pocock.

equivalent to those which I have used. ἀπειστραφη  
 εις οὐδεν. LXX. כִּי לֹא יָשָׁר עֲשִׂיתִי. Syr. “Obli-  
 quârunt se ad nihilum;” not, as the Polyglott trans-  
 lation gives it, “nullâ de causâ.” We say, in com-  
 mon speech, of a man, who, by misconduct, has lost  
 all esteem and credit in the world, “He has brought  
 himself to nothing.”

### CHAP. VIII.

(A) “The cornet at thy mouth,” &c. To this effect the Vulgate; with Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion according to St Jerome.

“*In gutture tuo sit tuba, quasi aquila,*” &c. Quæ tam latè audiatur, quam aquila templum supervolians, et è sublimi crocicans. *Grotius.*

(B) I place the soph-pasuk at יִרְעִיךָ. “O my God”— Israel, speaking collectively, uses the singular pronoun and the plural verb.

(C) —“of themselves.” Sponte. This I take to be the force of the pronoun הֵם. See ver. 9.

(D) —“have antipathy.” This is the true sense

of the phrase **לֹא יָדַל**. See Ps. ci, 5. Isa. i, 13; and compare Amos vii, 10.

(E) —“ pure religion.” For **נִקְיִן**, the Complutensian, and four other printed texts, with 44 MSS, among them some of the very oldest and best, give **נִקְיִין**; which is certainly the true form of the word. It signifies purity, or cleanness, generally. Hence moral purity, innocence. But here, I think, it particularly denotes “ pure religion,” or the purity of worship. “ Pure religion, and undefiled,” in opposition both to the superstitious practices of idolaters, and the false shew of hypocrites.

(F) —“ even this,” **וְהִיא**. The **ו** is highly emphatical, aggravating the accusation. Even a thing so abominable, as this, was his own invention. Archbishop Newcombe says, “ The Israelites may have originally borrowed this superstition from the Egyptians; for, in Egypt, he observes, “ this species of animals were worshipped; the Apis at Memphis, and the Mnevis at Heliopolis.” But the prophet says expressly, not indeed in the learned Primate’s amended text, and mis-translation; but, in his own words, he says expressly, that the Israelites borrow-

ed this superstition from nobody. It was all their own. Indeed, what they had seen in Egypt was the worship of a living calf; not of the lifeless image of a calf, or of any other animal.

(G) —“reduced to atoms.” שֶׁבִיבִים הִיָּה. Sebab est minimum quidque in re quâvis; ut scintilla, fragmenta, segmenta. Grotius ad locum.

(H) “To sow the wind, and reap the whirlwind,” may certainly be a proverbial expression for measures of bad policy, ending in ruin, and disappointing the statesman’s expectations. But instead of taking the verbs יִרְעוּ and יִקְצְרוּ as plurals, of which the plural pronoun of the third person understood, rehearsing Israel collectively, is the subject; I take the verbs in the singular number, and the final ך as the affixed pronoun of the third person singular, rehearsing Israel: and the nouns רוּחַ and סוּפְתָה I take as the subjects of those verbs respectively. And thus I bring out the sense expressed in my translation. The only objection I am aware of is, that the feminine nouns, רוּחַ and סוּפְתָה, are taken as the subjects of verbs masculine. But of these two nouns, the former is often masculine. And the anomaly of

gender between verbs and nouns, especially when the noun is the name of a thing, which hath not naturally the one sex or the other, is so frequent, that **רוח** is sometimes both masculine and feminine in the same sentence. It is somewhat in favour of my interpretation, that for **יקצרו** five MSS give **יקצורו**; in which form the verb must be singular, and the final **ו** must be the affixed pronoun. For the third person plural future admits not the epenthetic **ו**. It is true, that in Exodus xviii, 26. we read, in the printed texts, **ישפוטו**. But upon this Buxtorf observes, “Unum reperitur cum schurek præter morem.” And 15 MSS, and the Samaritan text, give **ישפטי** in the regular form, without the epenthetic **ו**.

(I) —“of their own accord.” This I take to be the force of the pronoun **המה**. And this is generally its force, where it appears, as in this place, pleonastic. See ver. 4. and chap. ix, 10.

(K) —“will I embody them.” **אקבצם**. The verb **קבץ** signifies ‘to collect into one mass’ things naturally separate and dispersed. Hence more particularly, to form or assemble armies. The use of the

verb in this sense, in the historical books of scripture, is very frequent. In Isaiah lvii, 13, the noun קבוציך renders ‘thy companies,’ *i. e.* companies of soldiers. I take the verb here therefore as a military term; and, considering how it stands connected with the verb יהני, I think that verb is to be taken as a military term too; the former rendering the embodying of armies, the latter the granting of bounties to the persons enlisting, or of tribute to foreign princes furnishing auxiliaries. Thus God threatens that he will press into his own armies against the Israelites, those very bands of foreign mercenaries, whom the Israelites themselves, to the great mortification of the king and the rulers, when the error of the measure appeared by the event, had paid at a dear rate.

I find I have the concurrence of the learned Noldius in this interpretation of the passage, as far at least as the general meaning is concerned: —“*Sensus est, quamvis mercede conducant gentes in auxilium, ego tamen mox contra eos illas ipsas colligam. Scil. brevi futuras ex amicis hostes.*” Nold. Concor-dant. Partic. Annot. 1031.

(L) —“and the rulers.” The reading of ושרים

for שרים is supported by such a weight of authority, that I cannot but adopt it. Eight MSS of Kennicott's, nine of De Rossi's, two more of Kennicott's originally, six more of De Rossi's originally, the notes of the printed Bible Minchath Shai,\* the Babylonian Talmud, the LXX, Syriac, Chaldee, Aquila, Theodotion, St Jerome, and the Vulgate. And yet there is no difficulty in the construction of the common text; for it might be thus rendered: "And ere long the rulers shall sorrow for the burthen of the king," *i. e.* for the burthen imposed by the king in taxes.

(M) I punctuate the original thus. Over the first מובחות, in verse 11, I place rebhia, or the semicolon; and at the second מובחות, in the same verse, I place the soph-pasuk: that the second לחטא may be thrust forward into the subsequent verse, where it stands as the object of the verb transitive אכתוב; expressing what God will write, or inscribe, upon Israël; namely, that he is the property of Sin. *Inuram ei notas, "Peccati mastigia."*

---

\* For an account of this Bible, see De Rossi, Prolegom. part i.

§ 37, 38.

A similar allusion, though with a different application, to an owner's, or commander's, mark impressed upon the person, occurs in Isaiah xliv, 5, in nearly the same phrases :

“ One shall say, I am Jehovah's ;

And another shall be called by the name of Jacob ;

וזה יכתב ידו ליהוה

And another shall inscribe his hand, JEHOVAH'S,

And surname himself by the name of Israel.”

—“ JEHOVAH'S.” This is what he will write upon his hand ; as “ SIN'S,” is what God in Hosea threatens to write upon Ephraim's person. The only difference in the phraseology of the two prophets is this : the verb כתב governs the thing written upon, in Isaiah, in the accusative ; in Hosea, by the prefix ל. The prefix ל in the word written, ליהוה in Isaiah, לחטא in Hosea, is the sign of the genitive of the possessor.

—“ an allusion,” says Bishop Lowth, upon Isaiah, “ to the marks which were made by punctures rendered indelible by fire, or by staining, upon the hand, or some other part of the body, signifying the state or character of the person, and to whom he belonged. The slave was marked with the name of his master ; the soldier, of his commander ; and the



idolater, with the name or ensign of his god.” Dean Spencer observes, that, among the heathen, slaves were usually marked in the forehead; soldiers, in the hand: and he thinks, that slaves were usually marked in the hand among the Jews. The mark of the idol was impressed on different parts of the body.\* We have allusion to this custom in Rev. iii, 12, xiii, 16, xiv, 1. In the primitive ages, it was usual for Christians to mark themselves, upon the wrist or arm, with the name of Christ, or with the sign of the cross; as Spencer and Lowth shew from Procopius upon this passage of Isaiah. —Το δε τῆ χειρὶ λεγει, δια το στιζειν ἰσως πολλους, ἐπι καρπων ἢ βραχιωνων, ἢ του σταυρου το σημειον, ἢ την Χριστου προσηγοριαν.

(N) “The masters”— For רבו, I read, with the marginal varieties of the Venice Bible of 1518, with the marginal Keri of Vander Hooght, and with 13 MSS, רבי.

(O) —“my proper offerings.” One can only guess at the precise sense of the unusual word הבהבי, which, with the majority of interpreters, I

\* See Spencer De Leg. Hebr. lib. ii, c. 14, § 1, 4.

take to be the plural of a noun substantive **הבהב**, from the root **יהב**, with the pronoun of the first person singular affixed, but blended by crasis with the jod plural. I think it renders those offerings, which were so appropriate to God, so demanded, as it were, by God as his exclusive property, that the whole was to be burnt upon the altar, and even the priests were not to taste it. And thus the word seems to have been taken by Livelye and Drusius. The accusation is, that the priests, the sacrificers of these offerings, sacrificed, and ate; an act of the highest sacrilege. —“ The sacrificers of my proper offerings.” **וּבְהִי**, I take for the particle Benoni plural, *in regimine*, signifying persons offering sacrifices. It is so used in 18 places besides this.

### CHAP. IX.

(A) —“ with joyous exultation.” **אֵל גִּיל**, *exultationem usque*. **גִּיל** is a noun substantive, signifying ‘leaping and dancing for joy,’ after the preposition **אֵל**; not, as some have taken the word, the imperative Hiphil of the verb **גִּיל** constructed with the prohibitory particle **אֵל**: for it is contrary to the invariable rule of the Hebrew language, that the impera-

tive mood should prohibit; or, in other words, the prohibitory particle must be constructed with a future tense, never with an imperative mood. Compare Job iii, 22.

(B) —“ fee of prostitution.” אַתְּנֵן. At this word I place the soph-pasuk.

(C) —“ must.” תִּירוֹשׁ. The word often signifies ‘ new wine ;’ but its primary and proper meaning seems to be ‘ must in the vat,’ under the process of fermentation. When this process miscarries, the must never turns to a sound wine. And this seems to be threatened here.

(D) —“ their.” For the singular בָּהּ, the marginal varieties of the Venice Bible of 1518, the Bible of Hale 1720, the notes of the Bible Minchath Shai, the Bible of Pesaro 1517, seventeen MSS of Kennicott’s (among them the oldest and the best), and three more originally, eight of De Rossi’s, and nine more originally, give the plural בָּם.

(E) —“ their sacrifices are not pleasant to him.” I take away the zakeph-katon from לִי, and instead

of it place rebhia at **זכחיהם**, taking that noun as the nominative of the verb **יערבו**. Dr Wheeler adopted the same punctuation.

Our Public Translation, with many others, makes this 4th verse predictive of the condition of the Israelites in captivity; when they should be deprived of the means and opportunity of making offerings to Jehovah, according to the prescribed rules of the Mosaic ritual. According to the construction which I adopt, it is a description of the enormity of their idolatrous practices, in their own land, previous to their captivity, which brought down upon them that judgment. And with this interpretation stands the authority of Kimchi, the LXX, Capito and Œcolampadius as quoted by Pocock, Calvin, Zanchius, and the learned Drusius. In the general sense of the passage all these interpreters agree; with some difference however among them in the grammatical construction of the words. That which I adopt is approved by Kimchi and the critical Drusius.

(F) —“ as the meat of mourners.” **כלחם אונים**. The noun **אין**, and the verb **אנה**, are distinct roots in the Hebrew language. And from the verb descends another noun, differing in sense as well as in etymo-

logy, but expressed by the same letters, as the former. The Masoretes have endeavoured to distinguish the two nouns by giving them different points, which would make the radical noun sound ‘awven;’ the derivative from the verb, ‘own.’ Nevertheless, they have perpetually confounded the two, applying to the one the points, which, in their system, belong to the other.

The radical noun פִּז, in the Masoretic pronunciation ‘awven,’ signifies ‘activity,’ or ‘strength and vigour,’ in actual exertion; and specifically, the generative strength and vigour of the male. And this sense of activity acting, I take to be the proper and primary meaning of the word. In one place I think it is used to denote ‘adult vigour,’ in opposition to the weakness of infancy.\* In the plural number, it is sometimes used to express intensity, or abundance of active vigour; and once, I think, for the rapid motions and efficacious influences of the heavenly bodies.† “Lift up your eyes on high, and behold! Who hath created these? [namely, the heavenly bodies.] He that leadeth forth their host by number, calleth every one of them by name. Made

---

\* Hos. xii, 4.

† Isaiah xl, 26,

abundant in active powers [מִרְבַּ אֹנִים], and firm in strength, not one faileth." It occurs in the plural once as a noun adjective, signifying 'persons endowed with strength, power, and activity,' for great enterprizes. "When a wicked man dieth, his expectation shall perish, and the hope of the active [וְתוֹחַלַת אֹנִים] perisheth."\* The noun here renders the Latin 'impigri ad labores;' and describes those who have been the most active, and with the best success, in arduous enterprises; never backward to encounter toil or difficulty.

From this primary sense of active strength, and specifically the generative vigour of the male, this noun became a name or title of the Sun; incessantly active in the constancy and rapidity of the apparent diurnal and annual motions (rejoicing as a giant to run his course), in the perpetual propagation of light and heat to the utmost limits of the universe, and in his genial influences on all nature, as the first physical principle of fecundity in the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms. These physical powers, which properly indeed belong to the Sun, as an instrument in the hand of God, the an-

---

\* Prov. xi, 7.

tient idolaters ascribed to that luminary, as inherent in itself, independent of the Creator; for they made it self-existent, *Αὐτοφυης*.\* By its influences on nature, they made it the author of all good to the good, and of all evil to the bad. At last they ascribed to it intelligence and will; at least they spoke of it as intelligent, and made it the sovereign of the moral, as well as of the material world. These various powers are distinctly expressed in the epithets ascribed to the Sun in the Orphic invocation :

*Αὐτοφυης, ἀκαμα, .....*

.....

*Κρασιν ἔχων ὥραν .....*

*Εὐδρομε, ροιζωτης .....* *διφρευτα*

*Ῥομβου ἀπειρεσιου δινευμασιν οἶμον ἔλαυνων,*

*Εὐσεβеси καθοδηγε καλων, ζαμενης ἀσεβουσι*

.....

.....

*Κοσμοκρατωρ, .....*

..... *φερσεβιε, καρπιμε, παιαν.*

.....

.....

*Δεικτα δικαιοσυνης .....* *δεσποτα κοσμου,*

---

\* Orph. H. V. lin. 3.

Πιστοφυλαξ .....

Ὁμμα δικαιοσύνης, ζωῆς φως.

Orph. H. V.

The noun  $\text{יָס}$ , as generally denoting activity, but more particularly the activity of the fecundating principle, comprehends almost every thing that is expressed by these separate epithets, except intelligence and self-existence, and was perhaps the oldest name of the Sun as an object of worship. Being once used as a title of the Sun, it became the name perhaps of any image or emblem of the Sun placed in the idolatrous temples; and was afterwards more largely used among the Israelites as the name of any idol-image. Thus it is understood in Isaiah lxvi, 3; at least so it is taken by St Jerome and the Vulgate; though nothing hinders but that it may be used even in that place as an appropriate name of some idol-image of the Sun: for the worship of the Sun was a very principal part of the idolatry of the Israelites, both long before and long after the times of the prophet Isaiah.\*

From this use of the word as a name for idol, images of the Sun, it naturally acquired the sense of

---

\* See 2 Chron. xiv, 5; 2 Kings xxiii, 5; and 2 Chron. xxxiv, 4.



Sun-worship in particular; and thence, of idolatrous worship in general. And then its meaning was extended to signify any thing in thought, word, or deed, contrary to true religion and the positive commands of God. And this accounts for the various senses of iniquity, unrighteousness, ἀδικία, ἀνομία, κακία, το ἄτοπον, ματαία, πονηρία, in which it is rendered by interpreters in various places; in the far greater part of which, however, the original word seems used with reference, more or less obvious, to idolatry, as the cardinal vice.

It once, and I think only once, signifies ‘vanity,’ in the sense of ‘falsehood,’\* and that in the specific instance of the false responses of the oracles of the idols. † In some other passages, in which it is rendered ‘vanity,’ it is either confounded with the o-

\* Zeeh. x, 2.

† “As עוה, or עון, by being a word for what made man fall, became a root for ‘iniquity;’ so by this the principal object in the system [*i. e.* the system of the visible universe] being worshipped, perhaps it [the name of that principal object] became a root for ‘falsity.’”

Mr Hutchinson, *On the Names of the Trinity of the Gentiles*. Tit. בית און.

ther word, rendering affliction, or may be taken in its common meaning of iniquity.

Falsehood is so nearly allied to ‘non-ent<sup>y</sup>,’ that it is not surprising, that the word should be found in this sense in Amos v, 5. **וּבֵית אֵל יִהְיֶה לְאֵין** — —“and Bethel shall come to nought.” *και Βαιθηλ ἐσται ὡς οὐχ ὑπαρχουσα*. LXX. **וּדְפַלְחִין לְטַעוֹתָא בְּבֵיתֵאל יִהְוִן לְלִמָּא**. Jonathan. **וְדַפְלַחִין לְטַעוֹתָא בְּבֵיתֵאל יִהְוִן לְלִמָּא**. Syr. —et Bethel erit inutilis. Vulg. This is certainly the only passage, in which the word **אֵין** signifies non-ent<sup>y</sup>, or, nothing. And were it not for the consent of all these antient versions with the Masoretic punctuation; another sense, with an alteration of the points, might be admitted here, which will be mentioned in the sequel.

Whether this word ever renders ‘wealth,’ or ‘worldly substance,’ may deserve consideration. From its primary sense of ‘activity,’ it might naturally be applied to the acquisitions of activity. But unexceptionable examples of this application seem to be wanting.

As the noun **אֵין**, in the sense of idolatry, or iniquity, in the singular number, never signifies a single individual act, a sin, or a crime, but denotes the general sinfulness, iniquity, or idolatry of the charac-

ter ; it is never used in the plural number to denote a multitude of such single acts : ‘ Idolatries, sins, iniquities.’ It occurs, indeed, in the plural only in four places.\* And, in every one of these places, it is confounded by the Masoretes with the other noun (own). But, in the last of the four, † it is used in its proper sense of animal strength and vigour. “ He giveth strength to the faint, וְלֵאֵין אֹנִים, and to him that is nothing in vigour he increaseth force.” In the second, ‡ it signifies vigour of procreation : and in both places the plural is used, only to give intensity to the sense. In the third, § it denotes the incessant activity of the heavenly bodies, in their rapid motions and physical influences, as hath been already declared : and in the first, || it is a noun adjective, in apposition with אֲנִשִּׁים understood, and is rendered, in our Public Translation, “ unjust men ;” but rather signifies, as hath been shewn, ‘ active men, bustlers.’ This text is rendered in a singular manner by the learned Mr Parkhurst, in his Lexicon (after Shultens, I believe), “ And his lingering hope shall miserably perish.” He takes

\* Prov. xi, 7. Ps. lxxviii, 51. Isa. xl, 26, 29.

† Isa. xl, 29.

‡ Ps. lxxviii, 51.

§ Isa. xl, 26.

|| Prov. xi, 7.

the plural אֲנִיִּים adverbially, ‘dolorificis modis.’ But there seems to be no reason to resort, in this text, to an unexampled use of the word.

Upon the whole it appears, that אֲנִיִּים, in the passage of Hosea under consideration, cannot be taken as the plural of the radical noun אֵין (awven); since no sense of that word, authorised by the usage of the sacred writers, is applicable in this place.

The verb אָנָה has two senses, remotely, if at all, connected with each other. 1. To occur, happen; to befall, betide. 2. To mourn, lament, grieve.

Some, instead of giving the root אָנָה these two senses, make two different roots; אָנָה, ‘to occur;’ and אָנָן, ‘to grieve, or mourn.’ But from אָנָה, which Calasio makes the single root, the verb אָנָן, which occurs only in the Hithpael conjugation, may be formed; as עָלָה from עָלָל.

From this root, אָנָה, therefore, in its second sense, or from אָנָן, if that be a distinct root, comes the noun substantive אֵין (own, in the Masoretic pronunciation), rendering what occasions mourning, lamentation, or grief; namely, ‘pain of body, or a condition of calamity and affliction.’ It is used for ‘bodily pain,’ in Gen. xxxv, 18. where it denotes the excruciating pains of laborious parturition. It

is used for grief, or mourning for the dead, in Deut. xxvi, 14. It is used for a state of misery or affliction, in Prov. xxii, 8. “He, that soweth evil, shall reap misery.” And it signifies calamity, misery, or tribulation, wherever it is connected, by the copula, with the noun עַמַּל. In the phrase אֵין וְעַמַּל, אֵין is always to be taken as this derivative noun, not as the radical. For though in many passages either might suit the context; yet in some, the radical noun will give no good meaning: whereas there is not one, in which this derivative, in the sense of misery or affliction, is not applicable. In Amos v, 5. אֵין might be taken as this derivative noun in the sense of tribulation. So Calvin takes it. “Bethel erit in molestiam,” *i. e.* “Bethel is doomed to tribulation, or Bethel shall be a cause of tribulation.” But the consent of the antient versions with one another, and with the Masoretic punctuation, in the sense of ‘nought, or non-entity,’ seems decisive, that the אֵין of this place of Amos is the radical noun. Were it not for the deference due to antient authority, Calvin’s exposition of the word, which takes it for the derivative, would be greatly to be preferred.

It may seem perhaps an objection to this analysis of the meaning of the two nouns, the radical and the derivative, that the name of the Sun has been generally supposed to have been Own, not Awven. That it is to be referred, therefore, to the derivative, not to the radical word; and cannot have been, as I suppose, the origin of that sense of the latter, by which it renders idolatry, and iniquity. I know not, that this opinion has been taken up, on any better authority, than that of the Masoretic punctuation. We read twice in Genesis,\* of a “priest of Own,” according to the points. But the versions of the LXX and the Vulgate in these places are so paraphrastic, that no conclusion can be drawn from them, concerning the pronounciation of the name. From the Syriac it should seem, that it was Awvan or Ovan; much nearer to Awven, than to Own. But however that may be, I contend only, that the two words, the same in the letters, are distinct in their etymology, and in their meaning. That the Masorettes meant to mark this distinction by their points. But I maintain, that if the two words were differently sounded, according to their different

---

\* Gen. xli, 45 and 50; and xlvi, 20.

meanings, the Masoretes have perpetually confounded them; and in many places have given Awven when they should have given Own, and Own when they should have given Awven; and thus have brought obscurity upon the meaning of the words, and have perplexed the texts, in which they occur. And the name of the sun is one instance, in which they have mispointed. But this is immaterial to my argument; which rests not on any supposed accuracy of the Masoretic points, or the truth of the pronounciation they represent. On the contrary, I impeach both. The name of the sun, rightly sounded, may have been Own, or it may have been Awven. The sound of the two words may have been, in all cases, the same; always Awven, or always Own, or always something else; and yet the words might be different in etymology and sense. As in Greek, οὐρανός, ‘the sky,’ and οὐρανός, ‘the palate.’ In Latin, *malum*, ‘evil,’ and *malum*, ‘an apple.’ In English, ‘a hop,’ a certain motion of the body, and ‘hop,’ the flower of a certain plant. ‘Born,’ carried, and ‘born,’ *partu editus*. Without deciding whether the pronounciation of the two Hebrew nouns were the same or dif-

ferent, or what was the true sound of either ; I maintain only the distinction between the two, in sense and etymology ; and I use the different sounds, ‘ Awven,’ and ‘ Own,’ only as received marks of that distinction, often confounded.

In two passages the word אִין has been taken in the sense of ‘ goods, or substance.’ “ His children shall seek to please the poor, וִירִיו תִּשְׁבְּנָה אוֹנוֹ; and his hands shall restore their goods.”\* And, “ I have found me out substance.”† But it must be the radical noun, if either, not this derivative, that can render ‘ goods, or substance.’ And if these passages are thus rightly rendered, the word in both texts is mispointed by the Masoretes. In the text of Job, it is at any rate mispointed ; for no sense of the derivative noun is applicable there ; and the radical is capable of its usual meaning : for the passage may be rendered, “ His children shall make their court to the poor, and his own hands shall recompense his iniquity.” See Scot’s Version of the Book of Job, and the Notes. The text of Hosea will be considered in its place.

The derivative word אִין never occurs in the plu-

\* Job xx, 10.

† Hosea xii, 8.



ral, in the sense of griefs, afflictions, calamities, mournings, or indeed in any sense at all. For the plural אֲנִיִּים is found only in the four passages quoted above; and, in every one of those, it is the plural of the radical noun, though otherwise pointed by the Masoretes.

Hence it follows, that the word אֲנִיִּים, in this text of Hosea, is not the plural of the derivative noun אֵין, rendering ‘mournings.’ And it has been shewn, that it cannot be the plural of the radical noun; which would give no meaning here. It remains, therefore, that it is the participle Benoni in Kal of the verb אָנָה, regularly formed, according to the rule of conjugation of the verbs quiescent Lamed ה; rendering ‘*lugentes*, persons who are mourning, or mourners.’

This being settled, it is not difficult to understand, what is meant by the ‘meat of mourners.’ The external expressions of grief for the dead, the rites of mourning, and the ceremonies of interment, seem to have been much the same among the Jews, as were practised by the heathen; even in some particulars which were expressly forbidden by the Mosaic law: insomuch, that practices, in many things contrary to the law, seem to have obtained even among those, who

cannot be suspected of giving in to any thing, that was understood, in their own times, to be idolatrous. How it came to pass, that the divine law, in these instances, gave way to fashion and custom, it is difficult to explain. But the fact seems indisputably proved by Jer. xvi, 5—8. For the expressions of grief and mourning for his countrymen, dying of grievous deaths, and consumed by the sword and by famine,\* forbidden to the prophet, seem to be such, as it is supposed the holy prophet would have used, had he not been so forbidden. And they seem to be forbidden, not as things generally sinful, but improper upon that particular occasion. And yet many of them were certainly contrary to the provisions of the law. It is very remarkable, that some of the same things were prohibited by the Decemviral law, and yet continued in practice among the Romans. “*Mulieres genas ne radunto, neve lesus funeris ergo habento.*” Was it that the prohibition among the Jews, as well as the Romans, was founded on political, rather than religious, considerations; so that though the civil law was disobeyed, in the continuation of the practice, no religion was vio-

---

\* Verse 4.

lated? Among the ceremonies of interment in use among the heathen, the most essential and indispensable were banquets among the relations of the deceased. These, indeed, were not forbidden by the Mosaic law, except to the priests; and to them only by virtue of the general prohibition of their interference in the obsequies of the dead; with permission, however, in the case of father, mother, son, daughter, brother, or virgin sister.\* These banquets were of two kinds. Banquets around the body of the deceased, before it was carried out; and a feast of the family and relations, after the obsequies were finished, and the body, or the ashes of it, entombed. Both are to be traced among the Gentiles up to the heroic ages. Of the first sort was the sumptuous feast, which Achilles made for his myrmidons around the body of Patroclus, while it lay unburied.† Of the second, the banquet in

---

\* Levit. xxi, 1—3.

† ——— αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσι ταφῶν μενοεικέα δαῖνυ.

Πολλοὶ μὲν βόες ἀργοὶ ὄρεχθεὸν ἀμφὶ σιδήρῳ

Σφαζόμενοι, πολλοὶ δ' οἶες καὶ μηκάδες αἰγίς·

Πολλοὶ δ' ἀργιόδοντες ἕες, θαλερόντες ἀλοιφῇ

Εἴδομενοι τανυόντο διὰ φλόγος Ἰφαιστοῖο.

H. F. 29, &c.

Priam's palace, after the interment of Hector.\* The latter was the conclusion of the mourning. The relations of the deceased assumed the garb of festivity; for they were crowned with garlands, and celebrated the praises of the deceased.† To this feast "the cup of consolation," mentioned Jer. xvi, 7. is probably to be referred, answering to the 'circumpotatio;' which was interdicted among the Romans by the Decemviral law, on account of the excess to which it was carried. The former feast, before the interment, was the Parentalia of the Romans, and the περιδειπνα of the Greeks. It is said, that the viands for this feast were contributed by the relations and friends of the deceased; and thence it is supposed to have acquired its Greek name. In the manner of the celebration among the Greeks, this banquet, in itself innocent, seems to have been con-

---

\* Χευαντες δε το σημα, παλι κιον' αυταρ επιτα

Ευ συναγειραμενοι, δαινοντ' ερικυδια δαιτα,

Δωμασιν εν Πριαμοιο διοτρεφειος βασιλης.

Il. Ω. 801.

† Sequebantur epulæ, quas inibunt parentes coronati; apud quas de mortui laude, cum quid veri erat, prædicatum. Cic. De Leg. Lib. II. c. 25.

nected with something of an idolatrous worship of the manes of the deceased. For in the parentalia of Patroclus, the company seem to have formed a ring around the dead body, placed in the centre, which, in that situation, was plentifully wetted with the blood streaming from the slaughtered animals; \* which gives the banquet the appearance of a feast upon the victims sacrificed to the shade of the hero. The feast, however, not abused by this superstition in the manner of the celebration of it, was so much esteemed among the Jews an indispensable duty to the memory of the dead, that it was a part of Tobit's excellent exhortation to his son, to "pour out his bread upon the burial of the just;" † that is, to be liberal in contribution of viands to the *περιδειπνα*. These contributory viands were probably "the bread of men" of the prophet Ezekiel. ‡ Among the Athenians it is said to have been the duty of a particular magistrate, to supply the provisions for this feast for the poorer citizens.

---

\* Παντη δ' ἀμφι νεκρυ κοτυληχρυτον ἔρρεεν αἶμα. II. Ψ. 34.

† Tobit iv, 17.

‡ Chap. xxiv, 17.

In the simplicity of the primitive ages, this feast was probably celebrated only a single day. It appears not, at least, that the parentalia of Patroclus were repeated. But in later times the feasts were continued every day, as long as the body lay above ground. Whence they acquired, among the Romans, the name of ‘*Novendiales Epulæ*.’ For on the ninth day, the body, according to their practice, was carried out. The Jews proceeded to such profusion in these banquets, that Josephus says, many persons of condition reduced themselves to beggary by this expence.\* The viands served up at these funeral feasts, whether the parentalia, or the concluding feast after the funeral, were all unclean, by the use to which they were applied, and defiled all who ate of them; and all come properly under the denomination of the “meat of mourners.”

But there were other offerings consecrated to the dead, in rites of the grossest superstition; which may be included under the same denomination. Such were the libations of wine and oil poured upon the

---

\* *De Bello Judaico, Lib. II, c. 1.*

funeral pile, and the meats burned with the dead body.

..... Congesta cremantur

Thurea dona, dapes, fuso crateres olivo.

Æn. VI, 224.

Such also were the provisions laid from time to time upon the tomb, or placed near the grave, for a repast for the shade of the deceased, which was supposed to feed upon them. These were properly the *κτερισματα* of the Greeks, and the Silicernium of the Romans. They were sometimes offered for the purpose of magical evocation, as in the *Odyssey*. Sometimes, to appease the ghost of a murdered man; as the offerings of Clytemnestra, at the tomb of Agamemnon, in the *Choëphoræ* of Æschylus, and the *Electra* of Sophocles. But more frequently they were merely offerings of the relations in honour of the dead. It may seem almost incredible, that the chosen people of God should ever give into a practice of such horrible idolatry. But what may we not believe of those, who could “set their abominations in the house called by the name of Jehovah,” and make their children “pass through the fire to Moloch?” And there is a text which brings them under strong suspicion, and seems plainly to insinuate,

that they brought this practice with them out of Egypt, and continued it afterwards. In the 26th chapter of Deuteronomy there is a law, which requires of every one, who should present himself before God to offer his first fruits, to make a solemn profession, that he had *bonâ fide* applied the whole of his tithes to the religious and charitable uses prescribed by the laws of tithing; without subtraction of the smallest particle, upon any pretence, for any other purpose. “I have not eaten thereof in MY MOURNING [that is, I have consumed no part of them in feasts at the funerals of my relations], neither have I taken away ought thereof for any unclean use, nor given ought thereof for the dead.” Or, more literally, —“nor given of it to a dead man.”\* Now, what should this giving of the fruits of the ground, or of the flock, to a dead man be, but something analogous to the Silicernium of the heathen? And why should this solemn profession be exacted, if the Israelites were not in fact addicted to this abominable practice? All these viands served up at the funeral feasts, and all the sepulchral cates laid about the graves of the dead, as offerings to the de-

---

\* Verse 14.



parted spirit, were “meats of mourners,” and all in the highest degree, but especially the last, unclean.

It would be unpardonable not to apprise the reader, that in the interpretation I have given of the text in Deuteronomy, I differ widely from the learned Dr Spencer; whose second chapter, of the second book of his work, upon the Hebrew ritual, entitled “*Lex, de professione triplici, post oblatas decimas et primitias, faciendâ,*” is well worth the reader’s perusal, if he delights in the refinements of deep erudition fancifully misapplied.

Upon the general subject of funeral feasts and the rites of mourning, many interesting and judicious remarks are to be found in the notes of the learned Dr Blaney upon Jer. xvi, 5—8.

(G) —“to themselves.” So Abarbinel expounds the word לִנְפֹשׁוֹ, and after him Grotius. “*Cibus eorum ipsis erit*”—*ipsorum tantum usibus servire poterit; quasi dicat, ὀναίητο.*

(H) “Their valuables of silver,” &c. There is certainly much ambiguity in the grammatical construction of this passage, though the general sense is

very clear. It describes the extreme devastation of the country by the Assyrian conquest, under the image of weeds growing up in the dwellings, deserted by the owners, and stripped of their costly and elegant furniture of silver.

To ascertain the construction, I observe, in the first place, that **מחמר** is a noun substantive, signifying generally whatever, for its value or beauty, is most desired. This is its frequent sense. The sense in which some take it, and which the learned Pocock seems to prefer, of the places in which such valuables were stored for safe keeping, or set out for use or ornament, though not inconsistent with the frequent import of the verbals formed with the he-mantic **מ** prefixed, and with the peculiar force of that formative, is I believe in this word unexampled.

2. In the word **לכנסם**, the prefix **ל** denotes that **כסף** is the material in which these valuables were wrought.\* And when two words are connected, as these two are here; a pronoun, suffixed to the latter of the two, very often belongs properly to the former; which I take to be the case here. So that

---

\* See Noldius, **ל**, § 15.

מחמר לכסף may properly be rendered ‘ their valuables of, or in, silver.’

3. The two words מחמר לכסף stand as a nominative absolute, expressing the principal subject of the sentence following; a figure of speech frequent in all the prophets, and in which Hosea particularly delights.

4. The verb יירשם is the third person singular future of the verb ירש in the Hiphil conjugation, with the pronoun plural of the third person suffixed. I say in the Hiphil conjugation; to which interpreters have not attended. For I cannot find that the verbs quiescent Phe Jod ever form the third person singular of the future in Kal, or Pihel, with the double י. Buxtorf indeed cites two instances;\* the latter with some hesitation. But in the first, the Samaritan text and the Complutensian Bible give ייצר in the regular form: and in the second, the verb יירע seems to be in Hiphil, as Buxtorf himself allows it may be taken. For the true rendering of the verse I take to be, “ For Jehovah is high, yet hath he respect unto the lowly; but the lofty one from afar *he maketh to feel.*” Compare Judges viii,

---

\* Gen. ii, 7, and Psalm cxxxviii, 6.

16, where many MSS give **וַיִּרְעוּ**. And **וַיִּרְעוּ** is a Hiphil form of the future, though less regular than the double **וַיִּ**. Now the verb **וַיִּרְשׁוּ**, in the Hiphil conjugation, signifies ‘to dispossess,’ to drive out the former owner or occupier, and take possession in his room.

5. The nominatives of this Hiphil verb are the nouns **קִימוֹשׁ** and **חֹהּ**; and **בְּאֹהֲלֵיהֶם** is to be taken as connected with both these nouns. Thus the exact rendering will be, “Their valuables in silver—the nettle, the thistle in their dwellings shall dispossess them.”

6. The pronoun **וְ**, suffixed to the verb **וַיִּרְשׁוּ**, may rehearse either the people, the Israelites; or their valuables, **מִתְּמָר** being taken as a collective. In the first way the sense will be, that the nettle and the thistle, growing up in the deserted mansions of the Israelites, shall dispossess them of their valuables; in the second, that these weeds so growing up shall dispossess the valuables, *i. e.* occupy the place which those costly things once filled. The latter I think the more easy and natural exposition.

If the learned reader is not satisfied with this exposition of the grammar of the text, he may find in Pocock all the constructions (except this) which the

words can be brought to bear ; and in the variety he may make his own choice.

(I) —“ the prophet.” The title of prophet seems to have been given to all of the prophetic order ; that is, to all who had been educated in the schools of the prophets, and professed a life of retirement and religion: because these were usually the persons to whom the gift of prophecy was imparted; though it was by no means given to all, or even to the greater part of them. Some perhaps among them pretended to it, who had never received it at all. And others, to whom it was in some degree given, temporised in the use of it, by profane accommodations to the humour of the people, the religious opinions, or the political measures of the court. Of the latter in particular we have a remarkable instance in those prophets of Israel, who encouraged Ahab to the expedition against the Syrian, for the recovery of Ramoth Gilead, which proved so fatal to himself. That the gross imposture of pretences to inspiration, by persons that had it not at all, was actually practised, seems to be implied in Micah ii, 11, and Jer. xxiii, 31, 32. That those who had the extraordinary gift pretended, upon some occasions, to visions which

they had never seen, and to commands which they had never received, is certain, from the very memorable story of the imposition practised by the old prophet, who dwelt in Bethel at the time of the schism of the ten tribes, upon the man of God of Judah, who had prophesied against Jeroboam's altar.\* The old prophet, whatever his crime might be in this deceit, and it certainly was great, appears to have been in his general character a true servant of God. But the more frequent crime was certainly that of temporising, in the manner of delivering messages of warning, which had been really received. The persons guilty of this conduct were deeply implicated in the guilt of the nation, and were promoters of the idolatry, to which the kings and the people were so much addicted;† and they are reprovèd and threatened in every page of the prophetic writings. These are the persons who, in this text of Hosea, under the title of prophets, are taxed with stupidity and madness.

The communication of the gift of prophecy, to persons so false to the duties of their office, seems somewhat analogous to the communication of the

---

\* 1 Kings xiii.

† Jer. xxiii, 15.

miraculous gifts, in the primitive church, to many who made, if not a wicked, certainly an improper and injudicious use of them. And analogous to the threatened punishment of false teachers, in the latter ages of Christianity, was the punishment of these prevaricating prophets. "God sent them strong delusion that they should believe a lie."\* "If the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet; and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel."† How it was that God deceived the prophet, is an awful question, to be cautiously touched. It is evident from the text of Ezekiel, that the prophet himself was highly criminal in the deception that he suffered. It may be that for his unworthiness the spirit of wisdom and understanding was withheld from him, which might have enabled him to discern the true meaning of the allegorical visions presented to his imagination. Or it may be that, for the guilt of the nation, the prophetic spirit was imparted to those who wilfully misinterpreted their visions. Thus the vision was true, and the whole falsity was in the error, or

---

\* 2 Thess. ii, 11.

† Ezek. xiv, 9.

the dishonesty, of the prophet. It is hardly to be conceived, that falsified scenes of futurity could be obtruded by the Holy Spirit on the prophet's mind. I would observe, that in the case of Ahab, the lying spirit in the mouth of the prophets, was not a spirit that lied to them, but a spirit that incited them to lie to the king.

(K) “In proportion to.” This is the force of על, —“according to.”

(L) —“his God.” I read אלהי, with the Soncinum Bible of 1486, the notes of the Bible Minchath Shai, four MSS of Dr Kennicott's, two more originally, three of De Rossi's, and one more originally.

(M) —“my God.” I read אלהי, with two MSS of Dr Kennicott's, and one originally of De Rossi's. The words אלהי and אלהי, in this verse, seem to have changed places, to the great detriment of the emphasis.

(N) Luther's notion of this passage was not very different from mine. —“Existimo antithesi uti prophetam.—Sententia enim est, quod priora tempora



habuerint veros prophetas ; qui magno animo reprehenderunt idololatriam, et docuerunt verum Dei cultum. Sed qui nunc sunt, inquit, occasio sunt errorum et impietatis. Ponunt enim laqueos populo," &c. Diodati too agrees in this interpretation.

(O) —“ I found.” The verb מָצָא here signifies not to find something in a place unexpected, but it is equivalent to the verb ‘ to find,’ or ‘ trouver,’ in such expressions as these : ‘ I find it very good ;’ ‘ je le trouve tres bon.’ And the sense is, as grapes in the parched barren desert are found delightful by the thirsty traveller, so was Israel antiently delighted in by God. See Pocock on the place. Calvin’s remark is very judicious : —“ Porro non intelligit propheta dignum fuisse populum, quem tantopere amaret : sed Hebræi dicunt ‘ invenire,’ quemadmodum etiam Gallicè dicimus, ‘ je trouve cela a mon gout.’ Reputavi igitur Israel tanquam uvas in deserto.”

(P) See chap. viii, note (1).

(Q) —“ to that obscenity.” לַבִּשְׁתָּ. Luther takes the word בִּשְׁתָּ for the name of the idol. For render-

ing the passage “ et sanctificaverunt se turpi idolo,” he adds this note; “ Boshet autem sine dubio appellat idolum Peor, turpem et foedam statuam.” He certainly is not far from the truth, though the word **בשׂת** is not altogether a proper name.

The word **פֶּעַר**, as a verb, signifies ‘ to open.’ It occurs in this sense in four places only, in all of which ‘ a mouth ’ is the object; in three, the human mouth; in the fourth,\* the mouth of Hades personified. It is never used as a noun, but in the name of the idol Baal-Peor; and once, as the name of a hill.† In the name of the idol it seems to be the infinitive, used as a noun; or as the Latin gerund in *di*, after the preceding noun Baal; so that the name of the idol renders in English ‘ the lord of opening.’ I take Baal-Peor therefore to have been worshipped as the power presiding over procreation; opening the womb, both for conception and for parturition; to have been, in short, the *Προθυραία* of the Orphic system.‡

\* Isaiah v, 14.

† Numb. xxxiii, 28.

‡ Compare Hutchinson, On the Names of the Trinity of the Gentiles, Tit. בעל פֶּעַר.

This power was worshipped by the Greeks under the name of Artemis. Her office extended far beyond the affairs of mere midwifery. She had not only propagation universally, not merely that of the human species, in her care; but as generation and corruption reciprocate in material things, she superintended both. And, being supposed to have in her power the issues of life and death, she was the general arbitress of the fortunes of men. She had a variety of titles, according to her various offices; and her family connections, her pedigree, and her consanguinity, are differently stated, according as she is contemplated in the exercise of one or another of her various powers. And from these different names and different stories, the poets, and their commentators, have made as many different goddesses. But *Ἄρτεμις*, *Εἰλειθυία*, *Προθυραία*, *Δημητηρ*, *Τύχη*, *Ἐκάτη*, *Jana*, *Diana*, *Partuna*, *Luna*, *Juno*, *Lucina*, were all the same power, considered in various acts, and worshipped with various rites, and under different symbols. But the paramount character of this divinity was that of the patroness of procreation; and in this character she was the *Baal-Peor* of the *Moabites*.

The learned reader will make it no objection, that

all the titles I have enumerated of the Greek and Latin idol are feminine, whereas Baal is a masculine. It was a first principle among the mystagogues that every god was of either sex. And this very personage, in the character of Selene, is saluted, in the Orphic invocations, as male and female, — *Θηλυς τις και αρσην*,\* and was both Lunus and Luna among the Latins; and the word *בשת* will lead to feminine appellations of Baal-Peor.

We are told by Herodotus, that the Artemis of the Greeks was worshipped by the Egyptians under the feminine appellation of Bubastis, in the city of the same name. † And in a Greek epigram, cited by H. Stephens, in his Thesaurus, Bubastis is said to be a title of Isis, as the guardian goddess of women in labour. It is very remarkable, that Busbatos was a title of Diana, as Hesychius affirms, among the Thracians. The Egyptian rites of Bubastis, as they are described by Herodotus, ‡ were in the highest degree obscene. But this is not all. The city Bubastis (commonly written Bubastos, but Herodotus writes it with an i) certainly took its name from

---

\* Orph. H. S.

† Euterpe, 156, and 59, and 138.

‡ Euterpe, 60.

the goddess. Now the name of the city, in the prophet Ezekiel,\* is פי כסת; which seems only a dialectic variation, as is observed by the learned Parkhurst,† for פי כשת. And the literal rendering of פי כשת is ‘foramen turpitudinis.’ Hence it is easy to guess under what emblematical figure the goddess was worshipped in the city that bore her name; and the conjecture is much confirmed by the attitudes by which the Egyptian ladies are said to have expressed their devotions‡ in the annual festival of this object of their worship.

Hence I have no doubt, that in the word כשת, as it is used here, and in some other texts of scripture, there is a paronomasia; a favourite figure with the prophets, which cannot be adequately expressed in a translation. To preserve what they could of it, our English translators have judiciously added the demonstrative ‘that’ to the word ‘shame,’ by which they render the noun substantive; and I have followed their example, prefixing ‘that’ to my word ‘obscenity.’ By giving the appellative ‘shame,’ or

\* Chap. xxx, 17.

† Lexicon, under the word כשת.

‡ Herodot. Euterpe, 60.

‘ obscenity,’ without ‘ that,’ the appropriation of the word to the idol would be lost ; and the sense of the name would be lost, if the Hebrew word ‘ Boshet’ were retained in the translation as a proper name.

The learned Vitrिंगa has a notion of his own about this “ consecrating of themselves to that obscenity.” He thinks some rite must be signified, by which some of the Israelites devoted themselves to the worship of that idol, “ ut placerent amasiis.” And so far he is probably in the right. But he conceives that the particular rite was the circular tonsure of the hair, by which the Moabites and Arabs, according to Herodotus, marked themselves as worshippers of Dionysus. This opinion Vitrिंगa sustains with much learning and ability ; but, as often happens to him, with too much refinement. It cannot be true, unless Baal-Peor was Dionysus : and of this he offers not a shadow of a proof.\*

The opinion that Baal-Peor was Priapus, seems to have taken its rise from a random guess of St Jerome’s, who understood that Baal-Peor was something obscene ; and looked no farther, than to some-

---

\* See Vitrिंगa in Isaiah xv. Not. Moab. § 3.

thing obscene in the Greek idolatry, to answer to the idol of the Moabites.

(R) “ Ephraim !” A nominative absolute.

(S) —“ when I turn away.” For **בשורי**, I read, with the Bible of Hale (1720), three MSS of Kennicott’s, one originally of De Rossi’s, Aquila, the Vulgate, Houbigant, and Archbishop Newcombe, **בסורי**.

(T) —“ to all appearance.” This I take to be the force of **באשר ראיתי**. And so the LXX, *ὅς τεροποιεῖ εἰδού* and to the same effect the Bishop’s Bible, “ as methinks.”

Diodati’s rendering deserves attention : —“ *mentre io l’ho regardato*”— “ So long as I looked upon him.” If this might be adopted, it would produce an elegant antithesis between the happy effects of God’s providential care, and the deplorable consequences of his turning away, mentioned in the preceding sentence. But I think the Hebrew words will hardly bear this sense,

(V) —“ planted on a rock.” —*εἰς πέτραν πεφυτευμένωσι*. Theodotion. And to the same sense, as it

should seem, Aquila and Symmachus: — *ὡς ἀκροτομῶν πεφυτευμένη ἐν κατοικίᾳ.*

(W) I remove the soph-pasuk from צמקים, where I place only rebhia to בגלגל, that רעתם may be an accusative after תן, in apposition with רחם and שרים.

(X) —“perverse practices.” See ch. v, note (B).

(Y) —“blighted.” The allusion is evidently to a tree, killed by what is called a blight. The verb נכה is often used in this particular sense of blighting.\* Dr Pocock thinks that the word, though used in a much larger signification, is “in proper language spoken of trees and plants, when by any chance marred.” See his note upon this place. I have sometimes been inclined to adopt the construction and rendering of the Syriac. “Ephraim is smitten at the root; he is dried up, so that he shall bear no fruit.” The version of the LXX, when it is rightly pointed, is to the same effect: — Ἐπονεσεν Ἐφραὴμ τὰς ῥίζας αὐτοῦ ἐξηρανθη, καρπὸν οὐκ ἔτι μὴ ἐνεγάγη.

---

\* Psalm cii, 5, Amos iv, 9, and Jonah iv, 7.



## CHAP. X.

(A) —“ yielding.” בוקק. The root בוק, or בק, signifies properly, ‘ to empty a vessel of its contents.’ Hence ‘ vastare.’ But a vine ‘ emptying itself,’ must be a vine pouring forth its internal strength in abundance of fruit.\* All the antient versions, except the Chaldee, agree in rendering the participle as expressive of luxuriance. Symmachus, indeed, renders it by a word that denotes ‘ running to wood,’ ἑλωμανουσα, and Aquila, by ἐνυδρος, ‘ a watery vine,’ which St Jerome explains to be a vine bearing grapes, which gave but a thin and watery juice, such as would not make good wine. But the context shews, that fertility of fruit is meant, and this idea is conveyed in all the other versions. ἐκκληματουσα. LXX. “ abounding in goodly branches.” But goodly branches are branches which bear fruit; and accordingly this version adds, καρπος εὐθηνων αὐτης. The Vulgate renders the participle of leaves, “ Vitis frondosa Israel;” but then he adds, “ fructus adæquatus est ei.” The Syriac ܕܒܩܩܝܢܐ ܕܝܫܪܐܝܝܠ ܕܒܩܩܝܢܐ ܕܒܩܩܝܢܐ. “ A branchy vine is Israel, which beareth

---

\* See Parkhurst, under the word בק.

fruit." The fruit, however, is not to be understood of the fruit of good works, as I have explained in note (1).

(B) —“ his fruit was answerable to his vigour,” literally, —“ and his fruit was equalled to himself.” So the Vulgate, “ fructus adæquatus est ei.”

(C) —“ God himself.” This I take to be the force of הוּא. And so it is understood by St Jerome.

(D) “ Negotiate,”— literally, if דברו be taken as an imperative, “ Talk words”— I take אלות as another accusative, in apposition with דברים, after the verb דברו; and כרת, as the infinitive used for the imperative, which is very common. “ Talk words,” *i. e.* “ negotiate.” Among the Indian tribes of America, a public conference to settle differences is called “ a talk.”

(E) “ Hemlock,” ראש, may be a general name for the vegetable poisons, hemlock, aconite, &c. from their common property of affecting the head. Compare Dr Blaney, on Jer. viii, 14.

(F) —“ the inhabitants.” I take שֶׁבֶן here as a collective, with all the antient versions. As I think, the same word (though differently pointed by the Masoretes) is used in Ps. cxxxv, 21. For I would render that verse thus: “ Blessed be Jehovah in Sion. O inhabitants of Jerusalem, praise ye Jah.” To be rendered with the versions, —“ that dwelleth in Jerusalem,” *i. e.* “ Jehovah that dwelleth,” the word should be השֶׁבֶן.

(G) —“ shall be in consternation.” Of the four verbs, יָנַר, גָּוַר, גָּרָה, גָּרַר, see chap. vii, note (M).

The word יָגִוְרִי, here, can be nothing but the third person plural future in Kal of the verb גָּוַר, regularly formed, according to the rule of conjugation of the verbs quiescent 'Ain ו, and the verb must be taken in its secondary sense of being in consternation.

(H) —“ for the great calf.” לַעֲגִלוֹת. It is not to be concluded from the feminine form of the noun, that the idol was a heifer. “ Imagines carent sexu,” says Vatablus. I conceive that when the living animal is in question, the masculine, עֵגֶל, renders a bull-calf, the feminine, עֲגִלָּה, a cow-calf. But that

speaking of the image of a calf, the feminine, עגלה, may be used of the figure either of the bull, or the cow. The plural number is used, because the calf of Bethel (here called Bethaven, because it was become the temple of an idol), was in its size, and the riches of the temple, the principal image. —“ quod Vitulus, qui in Bethel colebatur, esset præcipuus,” says Vatablus. I render the word, therefore, “ the great calf.” This noun in the feminine and plural form, is rehearsed in this text by a masculine and singular pronoun.

(I) —“ exulted.” יגילו. The future, even without the conversive ו, is often used for the præterite, according to Kimchi, as he is quoted by Buxtorf. “ Frequentissima est temporum enallage—Præteriti pro futuro, et futuri pro præterito, tum per se et simpliciter in prophetis, tum propter præfixam litteram ו.”

(K) For ארתו, I read with the Soncinensian Bible of 1488, the Brescian of 1494, the Pesaro Prophets of 1516, the Venice Bible of 1518, the Basil of 1536, which is the second of Munster’s, and twenty MSS of Kennicott’s, ארתו.

(L) See chap. V, note (I).

(M) —“ in sound sleep.” I take the word **בשנה** for the substantive **שנה** (heavy sleep), with the prefix. I know not how it can be regularly formed from the root **ביש**, to signify shame. The Vulgate, indeed, and the Chaldee, seem to favour this derivation and this sense. For the Vulgate renders the word by ‘ confusio,’ and takes it as the nominative of the verb. The Chaldee word **בהתא** is properly shame. But perhaps it may signify confusion, or inactivity of the faculties, from any other cause. The Syriac **ܒܫܢܗ** might, I think, be rendered, “ Confusion shall darken Ephraim;” which, if the noun **ܒܫܢܗ** may signify ‘ confusion,’ or torpidity of the mind generally, is exactly my sense, though it deviates from the construction. And this sense of the noun is, in some measure, confirmed by chap. xi, 1. according to the division which the Syriac translator follows; where the verb **ܒܫܢܗ** is joined with the verb **ܫܘܠܗ**, the clause being to this effect, “ In the morning, the king of Israel wondered, and was astounded.” The text of the LXX is in such a state, that no conclusion can be drawn from it of their reading or their sense. St Jerome’s LXX

seems to have had *ἐν ἰδοματι Ἐφραιμ δεξεται αἰσχυνη*. But, taking the Greek text as it now stands, I would propose to correct it thus: *ἐνδομα δε Ἐφραιμ δεξεται*. Taking *ἐνδομα* in the sense of ‘languor,’ from the verb *ἐνδομαι*.

(N) —“like a bubble.” *בְּקֶצֶף*. “Bullam interpretor. Dicitur autem bulla *בְּקֶצֶף* a *קֶצֶף*, quod fervere et bullire significat, quia fervoris et ebullitionis effectum est.” Livelye.

Mr Woide first proposed the division of the clauses which I follow, putting *rebhia* or *athnach* at *שְׁמֵרוֹן*, and understanding the verb substantive after *מַלְכָּה*.

(O) —“it overtook them not—iniquity.” I have preserved the exact collocation of the words in the original, that the ambiguity arising from it (if any) might remain in the translation. The clear sense, and the only sense, unless the particle *לֹא* be taken interrogatively, is that which I have given and explained in note (13). Taking the *לֹא* interrogatively, the words must be thus rendered: “Overtook it not them in Gibeah, the war against the children of iniquity?” That is, “Did not the war

against the children of iniquity overtake them (*i. e.* those children of iniquity) in Gibeah?" The pertinence of the interrogation to the subject might be, "Did I not thus execute judgment on those sinners? Much more will I execute judgment on you, who are worse sinners." But this rendering is not so easy and natural, as the former. The pronoun **ו** suffixed to the verb, in this way of taking the sense, must refer to the children of iniquity, which are placed after it in the sentence; a construction by no means unexampled, but not to be admitted without necessity.

(P) — "when they are tethered down to their two furrows." **באסרם לשתי עינתם**. For the last word, the Keri gives **עינתם**. The editions and MSS differ. The varieties of the Venetian Bible of 1518, eleven MSS of Kennicott's, and one more originally, agree with the Keri. Thirteen MSS of Kennicott's, and three more originally, give **עינתם**. The Complutensian Bible, and one MS of Kennicott's, give **ענתם**. The text of the Venetian Bible of 1518, and the Bible of Hale of 1536 (Munster's 2d), the Brescian of 1494, the Soncimensian latter Prophets of 1486, and eight MSS of Kennicott's, give

עֲוֹנוֹתָם. I take עֲוֹנוֹתָם, עֲוֹנָתָם, and עֲוֹנוֹתָם, to be in fact the same word, written defectively in some MSS, and in its perfect form in others. The authorities, therefore, for the Keri seem to preponderate; especially if we add those of the LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate. If עֲוֹנוֹתָם be the true reading, it might signify iniquities; and in this sense it is taken by the LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate, and many modern critics, who all render to this effect: —“when they shall be chastised for their two iniquities.” And modern expositors understand by the two iniquities the two calves of Dan and Bethel. This may seem at first an easy and obvious sense. But, upon a narrower inspection of the Hebrew words, it will be found, that they will not bear it.

In the first place, the word כַּאֲסָרָם cannot otherwise be resolved, than into אָסַר, with the prefix כִּי, and the suffixed pronoun ׁם. The word אָסַר, under the prefix כִּי, cannot be derived from the root יָסַר, ‘to chastise.’ And of the two alterations of the text, offered by Archbishop Newcombe to his readers’ choice, neither is justified by any sufficient authority; unless that of the three versions of LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate, without a single MS, and without any exigence of the place, may be deemed



such. Much authority is indeed due to the concurrence of antient versions, and especially of these three. But, in the present instance, it is by no means certain, that we have the consent of the three, or the authority indeed of any one of them, for an alteration of the text in this word. The more probable conclusion from their versions seems to be, that there is a great affinity of sense (as many men of learning have observed) between the two roots, אסר and יסר; which is the case, in various other instances, between roots quiescent Phe י and others quiescent Phe א; and that they took אסר in this place in the sense of יסר.

2. But admitting that the word אסר might be so taken; or, if it cannot be so taken, admitting, in deference to the versions, one or other of Archbishop Newcombe's altered readings, still there will be great difficulty in the construction. I know of no instance in which the prefix ל is used, as what some grammarians call *Causalis rei præteritæ*, or as the preposition of the reason, or motive of action, arising in the consideration of something past. Which must be the use of it here, if לשתי עונותם is to be rendered 'for their two iniquities.' It is true, that, among the enallages of the prepositions, gramm-

rians mention ל used for the detached על. But then it is for על in the sense of ‘against,’ or ‘upon,’ or ‘close to,’ not as signifying ‘upon account of.’ The prefix ל indeed sometimes signifies ‘according to the rule or measure of,’ or, ‘in proportion to.’ Thus Jeremiah xxx, 11. ויכרתיו למשפט, where למשפט is equivalent to במשפט, ch. x, 24. And the learned Dr Blaney judiciously remarks, that the word משפט in these texts signifies that ‘calm and dispassionate judgment, which stands opposed to the hasty sallies of anger and furious revenge.” And the sense of the former is, “But I will correct thee according to measure of such judgment.” Again, Ezekiel xxii, 6. איש לזרעו. —“each in proportion to his power.” And in this place of Hosea the prefix ל might render ‘in proportion to,’ if iniquities had been mentioned without limitation to the number two. “When they are chastised in proportion to their iniquities.” But to take the prefix in this sense, with respect to ‘two iniquities,’ would produce a litosis, little consistent with the vehemence of the discourse. For to punish in proportion to two iniquities, would be to ‘punish twice,’ and only twice.

Upon these considerations, I am persuaded, that in the word **כִּאֲסַרְם**, **אֲסַר** is the infinitive mood of the root **אֲסַר** in its own proper sense of ‘binding, tying to, fastening to, or upon,’ or, in some respect, ‘confining, restraining.’ The suffixed pronoun **ם** expresses the persons which are the objects of such binding, tying, fastening, confinement, or restriction; and the noun following, under the prefix **ל**, must denote that, to or upon which, those persons are bound, tyed, fastened, confined, or restrained. Indeed the verb **אֲסַר**, ‘to bind,’ properly governs the thing to which, by the prefix **ל**.\* There are two of these things; and it remains to inquire, what they may be.

It is supposed that the word **עֵינִית**, the plural of **עֵינָה**, may render ‘furrows in a ploughed field.’ No other passage is to be found in the whole Bible, in which the word is used in this sense. And the process of criticism, by which this sense is deduced from the etymology of the noun, as derived from the root **עֵנָה**, may seem rather far-fetched. The noun **מֵעֵנָה**, from the root **עֵנָה**, certainly signifies ‘a fur-

---

\* See Gen. xlix, 11.

row.\* Hence it is concluded, that the verb ענה may signify ‘to make a furrow.’ No example of this sense of the verb occurs; but it is certainly very consistent with its general sense, furrows being drawn to correspond in parallel lines. And if this sense of the verb be admitted, the noun עניה, or עינה, if that be the true orthography, may signify ‘a furrow.’ The only authority for this meaning of the word, among the antients, is Jonathan. But it is received with approbation by the most learned of the Rabbin, and by the majority, and the most able, of the Christian expositors. By Munster in particular, by Vatablus, Calvin, Tarnovius, and the learned Drusius. The latter, in his Annotations upon the Vulgate, goes so far as to say, that it is the only sense the word will bear. For proposing this correction of the rendering of the Vulgate, “Cum ligavero eos in duobus sulcis ipsorum,” he adds, “et ita necessario videtur reddendum ex Codice Hebræo.” The necessity, indeed, which this great critic supposes, is founded entirely on the Masoretic rules of punctuation; and the sense, which he esteemed so necessary, is rejected, as ill-suited to

---

\* See 1 Sam. xiv, 14. and Ps. cxxix, 3.

the context, by two other critics of great learning and great penetration, Luther and Livelye.

Those who adopt this sense of the word, all seem to agree, that the image, which the clause presents, is that of a pair of heifers yoked to the plough; which I take to be erroneous. For the furrows are two. —“bound to or upon their *two furrows.*” But a plough, though dragged by a pair of heifers, makes but one furrow at a time; and this is the one furrow of both heifers. Two of the Jewish expositors, Abn Walid, and R. Tanchum, avoid this discordance between the words and the supposed image, by imposing on the word עֲנִיָּה, the sense not of furrows, but of “plowing heifers.” But how this image of “plowing heifers,” or “heifers yoked to the plough to make furrows,” represents the ten tribes, is but ill agreed among those who receive the one or the other of these senses of the word; and no one among them, either Jew or Christian, has given any tolerable elucidation of the matter.

If ‘furrows’ be the true sense of the word עֲנִיָּה, I am inclined to think the being bound, or confined, to their two furrows may be a proverbial expression, not much unlike the more homely proverb of our own language, of ‘an ass between two bundles of

hay;’ describing the situation of a person fluctuating in his choice between two things, of which he must choose one. In like manner, the situation of extreme difficulty to which the Israelites were reduced under their latter kings, without any human means of relief, but in the choice of one of the two alliances, between which they were ever fluctuating, that of Assyria, and that of Egypt, may be represented under the image of an animal tethered by a short rope, in such a manner that its utmost liberty of feeding is but the breadth of a single ridge between two furrows, one on the one side, one on the other. The only objection, of which I am aware, to this interpretation of the image is, that pasture grounds are not usually laid down in ridge and furrow, and animals are not usually tethered to feed in corn land.

But if the word עֵינֹת be taken to signify ‘iniquities, or faults,’ the passage may be brought to the same general meaning, dismissing the image of a tethered animal, and rendering, —“when they are tied to their two faults,” or, with the Syriac, —“their two follies.” The two alliances, already mentioned, might be called the two faults of the people, as both were repeatedly reprobated by the

prophets, and yet the people were always courting the one or the other of them. Or they might be called their two "follies." For they never formed the one or the other, but they experienced the folly of the measure. Their ally, whichever of the two they chose, always proved a treacherous friend; and yet the name of an alliance with one always drew down the resentment and vengeance of the rival power. They were tied to these two faults, or two follies, when, by God's just desertion of them, they were cut off from all prospect of any better aid, than one or the other of these alliances might offer to their hopes, and felt themselves obliged to make a choice.

And, after all, if it be asked for what reason the word עֲוֹנוֹתָם may not be taken, as it is taken by all the antients except Jonathan, in particular by that most excellent interpreter, the author of the Syriac version, in the sense of 'iniquities, faults, or follies;' I say, that the objection stands upon no other grounds, than that of the principles of the Masoretic punctuation. From this arises all the necessity, which the learned Drusius holds out, of the other sense. For the single authority of Jonathan, though respectable, will hardly be allowed to constitute a

necessity, especially when set against that of the LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate. The textual word, or Cetib, is עִנְתָם. By the decree of the Masoretes the Keri must always take the vowel points applied to the Cetib. The Keri, therefore, pointed in conformity to this rule, must be עִנוֹתָם, in which both the ך's are quiescent in cholem. And this word cannot be derived from the root עוה, to signify 'their iniquities,' because we have nothing but cholem to represent the omitted ה of the root; and, by another decree of the Masoretes, one vowel point cannot supply the absence of two letters; or, in other words, the ך in עוה cannot be quiescent. But put the point chateph-patach under the initial ע, and give the cholem to ך consonant, that the word may be עִנוֹתָם, and then the sense of iniquities will be imposed upon the word by the very same necessity, upon the principles of the Masoretic system, by which, according to the other pointing, it is excluded: that is by no necessity at all, but the arbitrary rules of uninspired expositors of the sacred text. It is true, that the more regular orthography of this feminine noun would be עִנוֹתָם. But in the masculine form the word is usually written without the second ך. "In textu plerumque



scribitur," says the learned lexicographer Robertson, "cum simplice Vau ante cholem absque Vau sustentante." And for what reason a like omission of the quiescent Vau may not take place in the feminine form of the noun, since the only reason of the omission is the quiescence of the letter, let the believers in the Masorettes explain.

(Q) —“ I delighted in treading out grain.” To this effect Castalio.

(R) —“ I will make Ephraim carry me.” To this effect the LXX, the Syriac, the Vulgate, Luther, Castalio, Junius and Tremellius, and Grotius, who adds this remark, “ solent interdum rustici insidere bobus.”

(S) “ If we read as Shalman destroyed Beth-Arbel, reference is made to a fact, not elsewhere recorded,” says Archbishop Newcombe. And so said Luther long before him: —“ Historia, cujus hoc in loco propheta meminit, nusquam extat.” And so said Diodati: —“ Questa istoria non è discritta altrove”— But it never occurred to Luther, or to Diodati, that this would justify violent alterations of

the text, to obtrude upon the prophet an allusion to a history, which is indeed extant, but to which no man, without the gift of inspiration, can know, that the prophet meant to allude. The sense of the passage is as clear, as it could be if the history were known. The allusion is to a military exploit, well known we may be sure in Hosea's time, in which the conqueror spared neither sex nor age. And the Israelites are threatened with an equal calamity. Upon the subject of such emendations, as they are called, as have been proposed in this place, I present the reader with the judgment of the great Pocock. Having mentioned a remark of Drusius, that the LXX appear to have found כִּשְׂר in their copies instead of כִּשְׂר (but Drusius never set up this as a true reading), and Capellus's crotchet of changing כִּשְׂר into כִּשְׂר upon no authority at all, to make the text agree with some imaginations in history of his own; Pocock says, "By the same reason, every one, for introducing any where such a meaning as pleased him best, might alter the words as he pleased, of which there would be no end; and it would be a matter of very ill consequence: we must fit our meaning to the words, and not the words to our meaning." And afterwards, having mentioned the

alterations of the proper names proposed by Grotius, which Houbigant adopts, and Archbishop Newcombe from Houbigant, he says, “ But it will be too bold for us to follow his conjecture, as before we said concerning that of Capellus; if we should give ourselves that liberty, we should have in this verse three different readings: one from the Greek, in reading כשר for כשר; another from Capellus, reading for it בשר; and another from Grotius, in reading ביר for בית. And why may not some others, by the same authority, make others both here or any where else; so that we shall not know where to fix? It will be the only safe way to keep our reading as we have it, and to lay any fault or incongruity which we meet with, on the expositions, not on the words read in the text.” Thus this sober critic.

It is worthy of remark however, that the Vulgate, St Jerome, and the LXX, suppose that the history alluded to is Gideon’s destruction of Zalmunna. I join the LXX, with the two others, because the reading of the Alexandrian MS, Ἰεροβααλ for Ἰεροβοαμ, is confirmed by St Jerome’s version of the LXX. St Jerome says, that Arbel and Jerubbaal are names of the same signification.

I must observe further, that St Jerome, the Vulgate, and the LXX, all expressing the word **בית** in their versions, clearly reprobate the change of it into **ביר**.

(T) “As the morning”— For **בשחר**, I read, with the latter prophets of Soncinum of 1486, the varieties of the Venice Bible of 1518, the Bible of Hale of 1720, ten MSS of Dr Kennicott’s, three more originally, five of De Rossi’s, and three more originally, and with St Jerome, and St Cyril of Alexandria, and the Vulgate, **כשחר**.

The simile is expounded by St Jerome in his Commentary; and by St Cyril of Alexandria, and by Theodoret, in the sense which I have given in (22) of the explanatory notes. This exposition the prefix **כ** would not admit. It is strange that Archbishop Newcombe should have thought the two readings equivalent.

(V) —“brought to nothing.” The force of the word **רמה**, when it is used, as here, to signify a total destruction, is very often what cannot be adequately expressed in any word, hardly in any two or three put together, of the English language. From

its leading sense of assimilation, it may naturally signify the making of a thing all alike, inside and out, from top to bottom: hence the obliterating of all features and distinctions; the resolution of any organised substance into the promiscuous mass of unformed, undistinguished atoms, of which it is composed; the not leaving of a vestige of a form behind; the reducing of a thing to its *ύλη πρωτη*. We express much the same sort of destruction, but with less force, and much less propriety, by the verb ‘to annihilate.’

I would observe by the way, that of the four words, *רום*, *רום*, *רומם*, and *רמה*, the middle pair are certainly distinct from the extreme pair. Of the two *רום* and *רומם*, I take the noun *רום*, ‘silence,’ to be the primary root; and the verb *רומם*, ‘to be silent,’ or ‘to make silent,’ to be derived from that noun. Of the other pair, if they are not two distinct roots, I take *רמה*, ‘to be like,’ or ‘to assimilate,’ to be the root, and the noun *רום*, ‘blood,’ to be derived from that root; the blood taking its Hebrew name, as Mr Parkhurst, with great probability, conjectures, “from its property of being assimilated or confirmed, in the course of its circulation, to all the various constituent parts of the body, which want

supply or nourishment.” But with the root **רום** the root **רמה** seems to have no connection.\* Mr Parkhurst brings all these words, and all their derivatives, under the single root **רמה**, which, I think, is injudicious.

To return to the text of Hosea: it is to be remarked, that St Jerome, the Vulgate, the LXX, and the Syriac, make the tenth chapter end with the word **רעתכם**, ‘wickedness,’ in the 15th verse; and carry on the subsequent clause to the beginning of the eleventh chapter. And the Syriac very strangely connects it with the assertion of God’s love of Israel, when he was a child. For his rendering is to this effect, “In the morning, the king of Israel was astonished and astounded, because, while Israel was a child, I loved him.” As if the love of Israel at the beginning was the cause of the king of Israel’s astonishment. It must have been the false division of the chapter that led that interpreter into this error, and equally misled Jerome, the Vulgate, and the LXX; who all seem to assign God’s love for the infant Israel as the reason of the king of Israel’s sudden destruction.

---

\* See App. No. III.

## CHAP. XI.

(A) —“ my son.” —*τα τέκνα αὐτοῦ*. LXX. But this and the Chaldee only of the antient versions give the noun in the plural, and the LXX only give it with the pronoun of the third person. St Matthew’s citation is in conformity with the Hebrew text, not with the LXX.

(B) In the explanatory note (2), I have cited Deut. xxxiii, 7, as a passage relating to the Messiah. It will not be foreign therefore to my purpose, to endeavour to deliver this text, containing indeed a remarkable prophecy of the Messiah’s connection with the tribe of Judah in particular, from the obscurity in which the Masoretic pointing has enveloped it. It runs thus in the Public Translation :

“ And this [is the blessing] of Judah : and he said, Hear, Lord, the voice of Judah, and bring him unto his people : let his hands be sufficient for him, and be thou an help [to him] from his enemies.”

This is indeed a very faithful rendering of the words, as they are pointed by the Masorettes; and in the passage so rendered, no mention of the Messiah appears. For the elucidation of this disfigured text,

I shall begin with the latter clause, which will be a key to the true meaning of the former.

The latter clause may be thus rendered, without the alteration even of a point: —“ Great is his power for himself, and thou shalt be an help from his enemies.” יָדָיו, ‘his power,’ not his hands. The use of יָדָיו in the plural, as well as in the singular, for power, is unquestionable. And the construction of the plural, in the sense of power, with a singular verb, is not unexampled.\* This clause is so evidently characteristic of the Messiah, who, with greatness of power of his own, in his human nature depended upon God’s support; that some commentators have supposed, that the proper name of Judah is here to be understood of Christ.† —“ hæc unicè conveniunt,” says Houbigant, “ in eum Judam, de quo Jacob; ‘Juda, adorabunt filii patris tui,’ quem Judam optat Moses advenire ad populum suum; *i. e.* in terras venire, et cum homine conversari.”

But it is not true that the Messiah is designed under the name of Judah, in the last words of Jacob. The Messiah and Judah are mentioned by the patri-

---

\* See Josh. viii, 20.

† See Poole’s Synopsis, and Houbigant.



arch under different appellations, as distinct persons; and there is no reason to think they are confounded here.

Dr Kennicott imagines an emphatic reference of the pronoun 'him' (bring him) to Christ.

“Bring HIM unto his people;” *i. e.* bring unto his people, in thy good time, Him, the King, the Shiloh of the tribe of Judah.

Passages, I believe may be found, in which the mention of the Messiah is first introduced, by a pronoun carrying an emphasis like that of the Greek and Latin pronouns *ἐκεῖνος* and *iste*, when they demonstrate some very remarkable person not mentioned before. But then this emphatical reference of the pronoun must be made evident, by a construction of the sentence, which shall exclude the reference of it to any person or thing expressly named. In this case, the pronominal suffix of the verb **תביאני** naturally rehearses Judah mentioned in the preceding clause; “hear the voice of Judah.”

But there will be no necessity for this unnatural reference of the pronominal suffix, or for any mystic exposition of the proper name of the tribe (by which the tribe itself, as the declared object of the blessing, must be intended here), when this clause,

“bring,” &c. is rescued from the obscurity with which the points have covered it. We shall find the Messiah mentioned, under an appellation that most properly belongs to him, the appellative אֵל; which the Masoretes by their mis-pointing have turned into the preposition אֶל. But point the word with tzere instead of segol, and the entire verse must be thus rendered :

And this for Judah. And he said,  
Hear, O Jehovah, the voice of Judah,

וְאֵל עֲמוֹ תְּבִיאֲנִי

וְ אֵל עֲמוֹ תְּבִיאֲנִי bring thou unto him, אֵל עֲמוֹ, the Mighty  
One of His people.

Great for himself shall be his power,  
And thou shalt be an help from his enemies.

תְּבִיאֲנִי, ‘bring him;’ *i. e.* bring to him. The verb ‘bring,’ and some others, which in Latin require a dative of the person, and an accusative of the thing; in Hebrew, as in English, often admit two accusatives; one of the thing, and another of the person.

אֵל עֲמוֹ, “the Mighty One of His people.” So Ezek. xxxi, 11. אֵל גּוֹיִם, “the mighty one of the heathen.” אֵל, applied to man, seems to be something more than גִּבּוֹר. See Ezek. xxxii, 21. The plural אֱלֹהִים is frequently used for ‘leaders.’ And

here perhaps, and in Ezek. xxxi, 11, the singular מֶלֶךְ might be rendered ‘the leader, the captain, or the chief.’ But I prefer ‘mighty one;’ because the Hebrew word seems to involve the idea of pre-eminence in valour, and power to help, or power in the act of helping, rather than in rank.

(C) —“from my presence, they!”— I divide מִפְּנֵי הֵם into two words, thus, מִפְּנֵי הֵם. For which I have the authority of the LXX and the Syriac, and the approbation of Houbigant and Archbishop Newcombe. But I agree not to the removal of the stop made by those two learned writers, in order to thrust the separated word הֵם into the subsequent clause. On the contrary, I would alter the stops in the Greek of the LXX: —ἀπαρχοντο ἐκ προσώπου μου αὐτοῖς, &c. A similar instance of a pleonasm of a pronoun nominative at the end of a sentence has occurred, chap. v, 14. The deinosia produced by it is vehement.

(D) We read frequently in our English Bible of graven images and of molten images. And the words are become so familiar, as names of idolatrous images, that although they are not well chosen to express the

Hebrew names, it seems not advisable to change them for others, that might more exactly correspond with the original.

The graven image was not a thing wrought in metal by the tool of the workman we should now call an engraver; nor was the molten image an image made of metal, or any other substance melted, and shaped in a mould. In fact, the graven image and the molten image are the same thing, under different names. The images of the antient idolaters were first cut out of wood, by the carpenter, as is very evident from the prophet Isaiah. This figure of wood was overlaid with plates either of gold or silver, or, sometimes perhaps, of an inferior metal. And in this finished state it was called a graven image (*i. e.* a carved image), in reference to the inner solid figure of wood, and a molten (*i. e.* an overlaid, or covered) image, in reference to the outer metalline case or covering.\* And sometimes both epithets are applied to it at once. “I will cut off the graven and molten image.”† Again, “What

---

\* See the learned Mr Parkhurst, in his Hebrew Lexicon, under the word גִּסָּר.

† Nah. i, 14.

profiteth the graven and molten image?"\* The English word 'molten' conveys a notion of melting, or fusion. But this is not the case with the Hebrew word, for which it is given. The Hebrew נִסַּךְ signifies, generally, 'to overspread,' or 'cover all over,' in whatever manner, according to the different subject, the overspreading or covering be effected; whether by pouring forth a substance in fusion, or by spreading a cloth over or before, or by hammering on metalline plates. It is on account of this metalline case, that we find a founder employed to make a graven image.† And that we read in Isaiah‡ of a workman that "melteth a graven image;" and in another place|| we find the question, "who hath molten a graven image?" In these two passages the words should be 'overlayeth,' and 'overlaid.'

(E) — "a go-nurse." תִּרְנַלְתִּי. It is impossible to make this word a verb of any form, unless we would coin a conjugation on purpose, as some of the Jewish grammarians have done, calling it the conjugation Tiphel; though no other verb is to be found in

\* Hab. ii, 18.

† Judges xvii, 3.

‡ Chap. xl, 19.

|| Isaiah xlv, 10.

this conjugation of theirs, nor this supposed verb, in this conjugation, in any other place. But the word is a noun substantive; either the feminine תרגלת, with a paragogic י, or the feminine תרגלה, with a final ך, turned into ת before the suffixed pronoun of the first person.

If the י be simply paragogic, the noun signifies that sort of nurse who is employed in the office of teaching a young child to go, in the manner described in the explanatory note (4).

If the י be the suffixed pronoun, the noun תרגלה expresses the stepping or pacing of the nurse after the child.\* The former seems to me the easier, and the better exposition, though both come to the same sense. The Vulgate seems to have adopted the former; the LXX, the latter. —“ Et ego quasi nutritius Ephraim.” Vulgate. —Και ἐγὼ συνεποδισα του Ἐφραϊμ̄ *i. e.* “ And I stepped along with Ephraim.” For I cannot think that συνεποδισα is to be taken here, as St Jerome takes it, in its common sense of tying the two feet together. Or, as St Cyril of Alexandria understands it, of bringing the legs and thighs together, by the bending of the knees, in the sitting

---

\* See Parkhurst, רגל, II.

posture. I confess, I cannot produce another instance, in which the word *συμποδίζειν* signifies ‘to step along with.’ But there are many peculiarities in the phraseology of the LXX. The simple verb *ποδίζειν* often renders ‘incedere,’ and the compounds *ἀναποδίζειν* and *προποδίζειν*, ‘referre pedem,’ and ‘profferre pedem.’

It is to be observed, that some even of the Jewish grammarians take the word תַּרְגְּמָלְתִּי as a noun. But the great oracle Elias would not allow it, for this weighty reason; that, if it were a noun, it ought to have the accent on the last syllable, the annexed ך requiring that collocation of the accent. Place the accent therefore upon the last syllable, and there is an end of Elias’s objection.

(F) —“taking them.” קח. “Infinitivum anomalum,” says Livelye. Buxtorf and Archbishop Secker thought קח might be the preterite of the verb לקח; but De Rossi would admit an apheresis of the ל in Benoni, whose opinion I adopt.

This verb לקח is found in the preterite, without the first radical, in Ezek. xvii, 5. Buxtorf\* pro-

---

\* Thes. Gram. lib. i, c. 13.

duces two instances (but both are doubtful) of verbs quiescent Phe Jod, ירר and יצק, dropping the first radical in the preterite. If a verb drops the first radical in the preterite, there seems no reason why the like apheresis should not take place in the infinitive or Benoni. And the verb לקח seems to have had peculiar anomalies. In Jer. v, 3, and in 2 Kings xii, 8, it forms the infinitive like the verbs defective Phe Nun, dropping the first radical, but assuming a final ת. The anomalies seemed so extraordinary to Avenarius, that he had recourse to his usual expedient, of coining another root קוח.

—“over the shoulders,” “over his shoulders;” but I omit the pronoun, to avoid the discordance of the numbers in the two pronouns, the one singular, the other plural, rehearsing the same collective; which would appear harsh in English, though this anomaly is so frequent in the prophets, that it may be deemed a ‘*licentia poëtica*’ of the Hebrew language.

(F) —“preserved their health.” רפאתים. The verb רפא is rendered in the Lexicons ‘to heal,’ and so it usually signifies. But it also signifies ‘to preserve health;’ or, when God is the agent, ‘to give



health,' as well as to restore it. The Benoni in Kal is remarkably so used, in Exodus xv, 26. "If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of Jehovah thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians, כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה רִפְאֶךָ, for I Jehovah give thee health," or "preserve thy health." The plural noun רִפְאוֹת in Proverbs,\* signifies, not restored, but perfect original health. The noun מְרִפָּא occurs often in the same book, and is always rendered in our English Bible as a noun substantive, 'health,' and as a noun adjective, 'sound.' And I believe it will bear the same renderings, in most other places where it is found.

(G) — "amidst the grievous plagues." So I render בַּחֲבִלֵי. I place the soph-pasuk at אָרֶם. The version of the LXX, rightly pointed, gives the same sense: — και οὐκ ἐγγωσαν, ὅτι ἰαμαὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν διαφθορᾷ ἀνθρώπων. And so it is understood by St Cyril of Alexandria.

---

\* Chap. iii, 8.

(H) —“ to me.” I add these words, with Archbishop Newcombe, to preserve with perspicuity the elegant paronomasia of the original.

(I) —“ the sword shall weary itself.” It has been objected to this way of rendering, that, to give this sense, the verb should be חלטה, not חלה, which is masculine; inasmuch as חרב, the nominative case of the verb, is a feminine noun; and two other verbs, with which it is connected, in this same sentence are in the feminine form. Not to insist upon the frequent anomaly of the genders, in things not naturally of either sex, the roots חול, ‘ to be in pain,’ and חלה, ‘ to be sick, or faint, or weary,’ are so nearly allied, that an intercommunity of significations may easily be allowed. And חלה, from the root חול, is the third person preterite singular feminine. I must add, that the version of the LXX, and the Syriac, confirm this sense of חלה in this place. And the Syriac indisputably, and the LXX, too, according to the Alexandrine text, takes חרב as the nominative of the verb.\*

—“ his diviners.” בריו. Diviners are called ברים,

---

\* See App. No. II.

from the root כָּרַר, because they affected a solitary ascetic life. †

This sense of the word כָּרִים seems of all the most apposite to the context. The word is certainly capable of other senses, and has been differently taken in this place by different interpreters; among those, I mean, who adhere to the Hebrew text, as we now read it.

Some render it 'branches.' The word certainly signifies, among other things, the arms, or principal branches, of a great tree. But if this be the true rendering here, it must be taken figuratively. And what the figure may be, is not agreed among those, who adopt this rendering. Abarbanel expounds it, of the strong or valiant men; saying, that the chief branches of the people in a kingdom are the valiant men. Rabbi Tanchum explains it, of their children, which he says, are as the branches springing from their fathers. 'Branches' is the rendering of the Bishop's Bible. But in a marginal note the word is expounded of 'the villages adjoining to the cities.' This was Kimchi's interpretation. But, in my judg-

---

\* See Vitringa upon Isaiah xvi, 6, and xlv, 25, and Lively upon this place.

ment, it is set aside by his own remark upon the word; that, in the sense of branches, it is to be understood only of the great limbs of a tree, which issue immediately from the trunk. If branches therefore were the proper rendering, I should think Abarbanel's, or Rabbi Tanchum's, the better exposition. Some expound the branches of the turrets and bastions upon the wall; *quæ prominent ex muris, ut rami ex trunco*. But in this interpretation the similitude is so far fetched, that it deserves no attention.

Some render the word 'membra,' or 'artus.' Indeed it is used for the principal limbs of an animal, as well as of a tree. And this sense is adopted by Arias Montanus, Calvin, Junius and Tremellius and Cocceius. I suppose by the members of Ephraim, these interpreters understood the different orders of the state; the royal family, the army, the magistrates, the priests, the prophets, the commonalty, for these are the limbs of the body politic.

In the English Geneva the word is 'bars.' Luther has an equivalent Latin word, 'vectes;' and Diiodati, 'sbarre.' The word may certainly signify stout wooden bars. In Exodus xxv, 13, 14, 15, and in other places, it is used for the long wooden poles on

which the ark, and other articles of the furniture of the sanctuary were carried upon the shoulders of the Levites. These bars are understood by some, literally, of the bars of the gates of the fortified towns; but by the most learned of those who adopt that rendering, figuratively, of great men, either in the state or in the army. “Magnates, qui vectium instar rempublicam sustinent,” says Calasio. But Grotius, “Vectes rectè vocantur, qui armis rempublicam sustentant.” And with him I think Jonathan and Rabbi Solomon agree. For גבורים is properly a military word. It is somewhat in favour of this interpretation, that the Greek language has a similar figure in the word ἐξματα, which, among its other senses, signifies literally the great wooden rollers which were placed under vessels drawn up upon the beach to preserve the keels from the effect of the damp; which would have rotted them, had they rested upon the bare ground. But, figuratively, the same word is used to denote great chieftains, who, by their valour and skill in the art of war, were the defence and stay of the kingdom. Thus in the Iliad, Sarpedon is called ἐξμα ποληος. And he is so called, as the poet tells us, on account of the great force that he led to the defence of Troy, and his

personal military prowess.\* And in the *Odyssey*, after the slaughter of the suitors, Ulysses says to Telemachus, that they two had slain *ἔρμα πολῆος*, giving that name to the whole corps of the slaughtered princes as the bravest of the youth of Ithaca.†

Diodati understands the word of the whole military strength of the kingdom, consisting both in the works of the fortifications and the valour of the people: —“*sbarre. c. tutte le sue forze e difese, così nella fortezza delle città, come nel valor degli huomini.*”

The LXX and the Syriac certainly represent a different reading: *כִּירִי*, instead of *כְּרִי*. —*Και ἡσθενησεν ῥομφαία ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατεπαυσεν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ.* “The sword is weakened in his cities, and is become inactive in his hands.” Thus the LXX: and the Syriac is to the same effect. In both these versions the sword is taken, not for the

\* ——— *Τρωας δε κατακρηθεν λαβε πενθος*

*Ἄσχετον, οὐκ ἐπεικτον, ἐπεὶ σφισιν ἔρμα πολῆος*

*Ἐσκι, καὶ ἀλλοδαπος περ ἔων· πόλεις γὰρ ἀμ' αὐτῷ*

*Ἴλαοι ἔποντ', ἐν δὲ αὐτὸς ἀριστενίσκει μαχέσθαι.* Il. π. 548.

† *Ἡμεῖς δε ἔρμα πολῆος ἀπικταμεν, οἱ μὲν' ἀριστοι*

*Κουρων εἰν Ἴθακῃ.*

*Od. ψ. 121.*

sword of the enemy, but for Ephraim's own sword. The sense is certainly very good, but not better, I think hardly so good as most of the senses brought out of the various interpretations of בריו. And as none of the collated MSS, or printed editions, confirm the other reading, I am not inclined to adopt it.

Every one of the interpretations of בריו, as rendering branches, limbs, bars, or diviners, is admissible, and may very well suit the context. I therefore submit them all to the learned reader; but, in my own judgment, that of 'diviners' is far the best.

(K) —“all of one mind.” So I render יחד, ‘unanimiter.’ See Noldius.

(L) —“called them—they would not.” I give the pronoun after the first verb, and the nominative before the second, in the plural, for perspicuity; though they are singular in the original, as belonging to a collective, with which the participle תלואים agrees in the plural. The verb יקראו is plural.\*

---

\* See App. No. II.

(M) —“ my bowels.” As the word רחמים literally rendering bowels, is used, figuratively, for the feelings of compassion, with which, when vehement, the viscera are sensibly affected; I am persuaded the word נחומי here pays back what it borrows, and signifies ‘ my bowels.’ Diodati, as it should seem from the reference, which he makes in his note upon this place, to Gen. xliii, 30, was in the same opinion.

(N) —“ of cities.” Est nimirum, in posteriore membro, לא אבוא בעיר  $\tau\theta$  pallelum et synonymum לא איש  $\tau\psi$ , in priore. Fatutum אבוא habet vim frequentativam. “ Non soleo urbem intrare; non sum urbicola.” Est etiam in singulis membris pulchra inter se oppositio partium. “ Sum Deus et non Homo;” est auxesis in sequenti, et paulum variatur oppositio partium. “ Sum Deus tuus, tecum habitans, sed peculiari modo, extra ordinem, non more hominum.” Lowth, Prælect. XIX. To this exposition of that admirable critic, I scruple not to apply, what he himself says of this passage of the prophet, “ Nihil, opinor, clarius, nihil elegantius.”

(O) —“ himself.” הוא is evidently emphatical



here. But the emphasis would not appear in the translation, without the insertion of "himself."

(P) —"hurry." It is impossible to render, in English, the full force of the word יחררו. It expresses the rapid motion of birds in the air upon fluttering pinion. The Latin word, 'trepidabunt,' would exactly render it.

(Q) —"as the sparrow." לצפור. As a particular species of bird (the dove) is connected with Assyria, a particular species also must be connected with Egypt. Therefore I take צפור in its specific, not in its general sense.

I render "the sparrow," and "the dove;" because the Hebrew nouns, though in the singular number, certainly are to be taken here for the species, not for a single bird of each kind; a flight of sparrows, and a flight of doves. The sparrow and the dove are both birds of very quick motion.

(R) —"saith Jehovah." Here the chapter is closed in the Hebrew text, and the Syriac version; and the following verse is given to the next chapter. But the division of the LXX, Vulgate, and Chaldee,

which our Public Translation follows, seems preferable.

(S) —“ the Holy Ones.” קדושים. Even the Jewish expositors, R. Tanchum and Kimchi; understand this plural word in this place as signifying God: although the former disapproves not altogether the opinion of those, who would understand it of “ angels.” Among Christian expositors, Lyra, Œcolampadius, Munster, Mercer, Vatablus, understand it, as I do, of the persons of the godhead. Lyra goes farther; for he takes נאמן also for an epithet of God. And the apposition of this in the singular, with “ Holy Ones” in the plural, he understands as an intimation of the mystery of the unity of the essence in the plurality of the persons. But in this I cannot follow him. For although I think not lightly of the like argument for the doctrine, drawn from other texts of Scripture, I cannot find it here; being persuaded that נאמן is not to be applied to God, but to Judah. It is remarkable, however, that a learned Jew, Kimchi’s father, understood נאמן here as an attribute of God.

## CHAP. XII.

(A) See chap. IX, note (F).

(B) —“matched with the angel.” This I take to be the exact force of the Hebrew אל טלאר. προς τον ἀγγελον.

(C) —“and was endued with strength;” for ויכל, the later prophets of Soncinum (1486), forty-one MSS of Kennicott’s, and one more originally, read ויוכל. It makes no difference in the sense, but the orthography is certainly more regular.

(D) —“he had wept.” Of weeping, Archbishop Newcombe says, “we read nothing in Gen. xxxii.” Certainly we read nothing of Jacob’s weeping, upon the occasion of the colluctation at Penuel. But as the weeping and supplicating stand connected here, with the finding of God at Bethel; it is evident, that this weeping and supplicating were previous to any meeting with God at Bethel: consequently, previous to Jacob’s first meeting with God at Bethel. Now, previous to the first meeting, there certainly was weeping and supplicating. For we read, that

previous to that meeting Jacob was “in distress.” And that God “answered him in that distress.”\* I agree with Calvin, that the weeping and entreaty, which procured the very extraordinary favour of God’s appearance to Jacob, in a dream at Bethel,† are mentioned here, as the means by which he obtained that strength, which enabled him to prevail over the Angel.

The remark of Luther, upon this extraordinary conflict between Jacob and the person called the Angel, is so excellent, that I cannot but subjoin it here.

“Disputari autem varie solet, qualis ea fuerit lucta. Sed historia ostendit, Jacob venisse in certum vitæ discrimen, et totis viribus esse ab antagonistâ ignoto invasum. Itaque viribus corporis ipse quoque contra antagonistam est usus, ut defenderet vitam. Non tamen pugnavit corporis viribus tantum; etiam fides ejus luctata est; ac primum in tam præsentî periculo consolatus se est, quod divinitus esset jussus redire in terram Canaan. Deinde toto pectore arripuit promissionem in Bethel a Domino factam, ubi clare promissa est defensio. Cum igi-

---

\* Gen. xxxv, 3.

† Gen. xxviii.

tur angeretur, ac ab ignoto hoste totis viribus oppugnaretur, etsi viribus suis contra est usus, tamen fortius pugnavit fide; intuens promissionem, et certo statuens Deum, secundum verbum suum, affuturum in tanto periculo, et servaturum. Atque hâc fide vicit Deum: etsi enim Christus tentaret Jacob hâc lucta, tamen præter vel contra verbum suum, quo Jacob nixus est, nihil potuit facere.”

(E) —“with us.” עִמָּנוּ. It is perhaps a question that has never been accurately discussed, in what cases the suffix ׀ may be taken as the pronoun of the third person singular masculine; whether, when attached to any other words, than the infinitives and third persons singular future of verbs. If to any other words, whether to indeclinables.

(F) —“his memorial.” זִכְרוֹ. Houbigant refers the suffixed pronoun not to Jehovah but to Jacob, conceiving that the passage alludes to the name of Israel, given by the Angel to Jacob. It must be confessed, that the versions of the LXX, and the Syriac, are in favour of this interpretation, which was adopted also in the Bishop's Bible, Ὁ δε Κυριος ὁ Θεος ὁ παντοκρατωρ ἕσται μνημοσυνον αὐτου. LXX.

סרפס אלוהים אלהים אלהים Syr. If the pronoun may be supposed to rehearse Jacob, as these interpreters must have taken it, Houbigant's proposed emendations would however be unnecessary. For his sense, with this reference only of the pronoun, would be more emphatically expressed in the text as it stands, than as altered, without any authority, by that learned and acute, but too adventurous critic. But to the sense I have these objections :

1st, The name of Israel has no reference to יהוה but to אל. And taking the initial י in ישראל as merely formative of the proper name, as I conceive it to be, the exact significance of the name is, "a prince of God."

2d, God himself says this name Jehovah is his memorial ; that is, his appropriate, perpetual name.\* "And God said moreover unto Moses, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel : Jehovah, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you. This is my name for ever, and this my MEMORIAL (זכרי) unto all generations." Where 'this' rehearses 'Jehovah' by itself ; for the addition, 'the

---

\* Exod. iii, 15.

God of Abraham,' &c. is no part of the name or memorial, but a most gracious declaration of Jehovah's peculiar connection with the fathers of the Israelites. Accordingly, the Psalmist says, "Jehovah is thy name for ever; Jehovah is thy memorial for all generations."\* Then, after a description of the impotence and nothingness of idols, the work of men's hands, the psalm concludes with animated solemn worship of Jehovah, by the reiteration of this name.

"House of Israel, bless ye the Jehovah. House of Aaron, bless ye the Jehovah.

"House of Levi, bless ye the Jehovah. Ye that fear Jehovah, bless ye the Jehovah.

"Blessed be Jehovah in Sion. Inhabitants of Jerusalem praise Jah."†

Where I observe by the way, that wherever אה is prefixed to Jehovah as the accusative case after a verb, it points to the name "Jehovah," as the memorial. "Bless him who is the Jehovah." I have therefore always expressed it in my translation by '*the*.'

3d, I observe, that the proper name of a man, or

\* Ps. cxxxv, 13.

† Verses 19, 20, 21.

of a created being, is never called its ‘ memorial.’ This is applied solely and exclusively to the essential name of the self-existent God.

(G) —“ charity and justice.” See chapter vi, notes (D), (F), and (G).

(H) “ A trafficker of Canaan.”

*Δη τοτε Φοινιξ ἦλθεν, ἀνηρ ἀπαιτηλια εἶδως,  
Τρωκτης, ὅς δὴ πολλα κακ' ἀνθρωποισιν ἐωργει.*

Od. Ξ. 288.

“Ludit oratio in ambiguo,” says Houbigant; with whom I agree. For the Hebrew word *עַנַּן* is both a proper name and an appellative, rendering ‘ a merchant.’ And to preserve the ambiguity in my translation, I join the appellative and the proper name together. By giving the proper name without the appellative, or the appellative without the proper name, the whole spirit of the original would be lost to the English reader. All the antient versions, except the Chaldee, give the proper name.

(I) —“ upon over-reaching.” *עָשָׂה*. The word expresses ‘ oppression,’ either by violence or fraudu-



lent extortion. Πλεονεκτημα, in any way. —“ Cupidè infert injurias.” Luther. —“ amat fraudare.” Castalio.

(K) “ Although—iniquity.” To this effect the Syriac. And see chap. ix, note (F).

(L) —“ coming upon.” This I take to be the force of  $\text{לע}$ , expressing the control of the inspiring Spirit over the prophets.

—“ ille fatigat

Os rabidum, fera corda domans, fingitque premento.”

Æn. vi, 79.

Upon many occasions there seems to have been much reluctance and renitence upon the part of the prophet.

(M) —“ he kept watch.”  $\text{שמר}$ , ‘ excubias egit.’ In the office of a shepherd.

(N) —“ tended.”  $\text{נשמר}$ . In allusion to a shepherd tending a flock.

## CHAP. XIII.

(A) —“in their great wisdom.” So I render לתבונם. —“pro suâ scilicet sapientiâ.” Observe, that the reading לתבונם, instead of בתבונם, is confirmed by a great number of the old editions, among them by the text of Minchath Shai, by 31 MSS of Kennicott’s collation, and by 85 in all of De Rossi’s.

(B) —“molten images.” I am persuaded the noun substantive, though in the singular, is used as a collective, and renders a plural sense.

(C) —“their finishing is, that they say.” In the printed text we find athnach under the word בלה, which necessarily makes that the final word of the clause, and a new sentence begins with להם. Most interpreters, taking up with this division, render with our Public Translation, “all of it the work of the craftsmen; they say of them”— where “all of it” is given to answer to בלה. Expositors find great emphasis in “all of it,” expressing, as they conceive, that there was nothing in the idol beyond the form which the image received from the hand of

the artificer ; no mind, will, understanding, or power. And this sense, it must be confessed, would be very apposite to the general subject, if it could be brought without violence out of the Hebrew words. But for this purpose the word, instead of כלה, should have been כליל, from the root כלל, ‘to bring to perfection, to complete, to finish,’ in a good sense. From this noun כליל is the word which signifies totality, if we may so speak, in the concrete. Put in apposition with any noun substantive, it signifies, that the thing named by that noun substantive is in its state of totality, nothing wanting, the whole of it. As בגר כליל תכלת.\* From the same root כלל comes indeed another noun כל, which signifies totality in the abstract. And this noun prefixed to substantives, or with affixed pronouns, may seem nearly equivalent to the former ; for it often renders ‘all of’ the thing named by the subsequent noun substantive, or rehearsed by the affixed pronoun, as כל אחי רש שנאהו. “All the brethren of the poor man hate him.” † הגוי כלו. —“this nation all of it.” ‡ It is to be observed, however, that the two

\* Numb. iv, 6.

† Prov. xix, 7.

‡ Mal. iii, 9.

nouns, thus used, are materially different. כל renders the aggregate of many: the collected total of what naturally exists in detached parts. Whereas כלול renders the complete entire state of an individual thing. And this is the meaning wanted here, according to this exposition. The word כלה therefore cannot be taken here as the noun כל with the feminine affix ה, rehearsing the feminine noun substantive מסכה. The Masoretes indeed have pointed the word, as they have done in other places, where the affix ה is used, as they pretend, by an enallage for the masculine ו; viz. כלה. In three of the texts, where they pretend to find this enallage,† the affix seems to be really feminine. For it rehearses Moab, *i. e.* the land of Moab; which is feminine as a land, masculine as a people, and is rehearsed by other masculine and feminine pronouns indiscriminately, in the same texts. In the other passages the MSS vary; so that the existence of the anomaly in the genuine Hebrew text is doubtful. But this by the way. The Masoretes introduce it here, conceiving that the word rehearsed is the masculine מעשה, not the feminine מסכה. But this will make

---

† Is. xv, 3, xvi, 7, and Jer. xlviii, 38.

no difference; for מעשה and מסכה here are the same thing under different names. But the objection to this exposition of the word כלה is, that כל cannot render the all of an individual; and the individual idol, brought to its perfection by the hand of the artist, is the thing in question here, according to this exposition of the word, and of the context.

Hence I am persuaded that the final ה is no affix, but belongs to the word itself; which I take to be a verbal from the root כלה; which signifies to finish in a good, bad, or middle sense. The verbal I would point כִּלָּה, and take in its common and most obvious sense of the ‘act of finishing.’ Then athnach being carried back, and placed under the preceding word חרשים (instead of tiphcha, which, with its attendant merca, I expunge), that the clause may end with that word, the following words make a clause by themselves; namely, בלה להם הם אמרים זבחי ארם עגלים ישקן. In this clause the noun substantive כלה is the nominative of the verb substantive understood; להם is a dative after the verb substantive understood; and הם אמרים is a nominative absolute, exactly answering to the ablative absolute in Latin, when the ablative absolute expresses at once, as it often does, both the means

by which, and the time when, of the action; and the clause following אמרים stands as the accusative after that transitive participle. ‘Finis [est] illis, dicentibus, Vitulos osculantor, qui victimas humanas immolant.’

(D) It may seem extraordinary, that we find it nowhere mentioned in the sacred history, by whom the practice was introduced of sacrificing men to the calves, the pretended emblems of the true God, if so great an abomination ever prevailed. But this would appear an objection of no great weight to the interpretation I have given of the prophet’s words, which, however hitherto overlooked, is the only one they will naturally bear, if the prevalence of the practice were of necessity implied in the words of the prophet so interpreted. But it is possible that the calves themselves were never so worshipped. But that the zeal for idolatry was so great with some of the latter kings, that they made it a condition, upon which alone they would tolerate the worship of Jehovah in the calves, that the worshipper should join in the offering of human sacrifices to Moloch, or some other idol. For if any of the kings of Israel issued an edict of toleration, under such a

condition, he said in effect, "let the sacrificers of men kiss the calves." It is true, no such measure is mentioned in the sacred history. But the silence of the history is certainly no confutation of any thing, to which the prophets clearly allude as a fact. For the history of the kingdom of Israel, under the different usurpers, after the fall of Zedekiah, the son of the second Jeroboam, is so concise and general, that we know little of the detail of it, but what is to be gathered from allusions. We have the names of the kings in succession, the length of their reigns, and their principal exploits. But we know nothing of the particulars, but what we gather from the prophets, or from the more circumstantial history of the collateral reigns in the kingdom of Judah. In-somuch that human victims may have been offered to the calves, or the worshippers of the calves may have been compelled to dip their hands in the blood of Moloch's victims; though no evidence of either practice remains, but this allusion of the prophet Hosea; which leaves some degree of doubt between the two. Sacrifices to the calves themselves seem to me the more probable object of the allusion.

When it is recollected that Solomon himself built a temple to Moloch, and that Ahab introduced the

worship of the Tyrian Baal in the kingdom of Samaria, and that both these idols were appeased with infant blood, there is too much reason to believe that the practice must have begun early in both kingdoms, although it probably was late before it came to a height in either; and yet the first mention of it, in the history of the kingdom of Samaria, is when the sacred writer closes that history, with an enumeration of the crimes which provoked the judgment of God, and brought on its ruin.\* Nevertheless, it is certain, that this abominable custom was of older date, and perhaps of not much older date, in the kingdom of Samaria, than in that of Judah.† For, in the kingdom of Judah, Ahaz is the first king of whom we read that he adopted the practice. And it is mentioned as one of the things in which he followed the example of the kings of Israel. —“ Ahaz—did not that which was right in the sight of Jehovah, like David his father. But he walked in the way of the kings of Israel, insomuch that he passed his son through the fire, according to the abominations of the heathen.” ‡

---

\* 2 Kings xvii, 17.

† See App. No. II.

‡ 2 Kings xvi, 2, 3.



I am aware that Dr Wells endeavours to draw the contrary conclusion from this very passage of the book of Kings; namely, that the practice of human sacrifices began in the kingdom of Judah first, and was introduced in the kingdom of Israel by Hoshea, the last king. The Hebrew particle  $\text{כִּי}$ , which I render ‘insomuch that,’ Dr Wells, following our Public Translation, ‘yea, and’— understands as introducing a particular, in which Ahaz followed not, but went beyond, the kings of Israel. And I admit, that he went beyond them, but still following their example. He went beyond them in their own way. And the circumstance in which he went beyond them was this; that he sacrificed his own son, which is not recorded of any of the kings of Israel. The amount of the passage therefore, giving the particle  $\text{כִּי}$  its full force, is this: “But he walked in the ways of the kings of Israel, in such degree, [or to such a length], that he passed his own son,” &c.

The notion, that human sacrifices were introduced in the kingdom of Samaria by Hoshea, is a conceit of Dr Wells, founded upon nothing more certain, than his own arbitrary division of the book of Hosea, mentioned in my preface. According to

that division, the first eight verses of this thirteenth chapter belong to a prophecy, beginning with the 11th verse of chapter vii, the whole of which was delivered in the reign of Hoshea. And since the edict, that the sacrificers of men should kiss the calves, must be understood of some injunction of human sacrifices, which took place about the time of the utterance of this prophecy; it must be understood of an injunction taking place in the reign of Hoshea. And upon these grounds, the infamy of the introduction of those sanguinary rites is thrown, by Dr Wells, upon that reign.

But the character of Hoshea, though none of the best, is vindicated, however, from this aspersion, by the express testimony of the sacred historian; who writes, that “Hoshea, the son of Elah, began to reign over Israel in Samaria nine years. And he did that which was evil in the eyes of Jehovah, but not as the kings of Israel that were before him.”\*

Hoshea’s doings, therefore, were not good, yet they were less bad than those of his predecessors. Whereas, if the abomination of human sacrifices had not been introduced by them, and he introduced it;

---

\* 2 Kings xvii, 1, 2.

he, it is evident, was worse than they. Dr Wells eludes this argument by a great stroke of verbal criticism. For he says, that in the disjunctive proposition "Hoshea did evil, but not as the former kings," the particle 'but' is to be understood, not by way of extenuation, but of aggravation; that Hoshea was worse than they; and, by being worse, was not like them. And thus having turned the meaning of this plain text of the sacred historian upside down, he triumphs, as "having set a matter in a clear light, not afore duly taken notice of by any writer, and yet of importance to be rightly understood." The matter is, indeed, of importance to be rightly understood. And it is of great importance to vindicate the sacred text from these puerile subtleties of criticism, which leave plain readers at a loss, which way to take the most familiar expressions, which, by the usage of mankind, have but one meaning. When two things are thus contrasted by the disjunctive 'but,' that, of which the likeness is denied, is always set forth as the inferior, whether for good or for bad, in that with respect to which the comparison is made. Thus, if it be said, that Livia is beautiful, but not like Julia; the meaning is, that Livia, though beautiful, is inferior in beauty to Julia. Hippias is lascivious,

but not like Messalina. The sense is, that Hippiæ is the less lascivious of the two. So when it is said, that “Hoshea did evil, but not like the former kings;” the certain and single meaning is, that he was less evil in his doings than they. It is true, if we reverse the meaning, and say, Livia is more beautiful than Julia; Hippiæ more lascivious than Messalina; Hoshea worse than his predecessors; a disparity, though of the contrary kind, will still subsist, and dissimilitude might be predicated in the same terms, if the expression were used for the first time. But the custom of speech, in all languages, is the other way. Dr Wells was a man of great piety, and of sound learning. But his criticisms are sometimes more subtle than judicious.

Upon the whole, it may be concluded with certainty, from this text of Hosea, that, in the latter period of the monarchy of the ten tribes, the practice of human sacrifices came to such a height, and was so much countenanced by the kings and rulers, that it was either enjoined as an essential in the worship even of the calves; or required of their worshippers, with regard to other idols, as the only condition upon which even that shadow of the true worship would be tolerated. The time when this took



brew, without a previous knowledge of the actual state of the text, we should render ἐπισημαστων σζ by רעיתור, as the word literally answering to it. As for the Syriac, I see indeed no reason why he should use the word ܕܡܐ; if he found ירעיתור, in his Hebrew text; since the word ירע has the same latitude of meaning in the Syriac dialect, as in the Hebrew itself. But the letters ר and ܕ resemble each other in the Syriac alphabet almost as nearly as in the Hebrew. And if a corruption, by error of the transcriber, is to be supposed in either; it is much more likely to have taken place in the Syriac, than in the Hebrew. It is more probable, that the error of a scribe has changed ܕܡܐ into ܕܡܐ; in the Syriac, than רעיתור into ירעיתור in the Hebrew. For this may be laid down as a general maxim, deserving the attention of modern critics, who are often overhasty to correct the text upon the authority, or supposed authority, of the versions; that where the sense of both readings is the same, as is the case here, and the text and the version may be made to agree, by a slight alteration in either; the suspicion of corruption ought rather to fall upon the version, than the Hebrew text; considering the scrupulous care, carried even the length of superstition, with

which the latter was watched and guarded by the Jews. The argument for a facility of emendation, taken from the resemblance of certain letters in the Hebrew alphabet, goes evidently the contrary way; when the various reading, deduced from the authority of the versions, is not confirmed by a single MS or old edition, as is the case again here. The more the ו and ו of the Hebrew alphabet are alike, the more incredible it is, that all the MSS now extant should give ירעתיו, as they do, if רעיתיו were the true reading; or, if indeed it had been a reading at all, when the Syriac version, or that of the LXX was made.

Jonathan, in this place, is so paraphrastic, that he may seem to be no authority for either reading. For, like the LXX, he gives what is the plain sense of the passage, whichever way it be read. But I think the comparison of this text, and Jonathan's Targum with another text, and Onkelos's Targum affixed, afford a very strong argument for the text as it stands ירעתיו. In Deut. ii, 7. Moses says, "For Jehovah thy God hath blessed thee in all the works of thy hands; he knoweth thy walking through this great wilderness." ידע לכתך את המדבר הגדל הזה. This passage, and the passage we are

upon of Hosea, are much alike. The subject is the same; the wandering of the Israelites in the wilderness. The expressions are very nearly the same. In Hosea, "God knew thee."— In Deuteronomy, "God knoweth thy walking." The expression of Hosea, "God knoweth thee," is thus paraphrased by Jonathan: אָנָה סֹפְקִית צֹרְכֵיהוֹן בְּמִדְבָּרָא, "I supplied their necessaries in the wilderness." The expression, "God knoweth thy walking,"— in Deuteronomy, is thus paraphrased by Onkelos: סִפֵּק לֵךְ צֹרֵךְ, "He supplied thy necessaries." It will hardly bear a doubt, that it must have been the same Hebrew word in both places, which these learned Paraphrasts have expounded by the same Chaldee words. But, in Deuteronomy ii, 7. the word is יָדַע, without any variety of the Samaritan text, or of a single MS, and confirmed by all the versions. We must conclude, therefore, that the true reading, in this text of Hosea, is the word יָדַעְתִּיר, from the same root. And yet, as was observed with respect to the words of the LXX, ἐπισκομοῦν σε, if we were to translate these Chaldee words, which render "the supply of necessaries," back again into Hebrew, in either place, we should be apt to resort to the root יָדַע, rather than יָדַעְתִּיר.



I have dwelt the longer upon this passage, because I know of no instance in which an emendation, upon the bare authority of versions, without a single MS, and without any imperious exigence of the place, may seem more plausible than this. And yet in this, even the apparent consent of versions fails. It is otherwise indeed when the textual reading, and the reading inferred from antient versions, differ materially in sense; and where a strong *exigentia loci* appears to be on the side of the versions. In such cases, I would submit to the versions, even without MSS.

(F) —“ parching thirst.” תלאובת. The root לאב occurs no where in the Bible, nor any of its derivatives, except this noun; nor this noun, except in this place. I take the noun to be plural; and the correct orthography to be תלאובות. For the latter prophets of Soncinum of 1486, with twenty-two MSS of Kennicott’s, and three more originally, give the perfect word תלאובות. The Bible of Soncinum of 1488, and of Brescia 1494, the latter prophets of Pesaro 1516, the Basil Bible (Munster’s 2d) 1586, the Bible of Hale 1720, with thirty-nine MSS of Kennicott’s, give תלאבות, without the first ך. Five

MSS only of Kennicott's, and no edition, give תלאכת, without either ן. It is pretty certain, therefore, that תלאכות is the true form of the word. If the root לאב signify 'to be thirsty,' this noun, with the initial heemantic ת, must be from the hiphil of the verb, and must signify 'causes of thirst.' And a land of such causes must be a land which, from the nature of the soil, and other circumstances, affording no water, produces excruciating thirst in animals. The plural number is used only to give intensity to the signification; which I have endeavoured to express by the epithet 'parching.'

(G) —“and they were fed to the full.” I sustained thee, and in consequence of my sustaining, they were fed to the full. I remove the soph-pasuk from the word תלאכות to וישבעו.

It may perhaps somewhat illustrate these two verses, the 5th and 6th, if I exhibit them, in what I conjecture to have been the metrical arrangement.

5 אני ירעתין במרבר

בארץ תלאכות כמרעיתם וישבעו:

6 שבעו וירם לבם

על בן שבחוני:

The construction of the parallels is somewhat singular. In the second hemistich the verb ירעתיהם, with the suffix of the third person plural, is understood; to answer ירעתיו, with the suffix of the second person singular, in the former. And the second hemistich, of which the three first words (with ירעתיהם understood) constitute a complete parallel to the first, takes an additional word, the verb וישבעי, as a close, antagonised to the verb ירעתיו, in the first hemistich. And this verb is taken up again, with much animation, at the beginning of the next hemistich, carrying on the sense, and connecting the second distich with the first, and forming a quaternion of the two. The peculiar character of Hosea still prevails, the commata; and yet the commata, with singular art, are thrown into a period.

—“for that very reason.” This I take to be the force of על בן.

(H) —“by the way side.” על דרך, ‘close by the way,’ not in, or upon it.

(I) —“I will lie upon the watch.” אשור, the first person singular future Kal of the verb שור, ‘in-

sidiabor;” and to this effect the Chaldee and Arias Montanus.

(K) —“ upon the spot.” This I take to be in this place the force of שם; ‘ there,’ viz. upon the spot where I meet them.

(L) —“ wild beast.” The margin of our English Bible gives “ beast of the field,” as a more literal translation of the Hebrew חית השרה. But I think ‘ wild beast’ renders the idea of the original more adequately. For the ‘ beast of the field,’ *i. e.* of the open country, is so called, as distinguished from the tame domesticated beast, that lives in inclosures and stalls, and associates in towns and houses, with man. The distinction of the savage character is better expressed by the epithet ‘ wild’ than by the substantive ‘ of the field.’

(M) —“ shall tear them limb from limb.”

תבקעם, ‘ cleave them,’ or ‘ rip them.’ The verb expresses a violent distraction and severing of united parts in any manner; and is to be differently rendered, with regard to the particular agent and patient. When the agent is a wild beast, and the

patient the beast's prey, it must be tearing 'limb from limb.' 'Tearing,' by itself, is inadequate.

(N) "It is thy destruction—thee."

שחתך ישראל כי בי בעורך. In the grammatical construction of these words, I differ not greatly from the learned Jews, R. Tanchum and R. Nissim. The proper name, 'Israel,' is evidently a vocative, and is to be taken apart by itself. The four other words form a sentence, with the verb substantive understood. The three words כי בי בעורך, with an ellipsis which must be supplied, make a clause, which stands as the nominative case before the verb substantive understood; and שחתך is a noun substantive with an affix, which stands as a second nominative after the verb substantive understood. The supply of the ellipsis in the nominative clause is obvious and easy, and the order of construction of the complete sentence will be this: כי בי [היה כל אשר] בעורך [היה], שחתך ישראל, "That in me is [every thing which is] for thy help [is] thy destruction, O Israel." Rabbi Tanchum and Rabbi Nissim (as he is cited by Abarbanel) take שחה, and the clause כי בי בעורך, as the nominative cases. But they supply the ellipsis in the nominative clause very differently. Rabbi

Nissim, as I gather from his paraphrase, as it is stated by Abarbanel, in this manner: שחתך [המחשבה] כי בי [תמיר אשר] בעורר. And Rabbi Tanchum to the same effect. Both understand the sentiment to be, that the cause of the destruction of Israel was his presuming upon God's readiness to help him. They hardened themselves in their corrupt practices, in the confidence that God would never give them up; that, notwithstanding the severity of his threatenings, he would interpose, as upon so many occasions he before had done, to rescue them from their enemies, when things came to an extremity. The passage thus understood, is a cool reflection upon the fatal effect of God's kindness upon the perverse minds of the Israelites. But I rather take it as an awful threatening of dereliction, delivered in terms pathetically expressive of commiseration, according to the explanation which I have given in note (8). I have much less to supply, to bring out this sense, than is necessary for the purpose of the Jewish expositors; and the ellipsis seems easier, and more natural in my way, than in theirs.

(O) "Where"— אהי. All the antient versions give the interrogative 'where?' And yet we find

the authority only of a single MS, and that none of the best, for the transposition of the letters to make the interrogative איה in its usual form; which could hardly be, if that were the true form of the word in this place. But it is remarkable, that the LXX, the Syriac, and Aquila, give σου again, in the 14th verse, where אהי can be nothing but the first person singular future of the verb substantive: and is so rendered by Symmachus, the Vulgate, and St Jerome, and in effect by Jonathan; who, instead of ‘I shall be,’ in the first person, puts as usual, ‘My word shall be,’ in the third. Hence I think it may with certainty be concluded, that אהי, as well as איה, may ask the question about place; and that where the former occurs, it may be either the interrogative adverb, or the verb substantive future, as may best suit the context. The true orthography of the second interrogative I take to be איפוא; and the force of it is, ‘where is he *now*?’ in this critical moment of danger. This force of איפוא is expressed, though not adequately, by the Syriac, the Vulgate, and Jonathan. I conceive the word asks the question about time, but involving a repetition of the interrogation about place.

The emphasis of the interrogation, as a reply, in angry argument, to the effrontery of the Israelites not admitting their defenceless state, as explained in note (9), is very strongly expressed in the Syriac, *ובין תכמלא מלכך*, *Ubinam igitur rex tuus?*

(P) —“forsooth.” This I take to be the force of *ויושיעך* prefixed in *ו*.

(Q) Here at *ושפטיך* I place the *soph-pasuk*, and connect the six following words with the next verse.

(R) —“he is of the thoughtless race.”

*הוא בן לא חכם*. Literally, “he is a son not wise.” My rendering may seem, at first sight, paraphrastic; but, upon examination, I think it will be found to give neither more nor less than the just sense of the original. *חכם*, as a noun, is properly *ἀγχινοος*, one that has all his wits about him, ever heedful of his situations, vigilant, and provident against dangers, even remote. *לא חכם* describes the *steresis* of *ἀγχινοια*, one of a contrary turn of mind; regardless, not only of remote consequences, but even of his present situation; thoughtless and secure in imminent dangers. This character, as it may be best



expressed in our language, is ‘thoughtlessness.’ The word ‘son,’ as it is used here, always describes an individual as belonging to a class, distinguished by a certain occupation or character, and considered as a particular race or family. And conversely, the principal or head of that class is called in the Bible ‘the father.’ I cannot find words in the English language, more exactly rendering the ideas corresponding to the Hebrew words, than those I have used.

(S) —“the aperture, or breach.” מִשְׁכָּב. The passage between the bones of the pelvis burst open by the throes of labour. —“Collum uteri.” Vitringa ad Is. xxxvii, 3.

(T) “From the power of Hell”— The Hebrew, שְׂאוֹל; the Greek, Ἅδης; the Latin, Orcus; and the English, Hell; are words of one and the same import, signifying the place appointed for the habitation of departed souls, in the interval between death and the general resurrection. The word שְׂאוֹל describes this place as the object of universal inquiry, the unknown mansion, about which all are anxiously inquisitive. The Latin, ‘Orcus,’ names it as a

place inclosed within an impassable fence (ἐρμος); the Greek, Ἅδης, and the English, Hell, describe it by the property of invisibility; for nothing more is included in the natural meaning of those words. In the New Testament, two words are indiscriminately rendered, in our English Bible, by the word ‘Hell,’ Ἅδης and Γεενναῖα the latter, a word of Hebrew origin, transplanted into the Greek language, as the appropriate name of the place of the damned; which was generally so called by the Jews of the apostolic age. This use of the word Hell, in the English New Testament, has imposed a sense upon it quite foreign to its etymology, and abhorrent from its more general application.

The שׂוּלַם of the Old Testament, and the Hades of the New, is indeed the Hell to which our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the apostle’s creed, descended. It is the paradise, to which he conveyed the soul of the repentant thief. It is the place whither his soul went and preached, to the souls, not in prison, as we read in our English Bible, but ἐν φυλακῇ, ‘in safe keeping,’ (if that text of St Peter, I, iii, 19, is to be understood literally, and I know not how it can be understood otherwise), which one while *had been* disobedient (ἀπειθῆσασι ποτε); but, as the ex-

pression 'one while had been' implies, were at length recovered from that disobedience, probably by the preaching of Noah, and before their death had been brought to repentance and faith in the Redeemer to come. To these souls our Lord Jesus Christ went in his soul and preached. But what could he preach to them? Not repentance. They had repented of their disobedience, before they were separated from the body by death, or they had not been found in the bundle of life. But, if he went, and proclaimed to them (ἐκκηρυσσεν) the great tidings that he had actually offered the sacrifice of their redemption, and was now about to enter into glory; this was a preaching that would give new animation and assurance to their hope of the consummation, in due season, of their bliss. And this, by the way, I take to be the true sense of this text of St Peter.

Another inaccuracy obtains in our English Bible; the Hebrew שְׁאוֹל (Sheol) being perpetually in the Old Testament, and the Greek Ἅδης (Hades) sometimes in the New, rendered improperly by the word 'Grave,' which neither signifies. The Hebrew word for the Grave is קֶבֶר, and the Greek ταφος. The Hebrew names of Hell and the Grave never are confounded, nor the Greek, by

the sacred writers. No two things, indeed, can be more distinct. Hell is the mansion of the departed spirit; the Grave is the receptacle of the dead body. Hell is often personified, as it is here, by the sacred writers; the Grave, never. The boldest personifications of Hell, which occur to my memory, are in two passages of the Apocalypse.

—“ I looked, and behold a pale horse; and his rider was seated upon him: his name was Death, and Hell followed with him.” \*

And again,

—“ And Death and Hell gave up the deceased that were in them; and they were judged, every one according to his works, and Death and Hell were cast into the lake of fire.” †

I am inclined to think, but I suggest it only to the examination of the learned, without venturing to assert, that Death and Hell are always conjointly personified by the sacred writers, never one without the other.

But it is to be observed, that when either is personified, it is always in the character of an enemy of man, and an antagonist of the Saviour; which is

\* Rev, vi, 8.

† xx, 13, 14.

easily understood of Death, but may seem extraordinary of the other ; if what has been maintained be true, that Hell, in the true import of the word, as equivalent to Sheol, Hades, or Orcus, is a place of rest and comfort to the departed souls of the saints ; which is most certainly the case, insomuch, that to be in this place is mentioned by St Paul, as “ a being with the Lord.” \* Nevertheless, the happiness of this place is certainly full assurance of hope, rather than fruition. It is a place perhaps of seclusion from the external world ; and the state of the departed saints, while they continue there, is a condition of unfinished bliss, in which the souls of the justified would not have remained for any time (if indeed they had ever entered it), had not sin introduced death. It is a state, therefore, consequent upon death ; consequent, therefore, upon sin, though no part of the punishment of it. And the resurrection of the saints is often described, as an enlargement of them by our Lord’s power, from confinement in a place, not of punishment, but of inchoate enjoyment only. “ Our Lord will break the gates of brass, and cut the bars of iron in sunder,” and

---

\* 2 Cor. 5, 8, and Phil. i, 23.

set at liberty "his prisoners of hope." And when this place of safe keeping is personified, it is, consistently with these notions of it, represented as one of the enemies which Christ is to subdue.

In this passage, Death and Hell are personified very remarkably. And the two persons are threatened each with an incurable disease, causing speedy death, to be inflicted by God the Saviour.

(V) — "thy pestilence." For רבִּירִיךְ, the latter Prophets of Soncinum (1486); the Bible of Soncinum (1488); the Bible of Brescia (1494); ninety-seven MSS of Kennicott's, among them the oldest and the best, one more originally; twenty-five MSS of De Rossi's, and four more originally, give רבִּירִיךְ in the singular. This I adopt as unquestionably the true reading. The versions (although all mis-translate, except Symmachus, St Jerome, and the Vulgate) all give the noun in the singular, except Aquila, and the fifth Greek. רבִּירִי, in the sense of the plague, pestilence, or destruction, is never used in the plural number.

(W) — "thy burning plague." קטֹבֵךְ. The word קטֹבֵךְ occurs only in four places, of which this is one.

The other three are, Deut. xxxii, 24, Ps. xci, 6, and Is. xxviii, 2. In Isaiah, the connections of the word are not such as to point out any specific meaning. It is put in apposition with שער; but whether as an adjective agreeing with שער as a substantive; or as a substantive in the genitive case after שער; or a noun substantive, with which שער agrees as an adjective; appears not from any thing in the context. All that can be collected from this passage is, that קטב is something which may be connected, either as cause, effect, or concomitant, with tempest. But in Ps. xci. it is connected, as it is here, with רבר; and properties are ascribed to each, which shew the difference between the two; and, since it is certain that רבר is some kind of mortal disease, lead to the precise meaning of each. The holy psalmist, speaking of Jehovah's protection of Messiah, says to Messiah, "Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night, for the arrow that flieth by day: מדבר באפל יהלך מקטב ישור צהרים. For the *Deber* that goeth on in darkness, for the *Cheteb* which wasteth (or depopulates) at noon day." No one, in the least conversant with the style of sacred poetry, can for a moment doubt, that *Deber* and *Cheteb* are things of the same kind. But *Deber* is

a disease; *Cheteb* therefore is a disease too. And, by the description here given of each, *Deber* is the putrid plague fever, which usually makes its fatal progress in the dead of the night, while the patient is in sleep. *Cheteb* is the dreadful solstitial disease, which in the tropical climates, and, in some rare instances, in our own, in the extreme heat of harvest, smites suddenly in the open air and at noon-day, and kills either at once, or in a few minutes, by a putrescence of the juices of the living body, almost instantaneous. The disease is so rare in these high latitudes, that we have no name for it in our language; nor had the Greeks in theirs. Our Public Translation, therefore, is content with the very general word “destruction,” and all the Greek interpreters give strange paraphrases.

The sense of the word, which we deduce from the ninety-first psalm, is confirmed by the use of it in Deuteronomy xxxii, 24, where it is mentioned along with רשף, another malignant inflammatory disease.

And now it will be easy to expound the שער קטב of Isaiah; though, for want of a word to render קטב, it is impossible to translate it. שער קטב is the tempest, which often happens in the season of those



extreme heats, in which the קטב takes place; and is therefore a concomitant of the *Cheteb*.

‘Solstitial tempest’ would perhaps be the best English for the phrase; not that קטב signifies solstice; but it might be put in this place to mark the season when such tempests usually take place; which is, in fact, the solstice.

Of the four passages in which the word occurs, this text of Hosea now remains. And since the words *Deber* and *Cheteb* are connected here, just as they are in the ninety-first psalm, it cannot reasonably be doubted, that they are to be taken here, each in the same sense as in the psalm; especially as no sense of either can be found, which better suits this place. I give therefore “burning plague,” for קטב, not as an adequate expression, but the best I can devise.

The LXX render קטב by *νεπτρον*; and the Syriac by a word of the same meaning. Others would have רברר render *νεπτρον*. And, if this were admitted, it would follow that קטב must be something of the same kind, and would not be ill rendered by the same word. And the learned Rivetus, in support of the LXX, goes so far as to say, “Quicquid pertundendo et perfodiendo repente penetrat impetu vehemen-

tissimo, ut cuspis acuta solet, id Ebræis nomine illo [nomine קטב] designatur.” Of what Hebrews does he speak? Of the sacred writers? I demand the place, where any one of them applies the word in that sense, or in any sense but as the name of a disease? No such place is to be found. Are the Rabbinical writers the Hebrews of whom Rivetus speaks? What he says, can be said of no other Hebrews. But to interpret the Hebrew of the Holy Bible, by the use of words in the Rabbinical writings, is just what it would be, to attempt to explain Homer’s words by the senses of words in modern Greek.

As to the word דבר, I deny that in the Bible-Hebrew it ever signifies ‘a sting.’ The noun דבורה indeed signifies a bee; and bees have stings. But neither דבורה, nor any other word derived from the root דבר, signifies the sting of a bee in any one passage in the Bible. But we are told, that in the Arabic language, *Dabrah* signifies ‘the spur of a fighting cock,’ a sense which the Greek *αενδρον* also bears. Granted: but why must we resort to the Arabic for new senses of Hebrew words, when the well known genuine Hebrew sense suits the purpose of the sacred writer full as well, if not better? Whoever takes the trouble to examine the antient versions, in

the four passages where the word קטב occurs, will find that the translators were put to their shifts for a specific meaning; they had no discernment of the true meaning of the word, and their renderings are of no authority.

But the anxiety to sustain *νευτρου*, as the true rendering of one or other of the two words, קטב or רכר, has arisen, I believe, from an opinion which has long prevailed in the Christian church, that the animated exultation of the Apostle St Paul over death and hell, at the latter end of the fifteenth chapter of the first to the Corinthians, is a citation of this passage of Hosea; and this opinion is, for the most part, connected with a persuasion, that the apostle citing must represent the prophet's words with the greatest exactness. But we are not to assume, that the apostle cites a particular passage; and then to conclude, that the apostle's supposed citation gives the only true sense of the Hebrew words, which it is our bounden duty, by all contrivances and exploits of criticism, to bring out of them. We should first inquire, whether he cites or no; and if it should appear that he cites, it might still be reasonable to inquire, whether the general meaning of the prophecy might not be sufficient for his purpose; or

with what degree of accuracy it was necessary to his argument, that he should represent the prophet's words.

Now, upon the most mature consideration of the matter, I am persuaded that the apostle's triumphant exclamation, "O Death, where is thy sting? O Hell, where is thy victory?" is an allusion, indeed, to this text of Hosea; an indirect allusion, but no citation of it. The prophecy which the apostle cites, as one which would receive its completion in the general resurrection at the last day, as a saying "that is written," which shall then be brought to pass; this prophecy is written in Is. xxv, 8, and nowhere else. And this prophecy, which he cites, he cites with precision. And it may be useful to observe, that he cites it not according to the version of the LXX. He translates the Hebrew text verbatim, in contradiction to the version of the LXX. For the version of the LXX, in this place, is so wretchedly and abominably erroneous, that the sense it gives is exactly the reverse of the sense of the Hebrew text.

The apostle having cited this prophecy of "the swallowing up of Death in victory," and, looking forward to the great event, which he mentions as the

yet future completion of it, breaks out in those words of triumph, which allude to this text of Hosea. Death and Hell are personified and apostrophised, both by the prophet and by the apostle. The purport of the apostrophe, both with the prophet and with the apostle, is to set forth God's dominion over Death and Hell, and his merciful purpose of destroying both the one and the other. This is categorically asserted by the prophet; it is indirectly asserted by the apostle, in the shape of an interrogation. But in the prophet we have no mention of the sting, with which Death is armed in the apostle's imagery; none of victory, by the name of victory. On the other hand, in the apostle, we have no mention of the pestilence, and the burning plague, to be inflicted, according to the prophet, upon Death and Hell by God the Saviour.

It may seem, that the resemblance between the words of the apostle and the text of the prophet, upon this comparison, turns out to be so very general, as to leave room to doubt, whether so much as an allusion was intended. But I am persuaded, that an allusion was intended: and my persuasion rests principally upon these two reasons:

1. It is hardly to be conceived, that when the

apostle's discourse led him to refer to prophecies of the final abolition of Death and Hell, this passage of the prophet Hosea should not come to his mind; which, for the boldness of its imagery, is far more striking than the passage of Isaiah which he cites; which for that very reason perhaps he cites in preference, as being more explicit and perspicuous, because less figured and adorned.

2. Notwithstanding that a general resemblance only is to be found between the apostle's words and the Hebrew text, these words of the apostle are an exact literal rendering in Greek of the Syriac version of that Hebrew text: except that the words "sting" and "victory" in the apostle have changed places.

It would be much in the taste of modern criticism, to lay hold of this circumstance as an argument for the antiquity of the Syriac version of the Old Testament. To hold up that version, as sanctioned in this passage, by the apostle's citation, as a true rendering of the original; and then to go to work with the Hebrew text, and, covering our own bold sacrilege under an arraignment of the carelessness of scribes in general, and the bad faith of some (a heavy charge, even against our adversaries the

Jews, to which the candid will listen with great caution), to alter the text, till it should become a mere translation of the Syriac, and give it out, in that altered state, as the text of the holy prophet restored!

But, on the contrary, readily subscribing to the high antiquity, and general excellence of the Syriac version, I scruple not to maintain, that in this passage it is inaccurate. I deny, that the apostle's citation of it is any argument that he entertained a different opinion of it, or gives it the least sanction as an accurate translation of the Hebrew words. For the state of the case is plainly this; that the general meaning of the prophetic text was all that was requisite for the purpose of the apostle's discourse. Nothing depended upon a close interpretation of the words. And the general meaning the Syriac version gives; the full meaning, with less force, in my judgment, than the original; still with force, and with the greatest perspicuity. And there is this particular circumstance in it, which might incline the apostle to prefer it, upon this occasion, to a more precise translation of the original, which he certainly could have given. The form of the sentence in the Syriac is such as would readily admit of being

interwoven into the apostle's discourse, so as to make a part of it; not in the stiff form of a quotation, but as the apostle's own expression of his own sentiments. With his mind full of the general resurrection, and of the prophecies relating to it, he gives utterance to his own feelings of joy and exultation in words taken from the Syriac version of Hosea's text; which are better suited to that purpose, the purpose of being used as the apostle's words, than Hosea's own words. In this manner of adopting the words of the Syriac version, certainly no approbation is involved of its verbal accuracy.

St Jerome, who knew nothing, I believe, of the Syriac version, seems to have entertained a notion of the apostle's allusion to the prophet not very different from mine. In his Comment upon Hosea, having affirmed that the apostle St Paul understands this text of the resurrection of our Lord (he should rather have said, of the general resurrection, as the effect and consequence of our Lord's), he adds, "Itaque quod ille [scil. apostolus] in resurrectionem interpretatus est Domini, nos aliter interpretari nec possumus nec audemus." Where observe, he is not speaking of the verbal accuracy of the translation used by the apostle, as if that were not to be



meddled with; but of the application of the prophecy in its general meaning. The apostle having made the application, the holy father says he submits implicitly; and would not venture to apply it otherwise, if he could. But of the verbal accuracy of the translation, in this place, he says nothing. In another place, in his Comment upon the 14th chapter of Isaiah, he discovers his opinion upon that point. For he speaks of the apostle's triumphant exclamation, as the apostle's expression of his own sentiments, arising in his mind upon his meditating within himself upon Hosea's words. "Unde et Apostolus Paulus, interfectâ morte, ad quam per Osee sermo propheticus loquebatur, 'Ero mors tua, o mors, ero morsus tuus inferne,' loquitur ad eam, 'Ubi est mors contentio tua, ubi est mors stimulus tuus?'" It is not to my present purpose, to remark on the variations from the Greek text of the New Testament, as it now stands, with which St Jerome cites the apostle's words. But what, I would observe, is this. That he evidently represents the divine speaker in Hosea, as addressing Death in certain words; and the apostle, as addressing Death in other words. He represents the divine speaker in Hosea, as addressing Death yet alive; the apostle,

as speaking to Death lying dead before him. He considers the apostle, therefore, as uttering sentiments of his own, in words of his own. He was not aware, I believe, that the apostle borrowed his words from the Syriac version of the words in Hosea. But this makes no difference. He must have considered the apostle's exclamation as an allusion only to the prophet, not as a citation of any thing more than the general sense; much less as an accurate translation, which it were impious not to receive, as giving the sense of the Hebrew words with more certainty than the Hebrew words themselves.

I cannot close this long note, without briefly animadverting on the plausible, but fallacious, doctrine of sanction, supposed to be given to the antient versions of the Old Testament, by the citation of particular passages from them in the New.

And, with respect to the Septuagint in particular, in behalf of which this sanction is most frequently pleaded; I observe, that what is generally assumed upon this subject is not true. Namely, that the citations of texts of the Old Testament in the New are always from this version. This assumption, I say, is not invariably true. The instances, in which it fails, are many. I have mentioned one very re-

markable instance ; and I could produce many more.

I say, secondly, that upon the same principle, that a citation of the Old Testament by the inspired writers of the New, according to that particular version, is to be taken as a sanction of the version ; the citation of a text, not in the words of the LXX, more particularly in words that give a sense directly opposite to their sense, is a reprobation of the version. And since the inspired writers of the New Testament cite some passages according to the LXX, and some not according to the LXX ; it follows, that they sanction the version in some passages, and reprobate the version in others. And neither the sanction nor the reprobation must be extended farther, than to the particular texts cited. In the texts not cited, we have no judgment of the inspired writers of the New Testament upon the merits of the version. And as these uncited texts make certainly the far greater part of the whole book ; I shall contradict no apostle, or inspired writer, if I assert, as I do, of the Septuagint generally, that antient, respectable, useful, and valuable, as it is, and in many parts excellent ; it is not, upon the whole, to be put in competition, for verbal ac-

curacy, either with our own Public Translation, or with the Vulgate.

But, thirdly, I go further. I contend, that even with respect to the particular passages cited in the New Testament, according to the version of LXX; we are not always to conclude, that the citation implies the citer's approbation of the verbal accuracy of the translation, even in the instance of the passage cited. This will be indeed a just conclusion, if a faithful representation of the phraseology of the original be requisite for the purpose of the citer. But if the general meaning of the passage cited is sufficient, which, for the most part, is the case; no sanction of any thing more than the general meaning, which is often very adequately given in a very loose, and with respect to words, even an erroneous translation, can be inferred from the citation. For it certainly became the wisdom of the apostles to cite the Old Testament, according to the versions most in use and credit in their time, however defective in verbal accuracy; provided they found in them the general meaning: except indeed in those few cases, in which their argument turned upon the wording of the original. It was no part of the duty of the holy apostles and inspired preachers, to edit

a correct Greek translation of the Old Testament, or to give critical notes upon the extant versions.

(X) I place the soph-pasuk at שׂאֵל, and make the three words that follow the beginning of the 15th verse,

“No repentance is discernible to my eyes!” literally, “Repentance is hidden from mine eyes.” I cannot be persuaded, that this can possibly signify, that God’s mind would never change, with respect to his declared purpose of abolishing Death and Hell, notwithstanding the immutability of that declared purpose. It is pertinently remarked by Houbigant, that the internal purposes or affections of the mind of any person cannot be represented as an object of vision to that person. It cannot be said of them, that, to the person himself, they are either visible or invisible. The repentance, or change of mind, said to be seen, or not seen, must be the external signs of repentance seen, or not seen, by one person in another. I cannot, however, agree with the learned Houbigant, that the sense of the passage is a dreadful denunciation on the part of God, that he will shut his eyes against repentance, and pay no regard to it. The sentiment is horrible. No such

declaration is to be found in the whole Bible; but repeated declarations of the contrary purport. It is astonishing, that such a notion could drop from the pen, or indeed enter the mind of a writer of Houbigant's piety, and so conversant in the Holy Scriptures. The words are evidently words of complaint on the part of God, as I have explained in note (q), that no signs of repentance were to be found, by his all-searching eye, in Ephraim. This sense arises so clearly from the Hebrew words, when the sentences are properly divided, and is so much more to the purpose than any other, that nothing but an erroneous division could have kept it out of sight.

(Y) —“savage beasts.” אֲחִים. So I would point the word (not אֲחִים); and take it as in Is. xiii, 21.

(Z) —“east-wind—blast.” רוּחַ קָרִים, or רוּחַ הַקָּרִים, is the east-wind. But קָרִים by itself, without רוּחַ, is often put for the east-wind; almost as often, as in apposition with רוּחַ. And in Isaiah xxvii, 8, the two nouns are put separately, as they are here, as different appellatives of the same thing, בְּרוּחוֹ חֲקָשָׁה בְּיוֹם קָרִים.

(AA) —“ shall he.” אָהִי. 'An emphatic pleonasm of the pronoun at the end of the sentence. See chap. v, 14, and xi, 2.

## CHAP. XIV.

(A) “ Take with you words.” The phrase seems very similar to that, “ he took up his parable,” \* *i. e.* he assumed his prophetic style. And it seems, in both cases, to refer to a set form of words. For it is remarkable, that the exordium of every one of Balaam's effusions is a form; describing, in a highly-adorned style of amplification, the privileges of the prophetic office; or delivering certain solemn *γνωμαί*, which might suit almost any occasion of prophecy: and the resorting to these set forms is “ taking words,” or “ taking up the parable;” a phrase, however, that might be used, to express only the assumption of the peculiar style of the prophetic song. The formal proëm of the last of Balaam's effusions, is by far the most striking.

---

\* Num. xxiii, 7, 18. xxiv, 3, 15.

“ Then he took up his parable and said,\*  
 Balaam, the son of Beor, hath said,  
 Even he hath said the man of the secret eye. †  
 He hath said who heareth the speech of God,  
 And knoweth the knowledge of the Most High.  
 He seeth the scene of the Almighty,  
 He is laid at his length, ‡ and his eyes are set open.”

The exordium of the preceding song (the third) is the same, with very little difference; an amplification of the prophetic gift.

That of the second is different; but still it is much of a set form, composed of general *γνωμαι*.

\* Num. xxiv, 15, &c.

† הגבר שתם העין. I take שתם, which occurs only in this place, to be an unusual orthography of the word סתם, abditus, intus absconditus. The holy Psalmist says (li, 8.) “ Behold, thou delightest in truth in the inward parts, and shalt teach me wisdom בסתם,” ἐν τῷ ἔσω ἀνθρώπων, as Mr Parkhurst well explains it. So the prophetic gift, foreseeing things to come, is here described, under the image of a secret internal eye. And in the same language, Æschylus makes Orestes, in the Choëphoræ, describe the oracular prescience of Apollo :

Ὅρωντα λαμπρον ἐν σκοτῷ νῶμων γ' ὄφρυν. Line 283.

‡ —“ laid at his length.” This intimates, that when the ecstasy seized him, he usually fell down in a trance; and the emblematical scene was forced upon him, while he lay in that state.



“ Then he took up his parable and said,\*  
 Rise up, Balak, and hear,  
 Give ear to me, O son of Zippor.  
 God is no man, that he should lie,  
 Nor son of man, that he should repent him.  
 Hath he said, and shall he not perform?  
 Or spoken, and shall he not establish?”

The exordium of the first song is far more simple, being nothing more than a distich; but still it has the air of set form, and, *mutatis mutandis*, might serve any such occasion.

“ Then he took up his parable, and said,†  
 Me hath Balak brought from Aram,  
 The king of Moab from the mountains of the East.”

That set forms were in use in the earliest ages, upon all solemn occasions, is evident, with respect to the Jews, from holy writ; and with respect to the Heathen, from the poets. Miriam's song of thanksgiving is evidently a studied composition, set to music, and performed in parts, according to a pre-concerted plan, by her and the chorus of attending virgins. In the book of Numbers, a form of words is prescribed, in which the priests were to bless the

---

\* Numb. xxiii, 18, &c.

† Numb. xxiii, 7.

people.\* In the book of Deuteronomy,† a form of prayer and confession is prescribed, to be used by every Israelite that presented his first fruits, and at the end of his tithing. Part of the 105th Psalm, with the 96th, is a form of thanksgiving, which David delivered into the hands of Asaph and his brethren upon the occasion of bringing up the ark from the house of Obed-Edom, and placing it in the tent that David had pitched for it. Solomon's prayer, at the dedication of the Temple,‡ is most evidently studied composition; Jehoshaphat's,|| when he proclaimed a fast, under the terror of the powerful confederacy of the Moabites and Ammonites. And the priests and Levites, which upon this occasion attended the army, praised Jehovah in a set form of words. The service of the temple, restored by Hezekiah,§ was certainly according to the settled form of an antient ritual; in particular, the Levites were commanded by the king "to sing praise unto Jehovah with the words of David the king, and of Asaph

---

\* Numb. vi, 23—26.

† Chap. xxvi, 5—10, and 13—15.

‡ 1 Kings-viii, 22—53. 2 Chron. vi, 12—42.

|| 2 Chron. xx.

§ 2 Chron. xxix, 30.

the seer." Upon the return from the captivity, when the foundations of the Temple were laid, the priests and Levites attended in their sacred vestments, the priests with their trumpets, and the Levites with their cymbals, to "praise Jehovah after the ordinance of David king of Israel." And their praise was in David's set form of words, "Give thanks unto Jehovah, because he is good; because his mercy toward Israel endureth for ever." \* Such proof we find of the use of forms of worship among the Jews from the earliest times.

Among the Heathen, the thing is unquestionably proved by the Orphic hymns, as they are very improperly called. They are, indeed, set forms of invocation of the several deities, which were the object of worship to the Greeks. In Homer, it is very remarkable, that in the two prayers of Chryses, the one imploring the vengeance of Apollo on the Greeks, after Agamemnon's refusal of the proffered ransom of his daughter; the other, soliciting the god's blessing on the Greeks, when his daughter was restored; the prefatory invocation is nearly in the same words in both, and much in the style of

---

\* Ezra iii, 10, 11.

the Orphic services, addressing the god by his various titles.

Κλυθι μεν, Αργυροτοξ, ὃς Χρυσην ἀμφιέβηκας,

Κίλλαν τε Ζαθεην, Τενεδοιο τε ἰφι ἀνασσεις.

Σμινθευ.

Iliad. A. 36, 451.

But, what is more remarkable, in the body of the prayers the expressions seem to be as much the same, as the difference in the matter of the petitions would allow.

(B) So St Jerome understood this petition. “‘*Om-nem aufer iniquitatem et accipe bonum.*’ Nihil languoris in nobis et ruinæ pristinæ derelinquas, ne rursum mali seminis pullulent rediviva plantaria. ‘*Et accipe, inquit, bonum. Nisi enim tuleris mala nostra, bonum tibi quod offeramus, habere non possumus.*’” Diodati’s exposition is to the same purpose.

(C) —“‘bullocks, our own lips.’” No figure is more familiar in the Hebrew language, than that sort of metonymy, which puts the cause or instrument, for the effect; lips for words uttered by the lips. For the lips are a principal instrument in the articulation of words. It is very remarkable, however, that the word *לִפְּי*, ‘lip,’ when put for words

uttered with the lip, seems peculiarly applied to set forms of words in public worship. The prophet Isaiah, speaking of the introduction of the true worship into Egypt, says, “In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt *speak the lip of Canaan* ;” \* that is, as appears by the context, adopt the forms of public worship used by God’s true church in Palestine. The prophet Zephaniah, speaking of the final conversion of all the nations of the earth, says, “In that day I will turn to the peoples a *pure lip* (שפה כרורה), that they may all of them call upon the name of Jehovah ;” † where a pure lip evidently signifies a form of worship purged of all corruptions. It is used very remarkably in this sense in Psalm xii, 5 ; —“Our lips are our own.” The subject of that psalm is freethinkers ; their learning, audacity, and final excision. The psalmist, drawing these gentlemen to the life, makes them say, what they are heard to say daily, “our lips are our own ;” that is, we have a right to choose our own way of worship ; to worship what we please, as we please, or not to worship at all, if that should best please us. In Psalm lxxxi, 6, it is said of the land of Egypt,

---

\* Isaiah xix, 18.

† Zeph. iii, 9.

as we read in our English Bible, "I heard a language that I understood not." But, Jehovah being the speaker, this, as has been observed by the learned Julius Bate, must be an erroneous translation. Indeed the literal rendering is, "A lip which I acknowledged not (*i. e.* a worship which I disapproved) I heard." The sense seems to be, that even Israel, in his state of servitude in Egypt, was compelled to take part in corrupt and idolatrous rites. Upon a review of all these passages, had I rendered the words of Hosea, "bullocks, our devout confessions," I think I should have been justified by the peculiar use of the word שפה in so many places. But I choose to adhere to the literal rendering of the Hebrew words; as the metonymy, though in this instance somewhat harsh in our language, is abundantly perspicuous. With what view the worship of the Father in Spirit and in Truth is represented, under the image of bullocks sacrificed, I have shewn in note (5).

A slight inaccuracy in our Public Translation, which, departing not a tittle from the sense, but in a minute circumstance from the construction of the Hebrew, renders, "calves of our lips," as if lips were the latter of two noun substantives, which

ought to be expressed in the genitive case in our language, and ought in the Hebrew to induce the construct form upon the preceding substantive; this slight inaccuracy has occasioned this remark of Archbishop Newcombe, to justify an alteration of the text, which he adopts. —“ The phrase as it stands is NOT HEBREW; because פרים, ‘ the calves,’ should be *in statu constructo*. Jos. Mede, p. 282, and Le Clerc, on Hebrews xiii, 15, read, משפתינו, *fruit from our lips*; ò Arabic read, *the fruit of our lips*; and Syriac, *the fruit of your lips*; as if they omitted ו. See Heb. xiii, 15.”

Had the learned primate forgotten all the instances, that are produced by the Jewish grammarians, of an enallage of the *status absolutus* and *status constructus*, and the opposite? And is not this an answer to the formidable objection of the NOT HEBREW of the phrase? Perhaps indeed, when the instances of supposed enallage come to be examined, it will be found that many of them are to be solved by an ellipsis (which was Kimchi’s opinion of them all), and that others are reducible to a case of simple apposition, in which the *status constructus* would be improper. Not to enumerate specific instances, this will be the case, where the two substantives are only

different appellatives of the same thing, in different respects. Thus **שְׁלָמִים** \***וּבְחִים** are two appellatives of the same thing; the one a generic, and the other a specific name, in perfect apposition. And this I take to be the very case here: **פְּרִים** and **שַׁפְּתֵינוּ** are two appellatives of the same thing, in different respects: of prayers as articulated; and of prayers under the image of animals sacrificed, because offered to God. And these two appellatives of the same thing are properly put in perfect apposition. This I take to be the truth of the construction in this place.

But if an enallage of the two states of nouns, the absolute and the construct, is ever to be admitted (and perhaps it would be difficult to reduce every instance of it to ellipsis, or to apposition), I ask, in what instance it may with more reason be admitted, than in **פְּרִים**, the plural of **פֶּר**, ‘a bullock?’ which, if according to the rule of construction it were to drop the final **ם**, would not be distinguishable by the letters from the noun substantive singular **פֶּרִי**, ‘fruit.’ And in fact, upon a diligent investigation, I cannot find **פְּרִים**, the plural of **פֶּר**, in the construct

---

\* Exod. xxiv, 5.



state in the whole Bible, except in one instance; in which it is constructed with a pronoun suffixed, and the context renders it impossible to mistake the meaning of the word. This instance occurs in Jer. I, 27. The subject is the destruction of Babylon, Jehovah himself leading up the armies to the attack; “for this was the work of Jehovah of hosts in the land of the Chaldeans. Come against her *from the utmost border*—*open her fattening stalls*—*חרבו כל פרייה*—slay all her bullocks—let them go down to the slaughter.”

No emendation therefore is necessary in this text of Hosea, to wipe off the imputation of “not Hebrew.” And if no emendation is necessary, Le Clerc’s proposed alteration hardly deserves further notice. I must just however remark, that although the prefix כ is often used as the preposition of the efficient or the procreant, no instance is to be found of the word פרי in this construction. In justice to the memory of Joseph Mede, it must be remarked, that it is by some inadvertency that his authority is cited in support of Le Clerc’s reading. Joseph Mede says but little about this text; but what he says is to the contrary effect. In Book I, Discourse XLIX, upon the Nature of Offerings, &c. Mede says, that

“ the euctical or eucharistical offering must consist of three degrees, or parts; the offering of the heart, of the mouth, of the hand. The offering of the heart is a ‘ sursum corda,’ the lifting up of our hearts to God, either to praise him, or to pray unto him. The offering of our mouth is to express the same with our tongues, and is called THE CALVES OF OUR LIPS.” And he refers in the margin to this text of Hosea. But how is the mouth-offering called in this text of Hosea “ the calves of our lips,” if Le Clerc’s alteration be admitted? It is true, that Mede, in his margin, refers to Heb. xiii, 15, together with Hosea xiv, 2, as a parallel place; but without the least intimation that he thought “ calves or bullocks of the lips” was not the prophet’s genuine expression. To Le Clerc therefore alone be ascribed, for to him alone belongs, the entire unrivalled glory of this unlearned paltry criticism.

But by the reference to Hebrews xiii, 15, at the end of the learned primate’s note, I perceive that he thought a greater authority, than that of Joseph Mede, was to be produced, in support of the alteration he would adopt. And in that opinion he certainly was not alone. Without repeating what I have written at great length in the latter part of

note (v) of the former chapter, concerning the inference to be drawn from citations in the New Testament of passages of the Old, according to the versions, when the versions differ in words, though not in sense, from the Hebrew text; the whole of which would apply in this case, were it certain that the apostle cites the prophet Hosea in that text of his Epistle to the Hebrews: but without repeating this, I say that it is not certain, from any thing in the apostle's own words, that he either cites, or so much as alludes to Hosea. Without the mention of any writer of the Old Testament, he explains a phrase, which probably was current as a scripture phrase in his time. And he gives the plain sense of it, without saying where it was found in the Bible, and without any discussion of it as the proper rendering of any Hebrew text. That he alludes to it as a phrase of the Old Testament, I believe. But that this text of Hosea was the particular passage in his mind, would never have been surmised, had not the LXX unfortunately given *καρπον χειλεων ημων*, instead of any Greek words rendering "calves or bullocks of lips;" while the near resemblance of the words פֶּרִי and פֶּרִים, which was the occasion of their mistake, favoured the hasty conjecture of a mistake of

the Hebrew scribe; which could not have been less than a double mistake; first, פרי, in the sense of fruit, must have been mistaken for פרי, the plural of פרי, in *statu constructo*; and then, by a second blunder, פרים, in the absolute state, must have been written instead of פרי, so misunderstood. St Jerome, without the least hesitation, taxes the LXX with the error of confounding the two words; so little did he conceive any allusion in St Paul to this passage of Hosea, which might sanction their mis-translation. In truth, these interpreters were in the habit of confounding these two words. They have confounded them in the passage already cited from Jeremiah,\* where the mistake might seem impossible. But, for “slay all her bullocks,” they give ἀναξήρανατε αὐτῆς παντας τους καρπους. Some, indeed, have attempted to defend their version in this place, without impeaching the integrity of the Hebrew text. Observing that they often use the derivatives καρπωμα, καρπώσις, and ὄλοκαρπωμα, ὄλοκαρπώσις, for burnt-offering, and whole burnt-offering, these critics infer, that the primitive καρπος, in the phraseology of the LXX, might signify a bullock, an animal for burnt-offering.

---

\* Chap. i, 27.

This defence however is an admission, that the Hebrew text is correct as it stands. For the principle of the defence is this, that *καρπος* may perchance be Greek for a bullock!

All this anxiety to sustain the version of the LXX in this place, the solicitude of some to defend the Hebrew text against the suspicion of corruption brought upon it by that version, and the readiness in others to give it up as incapable of defence, arises from a supposition common to them all, that the version of the LXX has received the sanction of St Paul. And the supposition that their version has received that sanction, rests on an assumption that this text of Hosea is the passage which St Paul cites, or to which he alludes in Heb. xiii, 15. But that the apostle cites it not, is most evident upon the slightest inspection of his text; for he certainly cites no passage. But what reason have we to believe that he alludes to this text of Hosea, rather than to some other text of some other writer of the Old Testament? The apostle, as I have already said, explains the phrase, "fruit of the lips," as a scripture phrase, without saying in what part of the Old Testament he found it. And will it not be a phrase of the Old Testament, although it should not be

found in this text of Hosea, according to the true reading and a true translation? Is not the phrase to be found, not introduced by any of the versions, but is it not to be found, in the very sense in which the apostle takes it, in the Hebrew text of the prophet Isaiah?

In the 19th verse of the fifty-seventh chapter of that prophet, Jehovah says, “I create the fruit of the lips;” where the context shews, that “the fruit of the lips” can be nothing else than the sacrifice of praise, as it is explained by Grotius, by Lowth the father, and by Bishop Lowth. And this sense is so evident, so much more obvious than others to which the words have been wrested, that not only those able critics, but that dullest of all commentators, Samuel White, could perceive, that this is probably the passage to which the apostle alludes. And this deserves a deeper consideration.

The entire passage of the prophet Isaiah stands thus:

בורא נִיב שִׁפְתִּים שְׁלוֹם שְׁלוֹם לְרִחוֹק וּלְקֵרוֹב אָמַר יְהוָה  
וּרְפָאתָיו

The true construction of the sentence is pointed out in the Vulgate, as the Latin is pointed in the London Polyglott. —“Creavi fructum labiorum

pacem, pacem," &c. This interpreter took the substantives **ניב** and **שְׁלוֹם** as accusatives, in apposition, after **בֹרֵא**; the one rendering the cause, either material, or efficient, or final, of the thing, denoted by the other as formed. It must be confessed, that this construction of the verb **בֹרֵא** with two accusatives is rare; but it is by no means unexampled. We find it, Psalm lxxxix, 48. **עַל מַה שׁוּא בְרֵאת כָּל בְּנֵי אָדָם**, "Wherefore hast thou made all men (not in vain but) vanity." Again, Isaiah xlv, 18; **לֹא תָהוּ בְרֵאתָ**, "He created it (*i. e.* the earth, not *not in vain*, but) not emptiness, [for] he formed it to be inhabited." Again, Isaiah lxv, 18; **בֹרֵאתָ אֶת יְרוּשָׁלַם גִּילָה וְעֵמָה מְשׁוֹשׁ**, "I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." And this I take to be the true grammatical construction of this 19th verse of the fifty-seventh chapter; and in this, if I mistake not, I have the concurrence of the learned Forerius.

If this be admitted, the word **שְׁלוֹם**, 'peace,' may be taken as the material cause, and **נִיב שְׁפָתַיִם**, 'fruit of the lips,' as the thing made. And the sense will be, "I make (or am making) peace the subject or matter of praise and thanksgiving." And this is the exposition of Forerius, and of Grotius.

Forerius, indeed, applies the prophecy primarily to the peace and quiet which the Jews enjoyed under the Persian kings; but he acknowledges that ultimately it relates to the universal peace made by Jesus Christ, of which he considers the other as typical. But if this be the true grammatical exposition and rendering of the words, the ‘peace’ must be the ‘peace’ made by our Lord Jesus Christ, exclusively of any other; for it is a peace “to him that is far off, as well as to him that is near; to Gentile, as well as Jew.” Bishop Lowth brings the passage to the same sense, though by a different grammatical construction.

The sense is certainly good, and very pertinent to the subject of the discourse. But yet I doubt whether it be the exact sense. From the root שָׁלַם, ‘to be at peace,’ come, as the Masoretes will have it, two different noun substantives, שָׁלוֹם and שְׁלָמָה; the first signifying ‘peace,’ the second, ‘a peace-offering.’ The first is often written with the cholem point, without the sustaining ך: and, so written, it is not distinguishable, otherwise than by the points, from the second; which the Masoretes have been pleased to point with a double segol. But they, who, with me, have abjured the worship of the Ma-



soretic points, will say, that these two are in truth one and the same word, carrying two different senses, and written sometimes at full length, but much oftener defectively, without the ך.

Before I proceed, it will be much to my purpose to premise, that among all the offerings of the Jews, the peace-offering was that which was particularly typical of the worship of the Christian church. It was offered either as a thanksgiving for some particular mercy; or upon the completion of a vow; or as an act of general voluntary worship, not required by any law, or called for by any particular obligation; in which last case it was called the ‘free-will offering.’ Now, the sin-offering, the trespass-offering, and the perpetual burnt-offering, were all expiatory of particular or general guilt; and were all typical of the sacrifice upon the cross. But in the peace-offering, the worshipper was taken as already at peace with God, and entitled to partake of the feast upon the sacrifice he offered. These offerings therefore were peculiarly typical of the worship in the Christian church.

Now since שלום and שׁלום are the same word differently written; why may not שלום, in this passage of Isaiah, render ‘a peace-offering?’ It is true,

the noun in this sense is for the most part in the plural: but it is used in this sense in the singular.\* And if it be taken in this sense here, then **ניב שפתים**, ‘fruit of the lips,’ will be the material, and **שלו**, ‘the peace-offering,’ the thing made of that material. —“ I create the fruit of the lips, peace-offering (*i. e.* I make it to be, or, I make of it, the peace-offering); peace-offering for him that is far off, and for him that is near, saith Jehovah.” Thus the passage will be a prediction of the institution of that worship, of which the peace-offering was particularly a type, as the universal worship for all that are brought to Christ, whether of the Jews, or of the Gentiles.

The participle **בורא**, in this view of the passage, is used here with particular propriety and emphasis. The institution of a new mode of worship is called a Creation, as a thing to which no authority, but that of God himself, is competent.

If the learned reader will consider this text critically, and consider also critically the text of St Paul in Hebrews xiii; if he observes, how St Paul connects ‘fruit of the lips’ (**καρπον χειλεων**, **ניב שפתים**)

---

\* See Amos, v, 22.

with ‘sacrifice of praise,’ (θυσιαστων αινεσεως, שְׁלוֹם), he will perhaps be inclined to think favourably of the interpretation I offer of Isaiah’s text; at any rate he will conclude, that the passage of Isaiah is that to which the prophet alludes.

It will hardly be made an objection, that this phrase of ‘the fruit of the lips,’ though it be found in the Hebrew of Isaiah, is not in the Greek of the LXX in that passage. The Greek of the LXX in that passage is indeed so unlike either the Hebrew text, or any of the other versions (except its echo the Arabic), that it may well be suspected of great corruption. And what is not found in it now, might be in it in the time of the apostle, when its text was in a better state. But suppose this was not the case. Was the apostle under any obligation not to cite the Old Testament but according to the Septuagint, even when the Septuagint was wrong? Did he not understand the Hebrew language, as well, or better, than any or all of these Seventy-two interpreters? Was he not at liberty to translate for himself, when he thought proper; as he and the other writers of the New Testament have done in many instances, when the LXX had grossly mistaken (as they often have) the sense of the Hebrew? But

with those idolizers of the Septuagint, who would bind the inspired apostles (or even others who are not inspired) to its authority, and tamper with the Hebrew text without the least necessity, rather than confess the authors of that version to have been in error, I hold no argument.

(D) —“from me.” I follow the reading of the Oriental Synagogue, ממני, instead of ממוני, which makes a more regular construction, without altering the sense.

(E) “His suckers shall spread farther and farther.” ילכו, ‘shall go on.’ I think the image is the increasing vegetation of the forest, by the branches of the parent tree reaching quite down to the ground, where, resting upon the moist soil, each strikes a new root, or more than one, and each root sends up a new tree.

(F) “They shall return.” For ישובו, the latter prophets of Soncinum (1486), thirty-one MSS of Dr Kennicott’s, and three more originally, give ישובו. And the latter prophets of Soncinum, the latter pro-

phets of Pesaro (1516), and seven MSS of Dr Kennicott's, give the next word יִשְׁבִי.

(G) —“ they shall abound in corn;” literally, “ they shall vivify corn,” they shall grow abundant thriving crops.\*

(H) —“ and be famous as the wine of Lebanon;” literally, “ וְכָרוּ, his commemoration, *i. e.* his praise like the wine of Lebanon.” Thus Houbigant: —“ memoria ejus ut vini, &c. sive sermone celebrabitur ut vina generosa celebrantur et laudantur; verbum pro verbo, commemoratio ejus ut vini.” And to the same effect Coverdale, the Bishop's Bible, and Livelye. Great difficulty has been made about the singular number of the suffixed pronoun; which it has been thought, for that reason, could not relate to the subject of the plural verbs, which precede, and to the noun, understood, in apposition with the plural participle. This difficulty to me appears nothing. If יִשְׂרָאֵל be the antecedent of the ך suffixed to וְכָרוּ, Israel is a collective; and, as such, may be joined with verbs in the singular or plural indiffer-

---

\* See Pocock, vol. ii, p. 705.

ently, and may be rehearsed either by singular or plural pronouns. In the 4th verse, Israel is rehearsed by plural pronouns. In the 5th, the same word, or a pronoun understood rehearsing it, is constructed with verbs in the singular, and rehearsed by a singular suffix. In this 7th verse, the pronoun understood, rehearsing Israel as the subject of the verbs **ישובו** and **יפרחו**, and in apposition with the participle **יושבי** must be plural: whereas the pronoun suffixed to **וכר**, rehearsing Israel, according to the construction and sense which I adopt, is singular. But in this there is no difficulty at all. For nothing is more frequent, than for collective nouns, in form singular, to be rehearsed by plural and singular pronouns indifferently, and constructed with singular and plural verbs, not only in the same sentence, but in the same clause.\*

(I) —“ Ephraim!” &c. The very learned Drusus thinks there is something wanting after Ephraim. He therefore supplies ‘dicet,’ understanding what follows as the speech of Ephraim. The conjecture seems to have been suggested to his mind by the state of the accents; which are not what they ought

---

\* See App. No. II.

to be, according to the Masoretic rules, if nothing be wanting after the word Ephraim. The Syriac version and the Chaldee paraphrase certainly insert ‘shall say.’ Nevertheless, I am persuaded the insertion is improper. For the state of the accents, let the Masorettes look to that. The whole verse is an ἐπινομιον, in the person of Jehovah, over fallen idols, and a gratulation of the return even of Ephraim (whose case seemed the most desperate) to his God; according to the explanation which I have given in note (12).

(K) —“and I will make him flourish.” וַאֲשׁוּרֵנוּ. I take the word as the first person future singular in Kal of the verb אָשַׁר, ‘to prosper,’ or ‘to make prosperous,’ as it is taken in all the antient versions. Houbigant observes, that this verb in Arabic is specifically applied to the prosperous growth of trees. The Vulgate seems to have taken the verb in this sense here: —“et dirigam eum ego ut abietem virentem.” —“dirigam.” “I will lead him up strait and tall.”

—“from me thy fruit is supplied.” “This,” says Diodati, “may be understood of the good works of

the faithful, produced by the sole power of grace, and of the Spirit of God within them.”

(L) —“ wise—intelligent—shall comprehend.” The three words חכם, בין, and ירע, are so nearly allied in signification, that they are often used promiscuously one for the other, especially the two first. Each, however, has its own strict sense different from the strict sense of either of the other. And it is often of importance to attend to the difference, as it is in the present instance; for the first and second clauses of this verse are by no means tautologies. “ Who is wise?” and “ who is intelligent?” are different interrogations. And the apodosis to this, and that, is different.

These three roots, חכם, בין, and ירע, differ as *δυναμις*, *ποιεῖν*, and *ἐντελεχεια*. The root חכם speaks of wisdom, merely as a power in the mind; to be endowed with the power, or powers, of wisdom. בין speaks of that power in action, actually exercised in observing and noticing the differences of things, and passing a judgment of distinction between them. This wisdom energizing, we call, in our language, understanding, or intelligence; in the popular, not in the metaphysical sense of the word intelligence.



Lastly, ירע, although it speaks of knowledge of any sort, and by whatever means acquired; and has many senses, which belong not to the English word ‘to know,’ for it renders the Latin *noscere* and all its compounds; yet strictly it is ‘to know that knowledge,’ which is acquired by בין; and thus it properly speaks of the ἐντελεχεια of wisdom energizing.

“I want a man endowed with the powers of wisdom,” says the prophet: “for he will employ those powers of his mind upon these predictions and revelations of mine. I want a man that will so employ the powers of his mind; for he, and he only, will attain a knowledge of them.”

(M) —“streight and even.” I use both these words to express the full force of ישרים. For ישר, applied to a road, expresses both that it is drawn in a streight direction, without turnings or windings, and that it is smooth and level, without inequalities.

(N) —“the justified.” For יצדקים, the latter prophets of Soncinum (1486), the varieties of the Venice Bible (1518), forty-five MSS of Kennicott’s, and one more originally, give יצדקים. Two MSS

of Kennicott's give וצריקים. And three or four give צריקים. It seems therefore a safe conclusion, that וצריקים is the true reading, which is the plural of צריק with ו prefixed.

צריק is properly a forensic word, and signifies a person found not guilty, acquitted, and justified upon a trial. Hence, in a theological sense, it is a person found innocent in the sight of God. In the book of Psalms, and occasionally elsewhere in scripture, it is a title of Christ, in his human nature, and should be rendered 'the Just One.' He who stands justified by the perfectness of his own obedience. The only one of the human race who ever was just, or justified, by his own justice. The plural צריקים, except where the matter of the discourse is relative to mere secular transactions, signifies 'the justified,' those that are justified by faith in the Redeemer coming, or to come, and clothed with his righteousness.

With respect to this plural word; it has been remarked by some of the ablest critics among the Jews, that in all places where it occurs in the Pentateuch, except one, it is written without the plural ו, צריקים. Now the places in the Pentateuch in which it occurs are six; namely, Gen. xviii, 24, 26, 28;

Exod. xxiii, 8 ; Deut. iv, 8 ; xvi, 19. The one place in which it appears in its perfect form, צְרִיקִים, in all the printed Bibles, and in all the MSS but three, is Exod. xxiii, 8. In the other five passages also, the Samaritan text, and some of the best printed texts, and a great number of the very best MSS, give it full.

The text of Exodus,\* where it is, by admission, in its perfect form, צְרִיקִים, is very decisive for the proper meaning of the word. “ And thou shalt take no gift : for the gift blindeth the clear-sighted, and overturneth (not perverteth) רַבְרֵי צְרִיקִים, the cause of those who ought to be acquitted,” causam justificandorum. Thus Kimchi expounds the passage.

With respect to the singular צְרִיק, Hutchinson, though he considers it as a title of Christ, renders it “ the justifier.”† But he is mistaken. The Hebrew word for “ justifier” should be מְצַדִּיק, from the hiphil of the verb. But this word, מְצַדִּיק, is never used as a title of Christ. It occurs indeed but once in the whole Bible ; namely, in Daniel xii, 3, where it is the nominative plural, in the construct

---

\* Chap. xxiii, 9.

† See his Works, Vol. VIII. p. 97.

state, and describes the preachers of the word of God, under the character of the justifiers of many.

Mr Hutchinson cites Jer. xxiii, 5, as confirming his interpretation of צִדִיק. But this text affords no example of the use of the word in his sense, “the justifier.” The literal rendering of the 5th and 6th verses of the 23d of Jeremiah is to this effect.

5. “Behold, the days [are] coming, saith Jehovah, when I will raise up to David a branch,\* the Just One;† and King shall be King,‡ and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth.”

6. “In his days Judah shall be safe, and Israel shall dwell safely. And this is his name whereby he shall be called, JEHOVAH-OUR-RIGHTEOUSNESS.”

—“King shall be King,” *i. e.* He who is King of right shall be King in fact. מֶלֶךְ, King, according to the Jewish Doctors themselves, is one of the titles of Messiah.

—“judgment and justice.” מִשְׁפָּט וְצִדְקָה. When these two words are connected, as they are here, they express the whole office of a judge. “Judgment,” the condemnation of the guilty; “justice,”

\* צִמָּה.

† צִדִיק.

‡ וּמֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ.

the absolution of the innocent. This is a very just remark of Mercerus, with respect to the two words, as jointly applied to a judge, magistrate, or sovereign, in the exercise of his public character. When applied jointly to describe the principles of judgment, צדקה, is properly ‘equity;’ משפט, ‘law’ of positive institution. Again, as qualities in the moral or religious character of the individual, צדקה, is ‘justice,’ with regard to the universal natural distinctions of right and wrong; משפט, is ‘righteousness,’ *i. e.* rectitude of conduct with respect to the injunctions of instituted law.

The two forensic distinctions of these words are remarkably exemplified in the beginning of the 72d Psalm.

1. “Commit משפטיך, thy judgments, O God, unto the King, וצדקותי, and thy justifications to the King’s Son.”

King, and King’s Son, are the same person; described first, simply as King; then, as King by hereditary right. The psalmist prays, that God would commit to this King the exercise of his whole judicial authority, both in judging, *i. e.* condemning the wicked, and absolving the godly.

2. “ He will judge thy people בִּדְרֹק, according to equity, and thy poor בְּמִשְׁפַּט, according to law.”

The first verse is an instance of מֶלֶךְ, used as a title of Messiah. It is very strange, that Christian expositors, perceiving that “ King,” and “ King’s Son,” in the first verse, is one and the same person, should not perceive that this royal person is the King Messiah, not King Solomon. The Targum might have taught them better. “ O God,” says the Chaldee expositor, “ commit the promulgation of thy judgments to the King Messiah, and thy justifications to the son of David the King.”

(O) —“ proceed.” This is the force of יֵלְכוּ, as is explained at large in note (o). The English word ‘ shall walk,’ is very inadequate; as it expresses not the going straight forward, without obstacle or turning, to a destined end.

(P) —“ revolters.” פְּשָׁעִים. This word expresses a degree and enormity of disobedience far beyond any thing contained in the notion of ‘ transgressors, prevaricators,’ or any other denomination of guilt, by which the word is rendered in our English Bible. It denotes rebels, in the highest sense

of the word. Such as rise in opposition to the authority of a Sovereign by right, because he is by right a Sovereign. And, in a religious sense, such as wilfully, with premeditation, disobey God from hatred of his authority. חטא is a fault committed through inadvertence. עין is iniquity resulting from a perverse wayward disposition. מרה, or מרר, generally rendered rebellion, is rather ‘provocation,’ wilful disobedience, in particular instances, either of doing something forbidden, or neglecting something commanded; and this often repeated; but, proceeding rather from a reluctance of obedience, with respect to some particular command, than a general settled aversion to what is good. But פשע is beyond all these. It is bold avowed rebellion, or revolt, disowning the authority of the Sovereign, and having for its end the overthrow of his sovereignty. But it will be said; Who ever was so mad, as to avow or entertain a design or hope of overthrowing the sovereignty of God? I say, numbers in all ages of the world. Atheists, deists, idolaters, and secular powers, that persecute revealed religion. Many of these, indeed, retain the name of a God, or Gods, as signifying, in their conceptions, an *Animus Mundi*, or physical powers in different parts of the ma-

terial world. But they all disown and oppose the God of the Old Testament, and the New; the God of Jews, and of Christians. And they endeavour what they can to overthrow his authority, by uniting their efforts (in vain, but much in earnest) for the extirpation of the Christian religion. If those, who, in the present day, are the most forward, and most powerful, in this work of impiety, affect a partiality for the Jews; it is because they hope to draw them in, to take part in the demolition of Christianity; and, when that is effected, they expect to find in Judaism an easy conquest. Whether any part, or what part, of the Jews may be drawn into this snare of Hell, we presume not to predict. We hope, that the great majority of that race will have too much discretion to be duped. This at least we know, that ultimately the whole race of Israel, of the natural Israel, “will return and seek the Jehovah their God, and the David their King. They shall return, and, sitting under his shadow, they will flourish.” The head of the faction leagued against us and them, against our God and theirs, is the Devil. If I am not much mistaken, he is more than once named in Scripture עשׂן; the participle Benoni Kal being used as an appellative in the singular number,



to denote, “the Rebel;” “the Apostate.” And the same participle in the plural, which is the word here, denotes the followers of that chief, “Rebels,” “Revolters.”

(Q) This ninth verse, the close of Hosea’s written prophecies, much resemble those grave moral *γνώμαι*, with which the Greek tragedies are usually closed by the chorus. But for the weightiness of the matter, and the simplicity, brevity, and solemnity of easy unaffected diction, it is not to be equalled by any thing the Attic Muse, in her soberest mood, produced.

---

Having given in my Preface, an enumeration of alterations, in the text of this prophet, which, though adopted by Archbishop Newcombe, I have thought proper to reject; I here subjoin a list of emendations I have myself made; not by mere conjecture, in any single instance, but upon the authority of the most celebrated editions, manuscripts, and antient versions.

	PRINTED TEXT.	EMENDATION.	AUTHORITIES.
CH. II. 6.	דרכך	דרביה	Syr. See (D).
CH. VI. 3.	מצאו	מוצאו	Old Printed Texts, and MSS. See note (A).
CH. VIII. 5.	נקין	נקיון	Complutens. other Editt. and MSS. See note (E).
10.	שרים	ושרים	Editt. MSS. and Versions. See (L).
12.	רבו	רבי	Keri, and MSS. See (N).
CH. IX. 2.	בה	בם	Best Editt. and MSS. See (D).
8.	אלהי—אלהיו	אלהיו—אלהי	Editt. and MSS. See (L) and (M).
12.	בשורי	בסורי	Editt. MSS, Versions, Houbi- gant, Newcombe. See (S).
CH. X. 6.	אותו	אתו	Editt. and MSS. See (K).
10.	עינתם	עונותם	Keri, and MSS. See (P).
15.	בשחר	כשחר	Editt. and MSS. See (T).
CH. XI. 2.	מפניהם in one word	מפני הם in two	LXX, Syriac, Houbig. Newc. See (C).
CH. XII. 5.	ויכל	ויוכל	Editt. MSS. See (C).
CH. XIII. 2.	כתבונם	כתבונם	Best Editt. and MSS. See (A).
5.	תלאובת	תלאובות	Editt. MSS. See (F).
14.	דברוך	דברך	Editt. MSS. and Versions. See (V).
CH. XIV. 5.	ממנו	ממני	The Oriental Synagogue.
7.	ישבו ישבי	ישובו יושבי	Editt. and MSS. See (F).
9.	וצדיקים	וצדיקים	Editt. and MSS. See (N).

These nineteen are the only emendations of the printed text of Vander Hooght (according to the edition in 8vo, at Amsterdam, 1705, which has for many years been the standard), which I have adopted. They are all, except the 1st and 12th, supported by a great consent of MSS, and old editions of great authority, and sometimes by the antient versions besides. The 1st indeed rests chiefly upon the Syriac version, and the pressing exigence of the place, but not without countenance from the LXX in the most material part. The 12th is merely a division, of what appears in the printed text as one word, into two, as it was read by the LXX and Syriac, without the change or transposition of a single letter.

The learned reader will observe, that I seldom take notice of any such various readings (and such make the far greater part of those which the manuscripts present) as give only a varied orthography of a word, without altering, or in any way affecting, either the sense, or the grammatical construction. Such varieties might deserve the attention of an editor, but to a translator they are of little consequence.

I subjoin a list of the passages, in which I have altered the stops.

## ALTERATIONS OF STOPS.

CHAPTER.	VERSE.	—	
IV.	10.	—	See note (H).
VI.	9, 10.	—	See note (L).
VII.	14.	—	See note (M).
	15.	—	See note (M).
VIII.	2.	—	See note (B).
	11, 12.	—	See note (M).
IX.	1.	—	See note (B).
	4.	—	See note (E).
	14, 15.	—	See note (W).
X.	7.	—	See note (N).
XI.	4.	—	See note (G).
XIII.	2.	—	See note (C).
	5, 6.	—	See note (G).
	10, 11.	—	See note (Q).
	14, 15.	—	See note (X).

# APPENDIX.

---

---

## No. I.

CORRECTIONS OF THE TRANSLATION,

WITH

ADDITIONAL EXPLANATORY NOTES.

### CHAP. II, 10.

—“vileness.”— Perhaps —“shame”— might be a better word. See the reason, note (G). Shame is, indeed, the word in the Bishops Bible. The impoverishment and devastation of a rich country, by invasion and the depredations of the conqueror, seem to be represented under the image of a total denudation of the female person. Compare Ezek. xvi, 36, 37.

### CHAP. IV, 12.

Perhaps this whole verse might be better rendered thus: “My people consult their wood, and their

staff is their monitor. For a spirit of lasciviousness hath driven them astray, and they play the wanton, [withdrawing] from under their God." To be "under God," is to be both under his government, and under his care. And "to withdraw from under him," is at the same time to revolt from obedience, and to renounce his protection. See note (1), and Appendix, No. II.

CHAP. V, 10.

—"bounds," rather —"land-marks."

CHAP. VI, 8.

—"lying in wait for a man." Perhaps —"lying in wait for the passenger" might be a rendering, which, though less literal, might more clearly convey the meaning to the English reader. For the image is that of a banditti, not lying in wait for a particular man; but generally lying in wait, to take their chance of making booty of any traveller, whose ill hap might throw him in their way.

VERSE 9.

—"committed lewdness," rather —"wrought lewdness," which was the expression in some of the old

versions. For the priests are taxed, not barely with spiritual lewdness, as committed by themselves, but as the promoters and abettors of it among the people.

## CHAP. VIII, 4.

When I say, in the explanatory note (2), that “the only kings of the Israelites, of God’s appointment, were those of the line of David in Judah, and of Jeroboam and Jehu in the ten tribes;” I forget not, that Baasha indeed is spoken of, in the First Book of Kings, as an instrument in the hand of God, to execute his judgments upon the house of Jeroboam; and Zimri likewise upon the house of Baasha; and Omri upon that of Zimri. But no one of these seems to have received an express commission for what he did, or an appointment to the kingdom, from any prophet; such as Jeroboam received from the prophet Ahijah, and Jehu from Elisha.

## CHAP. XI, 6.

See No. II.

## APPENDIX,

### No. II.

#### ADDITIONAL CRITICAL NOTES.

#### CHAP. II, 13.

—“ her necklace,” or, perhaps, “ her ear-rings.”  
The word חלית may be from the root חלל, to perforate, of the form of גפרית from גפר, ראשית from ראש, and ברית from ברר; and it may signify an ornament of gold or silver, in open work, like what is now called filigramme, which seems to have been in use in the highest antiquity; for such, I think, were the ear-rings of Juno.

Ἐν δ' ἄρα ἔρματα ἤκεν εὐστρητοισι λοβοῖσι

Τριγλινα, μορροεντα.

II. Ξ. 182.

In the pierc'd auricle, on either side,  
She fix'd the trembling pendant, triple drop,  
Of tender filigramme.

Filigramme—μορροεντα from μείρομαι, like חלית from חלל.



## CHAP. III, 2.

## ADD TO NOTE (B).

St Jerome, and St Cyril, of Alexandria, conceiving perhaps that the prophet, if he had once divorced his wife, could not legally take her home again, imagine, that the adulterous woman of this chapter is a new connection, formed after the dismissal of Gomer. And in this opinion they are followed by Estius, Menochius, and Tirinus. Some other expositors of inferior note, taken up with this notion, interpret this second connection of the Christian church, considered as a second wife, married after the divorcement of the Jewish. To this it may be objected; *1st*, That all that passed between the prophet and his wife (or wives, if in fact he took more than one), must be expounded by the analogy of God's dealings with the church, considered as the wife, in every period; both when it was composed of the natural Israel only, and since the grafting in of the Gentiles. *2dly*, It must indeed be admitted, that a woman, separated by bill of divorce, according to the law, Deut. xxiv, 1—4, after marriage had thereupon with a new husband, if that second

marriage came to be dissolved, either by the death of the new husband, or by a formal divorce from him; could not be taken again to wife by the first husband. But nothing hindered her re-marriage to her former husband, if new espousals with another had not taken place. And, further, if no divorce had taken place by bill, the right of the husband over her person, notwithstanding any separation (as we would now speak of bed and board) continued in full force. Now the state of the Jewish nation in the aggregate, even in their outcast forlorn condition, is never represented in the prophets, as a divorce by bill. The question, in Isaiah li, 1, "Where is this bill of your mother's divorcement?" amounts to a negation of the existence of any such instrument. In Jeremiah iii, 8, Jehovah says, indeed, of "backsliding Israel," that is, of Samaria, that "he had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce." But nothing of the kind is said of Judah, clearly distinguished in this prophecy from Samaria, and mentioned as her "sister;" that is, her sister, not only in consanguinity, but in the mystical wedlock. And, notwithstanding the bill of divorce, "backsliding Israel," no new espousals having taken place after the divorce, is affectionately invited to return to her

former husband, who revokes her divorcement.\* Further, it is to be observed, that the Christian church is never mentioned in prophecy as a second wife. But the converts of the Gentiles are represented under the image of a brood of children acquired to the original wife, pardoned, after a long separation, by the injured husband, taken home again, and into favour. From all this it appears, that, to represent the case between Jehovah and his church, the adultress, whom the prophet is in this chapter commanded to love, must be Gomer herself, the offending wife of the first chapter; not any other woman. And in this opinion I am confirmed by the authority of Drusius, Lowth the father, and Wells, among ourselves; of Tarnovius, among the Protestant divines of the Continent; and of Ribera and Rivetus, of the Church of Rome. I must observe farther, that Hosea's marriage was an extraordinary transaction, under the special direction of an absolute Sovereign, who had full authority to dispense with the forms of any written law; and many things in the treatment of the incontinent wife seem to have been more conformable to the practices and

---

\* See Jer. iii, 6—14.

custom of mankind in general, in the earliest ages, than to the particular provisions of the law of Moses.

### CHAP. III, 3.

—“neither will I with thee.” The negative לא is carried over to this from the preceding clause, by the force of the copula. Nothing more common. So that the sense is the same, as if it had been written וְגַם אֲנִי לֹא אֶלֶיךָ.

### CHAP. IV, 11.

When I said that the seven texts, produced in page 45, “are the only instances in the Bible, in which a noun, or what stands as a noun, following the verb עִיב, is connected with the verb by ל;” I had overlooked an eighth, in 1 Chron. xvi, 37, in which, taking the passage as it is rendered in our Public Translation, the immediate object of the verb may seem to be connected with it by ל. “So he left there [וַיַּעִיב שָׁם] before the ark of the covenant of the Lord, Asaph and his brethren [לְאַסָּף וְלֵאחָיו].” But, upon a critical consideration of the passage, it will appear, that the immediate object of the verb is not “Asaph and his brethren,” but

the proper names, in verses 38, 39, 40, 41, 42. And the sense is, that he left those persons *to* Asaph and his brethren; that is, under their direction and superintendance. And the whole should be thus rendered. “So he left there, before the ark of the covenant of Jehovah, under command of Asaph and of his brethren (to minister before the ark continually, as every day’s work required (38) Obed-edom and their brethren three-score and eight: Obed-edom also the son of Jeduthun,” &c. Observe, that the ך prefixed to עֵבֶר אֲרָם at the beginning of verse 38, should not be rendered “and,” for it is the particle of specification. “He left under command of Asaph and his brethren,” &c. viz. “Obed-edom,” &c. Of this use of ך, see p. 4.

### VERSE 12.

#### ADD TO NOTE (I).

I find I am quite alone in taking this clause, “let their staff therefore give them answers,” as I still think however it may be taken, as a severe menace of dereliction. I have offered therefore, in No. I, another translation of this whole verse; in which this clause is given as a repetition only, in other words, of the assertion contained in the former; or,

at most, as alleging against the Israelites a specific instance of the crime of idolatry, charged generally in the former clause. In this mention of the staff, as giving oracular advice, some have imagined an allusion to a very antient superstition, mentioned by the grammarian Festus, which consisted in the adoration of a peeled stick, as the symbol of some Deity. And I cannot but think, there is some ground for the conjecture. The Hebrew word *לִקְוֹ*, though given as a root by Buxtorf and most lexicographers, is, by some grammarians, deemed a verbal from the root *לִקַּץ*, ‘to polish, or make smooth.’ If this be the true derivation of the word, and it is certainly very plausible, its proper sense must be that of a peeled stick, or wand, trimmed by the knife of all the lateral twigs and buds, and divested of the outer bark or rind; and so made perfectly smooth and bare.

—το μὲν οὐποτε φύλλα καὶ ὄζους

Φυσεῖ, ἐπειδὴ πρῶτα τομὴν ἐν ὄρεσσι λείλοιπεν,

Οὐδ’ ἀναθλήσει· περὶ γὰρ ῥά ἐ χαλκὸς ἔλεψε

Φύλλα τε καὶ φλοῖον.

Certainly the word is used but once for a growing twig, viz. Jer. i, 11. And it is remarkable, that in the old Latin language, the name of the deified wand

was, according to Festus, a word of similar etymon and import. —“ DELUBRUM dicebant fustem DELIBRATUM, *i. e.* decorticatum, quem venerabantur pro DEO.”

## VERSE 18.

—“ her great men.” מַגְנִייהַ, ‘her,’ *i. e.* Ephraim’s. Of this anomaly of gender, see the Preface.

## CHAP. V, 2.

I read שְׂטִיִּים, not שְׂטִיִּים.

## VERSE 4.

Of the six passages, in which the LXX are said (p. 61) to have rendered the word מַעֲלִילִים by ἐργα, I find, upon a re-examination of them all, that two are doubtful; namely, Jer. xxi, 12, and 14. For the different editions of the LXX vary very much. Trommius seems to have had no better authority, for giving ἐργα as the rendering in these two texts, than the Scholia of the Frankfort Septuagint. In the Vatican and the Alexandrine MSS, we have nothing at all in the Greek to render the word מַעֲלִילִים, the clauses in which it occurs in these two verses being entirely omitted. Grabe supplies the

defect, under an asterisk, as from the Hexaplar text; and he gives the word ἐπιτηδεύματα. Under this uncertainty, these two texts of the LXX should be taken as neutral with respect to any interpretation of the word. But this in no degree affects the result of the disquisition.

VERSE 13.

—“ the king who takes up all quarrels.”

ADD TO NOTE (κ).

Theodoret understands this king, of the king of Egypt. But I rather think the Assyrian, named in the preceding clause, is introduced again here, not by name, but by character. For in the next clause, it is evidently said of one and the same person, that “ he will not be able to repair the damage” made in Ephraim by the moth; or, “ to make a cure of the corrupted sore” created in Judah by the worm in the flesh.

VERSE 15.

—“ they will rise early to seek me.” The verb יִשְׁחַרְנֵנִי is plural. Many MSS give יִשְׁחַרְנֵנִי. It is not unusual, however, for the *crementum* י, of the



third person plural of verbs, to be dropped before the paragogic ך, followed by a pronominal suffix; the absence of the ך being marked, as in this place, by the point kibbutz under the last radical; *או יקר־אני ולא אענה ישחר־נני ולא ימצא־נני*.\* In which place, however, the three verbs are all written full in many MSS. Sometimes the ך is omitted before the suffix not preceded by the paragogic ך. Indeed this omission is universally incident to the personal increment ך, whenever that increment should regularly take place. The second persons plural preterite, both masculine and feminine, change their proper termination ם and ך into ך before the suffixes. But this ך is often omitted. The second and third persons plural feminine in the future change their termination ךה into ך before the suffixes. And this ך again is frequently omitted. And the omission of the ך, in all these cases, is invariably marked by the point kibbutz under the third radical of the verb.

I take this omission to be a change in the letters of the verbs by the suffixes, originally belonging to the language, independent of the points; and as

---

\* Prov. i, 28.

such it is considered by the great antagonist of the Masoretic punctuation, the learned Masclef.

### CHAP. VI, 10.

—“ a horrible thing.” שְׁעִרִיָּה. The form of the noun is certainly very singular. Two MSS give שְׁעִרוּרָה, in which form, as Archbishop Newcombe observes, the word occurs twice in Jeremiah.\* But this seems not a sufficient reason for altering the text. The Keri, and many MSS, as the same learned prelate has remarked, give שְׁעִרוּרִיה; which confirms the form in the printed text in the most extraordinary part of it; the termination יָה. As for the insertion of the ך between the two reshes, this is not uncommon in nouns formed by the re-duplication of the third radical.

### CHAP. VII, 10.

—“ seek him.” בְּקִשְׁוּהוּ. Vide supra, V, 15.

### CHAP. VIII, 7.

—“ shall swallow it up.” יִבְלָעֶהוּ. Vide supra, V, 15.

---

\* Chap. v, 30, and xxiii, 14.

## CHAP. X, 14.

—“and all thy fortresses shall be demolished.” Observe, that in the original, the singular **וכל**, not the plural **מבצרים**, is the nominative case to the verb **יושר**. There is therefore no anomaly of the number.

## CHAP. XI, 6.

—“weary itself.” Or, “be weary;” or, “fall furiously upon;” or, “play havoc in.”

The verb **חלה** may be either, 1<sup>st</sup>, the third person singular preterite, in the masculine form of the root **חלה**; or, 2<sup>dly</sup>, the third person singular preterite, in the feminine form of the verb **חול**; or, 3<sup>dly</sup>, the third person singular preterite feminine of the verb **חלל**. As the first it will render ‘weary itself,’ or ‘be wearied,’ if an anomaly of the gender, of which the instances are frequent, be admitted; the noun **חרב**, which is the nominative case, being feminine.

2. **חלה**, being taken in the second manner, will give the same sense, if an intercommunity of sense be allowed between **חלה** and **חול** in the secondary sense of the former, of being exhausted with continued toil.

3. חלה, taken in the third manner, will render ‘fall furiously upon,’ or ‘play havoc in;’ which two last renderings come to the same thing.

As for the sense of ‘resting upon,’ or ‘abiding on,’ given in our Public Translation, and by the majority of interpreters, it is altogether inadmissible. For neither of the roots חול nor חלל signifies ‘to remain, abide, or continue in.’ The words, which, in the sense of continuance, or abiding, are placed in the Lexicons under the root חול, are some to be referred to the root יחל; others are misinterpreted, and belong to the root חלל in another sense: none of them to the root חול. But to the root יחל, the word חלה of the text cannot be reduced. The expression in the Bishop’s Bible, and the English Geneva, instead of ‘abide on,’ was ‘fall on,’ which was much better.

Of the two renderings, 1st, ‘weary itself,’ or ‘be weary;’ 2d, ‘fall furiously upon,’ or ‘play havoc in;’ either is admissible, and well suited to the context. But in my own judgment, I abide by the former, as the better of the two.

#### VERSE 7.

—“they called them.” יקראן. See V, 15, and VIII, 7.

## CHAP. XIII, NOTE (D).

When I say (p. 194) that the abominable custom of infant sacrifice was more antient in the kingdom of Samaria than of Judah, I speak strictly of the comparative antiquity of the custom, as among the Israelites themselves. The temple built by Solomon to Moloch, was for the gratification of his Ammonite concubines. And they, those foreign women, "burnt incense, and sacrificed in it." But it appears not, that the king himself, or any of the race of Israel in his time, nor till long after, were partakers in those impious rites. The erection therefore of this temple shewed a propensity to this species of idolatry, but was not the beginning of a permanent custom. On the contrary, the worship of the Tyrian Baal, introduced by Ahab, was the beginning of a practice which, though checked for a short time by Jehu, was daily gaining ground, in both kingdoms; rose to its height in that of Samaria, about the time of Menahem; and afterwards, in the reign of Ahaz, in the kingdom of Judah.

## CHAP. XIII, 14.

I have said in note (τ), p. 213, that the Hebrew names of Hell and the Grave, *Sheol* and *Keber*, never are confounded by the sacred writers. But although *Keber* is never used for *Sheol*, to signify Hell, there are five texts in which the contrary may seem to have taken place; namely, the use of *Sheol* for *Keber*, to signify the repository of the body, rather than the mansion of the departed spirit. These five texts are, Gen. xlii, 38; xliv, 29, 31; 1 Kings ii, 6, 9. But upon consideration it will appear that, in every one of these, the thing to be expressed is neither Hell nor the Grave, particularly, and as distinct the one from the other, but ‘the state of Death;’ and this state is expressed under the image of a place of residence of the dead collectively. And for this place, taken in the gross, not as divided into the two separate lodgments of the spirit and the carcase, the word שְׁאוֹל is used. It is therefore very ill rendered by the word ‘grave,’ even in these texts; and ‘hell’ would be a better rendering: because the only general place of residence of the dead collectively is that of the departed spirit. The grave is no general place, since every dead body has

its own appropriate grave. Perhaps in these instances the word *Sheol* would be best expressed, in English, by a periphrasis, ‘region of the dead,’ or ‘dwelling of the dead,’ or ‘the nether regions.’

There is yet a sixth text, Psalm cxli, 7, in which we read, in the English Bible, of “bones scattered at the grave’s mouth;” but, in the Hebrew, “at the mouth of *Sheol*.” This passage is often alleged as an evident instance of the use of שְׁאוֹל for the grave. But the fact is, that here we have no mention of the grave at all. For the psalmist is clearly speaking of the bones of persons massacred, whose bodies never were in any grave, but had been left to rot, unburied, upon the surface of the earth. And the mouth of *Sheol* is this surface, considered as the entrance of *Sheol*; which, in the imagery of the sacred writers, as well as of the oldest Greek poets, is always considered as in the central parts of the earth’s hollow sphere.

—Ταρταρον ἠεροεντα

Τηλε μαλ’, ἤχι βαθιστον ὑπο χθονος ἐστι βαραθρον

Ἐνθα σιδηρειαί τε πυλαι και χαλκεος οὐδος,

Τοσσον ἐνεσθ’ αἰδεω ὅσον οὐρανός ἐς ἀπο γαιης.

Iliad. 9, 15, &c.

It is very curious to remark, by the way, that the Tartarus of Homer, or his dungeon of the damned,

—ἰν' Ἰαπέτος τε Κρονος τε

Ἕμενοι, οὐτ' ἀύγης ὑπεριονος ἡέλιου

Τερποντ', οὐτ' ἀνεμοισι, βαθυς δὲ τε Τάρταρος ἀμφις.

Iliad. 9, 479, &c.

the “*crassa caligo inferum*” of the old Latin poet, is a pit below Hades: to which in position it bears the same relation, as Earth, the low mansion of man, to Heaven, the bright and blissful seat of the immortal gods. Whence it is evident that Homer's Hades was the dwelling of spirits not in punishment. The shell, or crust, of the terraqueous globe, on which we live, is the outer wall of this nether region, consisting, according to this imagery, of two parts; Hades, the uppermost, and Tartarus, below, in the very centre. The whole, without distinction of its parts, is denoted by *Sheol*, in the Hebrew language. And the surface of the earth is the outside, or entrance, of this *Sheol* in the psalmist. The soul, expelled from its case of clay by the weapon of the murderer, flees to *Sheol*, and leaves its *exuviae* at the entrance. Observe, that in the compound word לִפְי, the noun פִּי does not always retain its proper and literal signification of ‘a mouth.’ It is used,



with great latitude, to signify the edge, properly the outside edge, or beginning, of any thing. In this passage, neither the LXX nor the Vulgate express any allusion to a mouth. —παρὰ τοῦ Ἄδην. LXX. —“secus infernum.” Vulgate.

I have the satisfaction to find, that, with respect to the distinct proper senses of the words *Sheol* and *Keber*, and in the interpretation of the mysterious text in St Peter's First Epistle, as far, at least, as the general principle is concerned, I have the concurrence of a very learned writer, the reverend George Bennet, minister of the Gospel at Carlisle, in a book entitled, “*Olam Hanashemoth; or, a View of the Intermediate State;*” which was published about the very time these sheets were committed to the press. It is a work of various erudition, and deep research. And a reader must be very learned, who finds not much in it to instruct him; very dull, if he is not delighted with the ingenuity that is displayed even in those parts, in which he may see reason to doubt the solidity of the author's argument, and the truth of his interpretations; and very captious, if in a variety of novel expositions, many of which he may think inadmissible, he finds any thing to give him offence. I take a particular pleasure in bearing

this testimony to the merits of an author, whom I suspect to be of a different branch of the Christian family from my own, and who seems to have a different notion from mine of the prophecies, relating, as I conceive, to the final restoration of the Jewish nation.

### CHAP. XIV, 7.

#### ADD TO NOTE (H).

Diodati refers this masculine suffix to God. For having rendered, “la ricordanza d’esso sarà come il vino del Libano,” he gives this note: “Vuol dire, la sua conoscenza e dottrina sarà sempre dolcissima al suo popolo, a guisa di vino eccellente.” He offers indeed another exposition, which refers the pronominal suffix to the people. “Iddio terrà carissima la memoria del suo popolo.” According to the former exposition, *זכרו* is the people’s constant remembrance of God; according to the latter, it is God’s gracious remembrance of his people. Both seem to me forced and unnatural.

## APPENDIX.

### No. III.

#### CHAP. I, 7.

—“armour.” The original word מלחמה seems to be used here as in chap. ii, 18. See the note (L) upon that place.

#### CHAP. II, 6.

—“hedge up.” Upon the suggestion of a very learned critic (as he appears to be) in a periodical publication,\* I have restored the word “hedge” of our Public Translation, ill changed into “stop” in my first edition.

#### VERSE 16.

—“thou shalt call me husband,” &c. Upon mature consideration, I have thought it better to give the sense of the words ISHI, BAALI, and BAALIM, in this place in our own language, than to retain the

---

\* See Monthly Review, March, 1804.

Hebrew words themselves; which, in deference to the example of our Public Translation, I had done in my first edition. These words are mere appellatives, expressive of certain relations, between those, who are supposed to use them, and those to whom they are applied. The relations, it is true, are allegorical. But the words are used in their plain literal meaning, and as appellatives. Not as appellatives turned, by compounding, into proper names, like the words JEZRAEL, LO-RUHAMA, LO-AMMI, imposed upon certain allegorical personages; that is, upon persons, which, if real, are put however to represent other persons, the circumstances of similitude between the type and antitype being pointed out, by *innuendo* as it were, in the signification of the proper name resolved into its component parts. But these are used only as appellations of certain well-known relations in society, by which other relations, real, or imaginary, are adumbrated: a real relation between God and his people; an imaginary relation between the people and their idols. And without the common meaning of the words as appellatives, not as proper names, the passage is unintelligible. In a translation, which adequately renders that common meaning, the sense of the passage will be clear;

and not made more clear by the introduction of the original words, which can throw no light upon the sense to him, to whom the original language is unknown. In any translation, therefore, all such words as these should be rendered in the corresponding appellatives of the translator's language. I must observe however, that, in this instance, either all three should be translated, or all three retained. The middle way, taken by Castalio, who translates the first two, and retains the third, is the worst of all: for in this way it appears not, how the disuse of the second puts the third entirely out of the mouth of the spouse.

VERSES 19, 20.

—“to myself, I say,” &c. It seems high time that the antient particle of asseveration, ‘yea,’ should be laid aside; as the use of it is one of the peculiarities of colloquial phraseology by which a certain sect is frequently ridiculed upon the stage. Archaisms, once become ludicrous, cease to raise the dignity of style, and should be banished from Holy writ. And yet the particle ‘yes,’ which I had used in my first edition, seems too familiar. I therefore express the asseveration more solemnly by ‘I say.’

## CHAP. IV, 11.

—“to devote themselves to dalliance,” &c. The more literal rendering of the Hebrew words is certainly what I gave in my first edition, “to give attention to.” But the phrase “to give attention to,” in our language, seems to imply a serious application of the mind to some weighty business, or grave pursuit. And it is not without some impropriety applied to a perpetual engagement in those riotous scenes, which destroy all attention. The translation which I now give, expresses the full sense of the Hebrew words, but without distinctly conveying that particular notion of the voluptuary, which the original contains, as a person making loose pleasures the whole business of his life, and having no employment for the powers of his mind, but in the gratification of his appetites. But as the mere literal rendering would hardly convey that notion to the English reader, who would only be struck with the seeming inconsistency of the expression, of “giving attention” to that, by which the very power of attention is taken away, I prefer the translation I now give. Declaring, however, that neither this, nor the former, nor any other version I have been able to

form of the Hebrew words, satisfies myself, as answering in every particular to the original.

### CHAP. V, 3.

“ At this very moment”— Heb. “ Surely now”—  
 וְ in this place is rather the particle of asseveration, *reverâ*, *profectò*, than the causal conjunction ‘ for.’

### VERSE 4.

In my note upon this passage, p. 54—62, I have said (p. 57), that from the poel form of the verb עיל, two nouns are derived, both signifying ‘ a little child.’ I should rather have said, both understood to signify ‘ a little child.’ But with respect to the latter of the two מעולל, the LXX appear to have followed a very different reading, in the only passage in which the word is supposed to be used in this sense, namely, Isaiah iii, 12. The word which the LXX found in that place must have been מעילליר, which they take as the participle poel plural, with the suffix of the second person, and they render it ‘ are gleaning thee.’ Now if this of the LXX be the true reading, then the word מעולל no where occurs in the sense of ‘ little child.’

## VERSE 9.

—“working conviction.” The grammatical construction I take to be this: that the noun substantive תוכחה, governs the noun substantive which immediately follows it, שבטי, by the preposition ב; as the verb, from which it is derived, would govern its object. This verb יבה, from its primary sense of ‘making manifest, shewing,’ comes to signify ‘to prove,’ by argument. And thence ‘to disprove’ by argument, ‘to shew to be in error,’ or ‘in fault,’ ‘to refute,’ ‘to convince.’ And from the sense of ‘convincing’ in argument, it acquires the sense of ‘convincing’ by other means. In particular by punishment, which brings a delinquent to a sense of his folly or his crime. Hence the noun תוכחה signifies ‘punishment,’ which produces that effect, or is applied for that purpose. The day of “working conviction in the tribes of Israel,” is the day appointed in God’s counsels, for executing those judgments, which should bring the hardened Jews to a sense of God’s power, his veracity in his threatenings, and their own sin and folly in disregarding the warnings of his prophets. The verb is rendered ‘work conviction’ by Bishop Lowth, Isaiah ii, 4. From him I borrow the expression. The word ‘re-



buke' of our Public Translation, which I retained in my first edition, is much too weak for this place, though in some it might be properly used.

### CHAP. VI, 2, 3.

—“ we shall live in his presence, and attain,” &c. I place rebhia only at לפניו, and remove the sophasuk to the end of the following word ונרעה, with which I make the second verse end; and I begin a new verse and a new sentence with נרפה. Thus, understanding the verb נרעה neutrally, I connect the attaining of knowledge with the living in the presence, as the effect with the cause: To live in God's presence, is to live in the communion of his church, receiving the instruction of the Divine word, and the comfort of the sacraments. The attainment of knowledge, that is, the true knowledge of God, and a right understanding of his word, is the effect of thus living in his presence. And a further effect of the attainment is, a taste and liking for the knowledge so attained, a desire of perpetual proficiency in it, and a voluntary pursuit of it.

—“ Ita nobis veritatis suavitas allubescet, ut perpetuo sequi cupeamus.” Ecolampad.

## CHAP. VI, 8.

“Gilead”— In my note upon this passage in my first edition, I said that Gilead, the son of Machir, might be the leader of the expedition against a city of the Amorites, which is mentioned Numb. xxxii, 39, 40. But it is more probable, that a grandson of that Gilead, bearing the same name, might be that successful leader. Gilead indeed, the son of Machir, was the great-grandson of the patriarch Joseph. Moses and Aaron were great-grandsons of the patriarch Levi. But Joseph was so much younger than Levi, that his great-grandsons may well be supposed to have lived with the great-great-grandsons of Levi; that is, with the generation next below Moses and Aaron, and to have had a considerable part in Joshua’s wars. And upon this general view of the subject it was, that I thought it not improbable that Gilead, the son of Machir, might be the captor of that city of the Amorites, which afterwards bore his name. But when it is recollected that Machir had children born before the death of his grandfather Joseph;\* and that Joseph died not less

---

\* Gen. 1, 22.

than 359 years before the Exodus; it is quite incredible, that any son of Machir's, and hardly credible that any one higher in the pedigree of the family than one of his great-grandsons, should be alive to serve in Joshua's wars.

The latitude in which the Hebrew word for sons is used, and the inaccuracy of the Hebrews in the enumeration of genealogical descents, is in no instance more evident than in that of the family of Manasseh. In Joshua xvii, 2, the same persons are mentioned as Manasseh's sons, which are mentioned in Numb. xxvi, 30—32, as the sons of Gilead; *i. e.* great-grandsons are called sons.

#### CHAP. VII, 8.

—“mixed himself with the peoples.” The word עַמִּים in the plural, always signifies the various nations of the earth, the unenlightened nations, in opposition to God's peculiar people, the Israelites. There is indeed a familiar use of the word in common speech, as promiscuously compellative of the individuals of a company; in which it renders the English phrase ‘good folks,’ or ‘good people.’ But as applied to bodies politic, it is never used otherwise than to denote the many nations of the Gen-

tiles, in opposition to the one nation of the Jews. I have therefore thought it necessary to give it in the plural in English, ‘peoples,’ though not without some violation of the propriety of the English language, which disowns the word in the plural form. Bishop Lowth in his *Isaiah*, studious as he was of the purity of his English style, has taken the same liberty for the same reason.

#### CHAP. VIII, 1.

“The cornet at thy mouth be it like the eagle,” &c. To my translation and exposition of this passage, it has been objected by a learned friend, that eagles never scream. And this I suppose is the opinion of modern naturalists. But of the six species of eagles enumerated by Aristotle, the little black eagle is the only one, of which he says it neither *cries* nor *croaks*. Of the next species, the *Pelargus montana*, he says, that when it carries off dead carrion, it labours much, squalls, and cries. *Hist. An. lib. ix, cap. 32*. Pliny’s testimony is more explicit. He says, of the little black eagle, that it is the only species which never screams or cries: —“*Sola sine clangore, sine murmuratione.*” *Lib. x, c. 3*. Bochart says, that ‘*clangere*’ is the true Latin verb to

express the voice of the eagle. In this he is supported by the grammarians. Homer's eagles screamed. *Iliad.* μ, 207. Æschylus's screamed. *Tusc. Quæst. lib. ii, c. 30.* If eagles have left off screaming, it must have been since the time of our first Edward. For when the shores of Caernarvonshire were strewed with the dead bodies of the bards slaughtered by him, the Welch eagles made a piteous screaming.

On dreary Arvon's shores they lie,  
Smear'd with gore, and ghastly pale ;  
Far, far aloof th' affrighted ravens sail,  
The famish'd eagle SCREAMS and passes by.

From antient authorities it should seem, that three different notes were to be found in different species of the eagle. 1. A doleful whining cry, *μινυριζειν*, *murmuratio*. 2. A hoarse croaking sound, *λεληκεν*. 3. A shrill squall, or scream, of furious savage joy *βοαν*. *Clangere, κλαγξας*. *Hom.*

It is not clear to me, that Aristotle says even of the black eagle, what he certainly says of no other, that it is absolutely mute : only that its voice is not ominous, being neither doleful nor hoarse. Certainly they were black eagles, which screamed with

horror at the sight of the murdered bards; for Snowdon is inhabited by no other.

However modern naturalists may decide, I think the prophet Hosea is likely to have been in the opinion of Homer, Æschylus, Aristotle, Pliny, Bochart, Gray.

#### CHAP. IX, 5.

—“ All are gone! Total devastation!” The Hebrew sounds literally, as it was given in the first edition. “ For lo they are gone because of devastation.” That is, they, the people of the land, harassed with the ravages and exactions of the foreign invader, are fled from their homes to distant regions, and have left the country so thinned of its inhabitants, that the few remaining in it are not enow to make an attendance at the stated festivals. This same sense, and neither more nor less than this same sense, the words now given express, as I conceive, with more force and perspicuity, to the English reader.

#### CHAP. X, 11.

—“ shall harrow”— It is matter of doubt, whether the harrow was in ancient times, more than in

the present, among the implements of husbandry in Palestine. Be that as it may, the two verbs **הרש** and **שרר** unquestionably speak of two different effects, however the same instrument might be employed for both: the one, that which is the proper operation of the plough; the other, that which with us is the proper operation of the harrow. The verb therefore, ‘to harrow,’ may very well be used to render the Hebrew **שרר** as predicating the work done, by whatever instrument. Indeed, ‘to harrow’ is the only verb in our language, to render the Greek *βαλοκοπεω*, or the Latin *offringere*.

VERSE 12.

Sow to yourselves for righteousness, “that ye may reap.” So Piscator, “*Ut metatis;*” and to the same effect Rivetus. Imperativus pro futuro. Sic alio loco “*Accedite ad eum et illuminamini et comedite bonum,*” *i. e.* comedetis.

—“according to mercy,” pro ratione Divinæ benignitatis, quæ supra modum compensat. Rivetus.

VERSE 13.

“Ye have plowed-in wickedness.” I think the verb **הרש** here is used in the sense of plowing-in,

the seed plowed-in being the object. And so Rivetus understood it. *Arando seminâstis : nam impietas fuit semen mandatum terræ, bonorum sterili, malorum feraci.*

#### VERSE 14.

—“and all thy fortresses shall be demolished.” Observe, that in the original the singular noun substantive כל, not the plural מבצרים is the nominative case to the verb יושר. In this case therefore there is no anomaly of the number.

#### VERSE 15.

—“brought to nothing.” In asserting that the roots דמה and דום have no connection, I have the misfortune to differ from my late very learned friend Mr Parkhurst.

Mr Parkhurst cites Exod. xv, 16, Job xxx, 27, Psalms xxxv, 15, Jer. xiv, 17, Lam. ii, 18, iii, 49, as passages, in which the verb דמה is used to signify, “to be quiet, still, composed,” observing, that in the last of these passages, “the final ה is clearly radical.” Now, in the first of these passages, Exod. xv, 17, the word ירמי may be deduced either from דמה or דום. The Masoretes indeed have pointed it,



as if they referred it to רמה. But not to רמה in the sense of רמם, “to be quiet or still,” but in its own sense, “to be like to;” for the passage might very well be rendered, “by the greatness of thy arm they shall become like a stone,” *i. e.* petrified with dismay. In the second and third passages, Job xxx, 27, Ps. xxxv, 15, the word is רמו, and nothing, either in the letters or the points, makes it necessary to refer it to רמה rather than to רום. In the fourth passage, Jer. xiv, 17, the word is תרמינה; which might be the third person plural feminine of the future tense in kal either of רמה or רמם; for, in this person, the verbs quiescent Lamed He, and the verbs doubling Ain differ in form in the points only. The Masoretes indeed have applied the points, which, in their system, belong to the verbs quiescent Lamed He. For thus they write it תרְמִינָה. But this is only one instance among many of their want of judgment. Alter only one of their points, place Kibbutz instead of Scheva under ר, thus תרְמִינָה, and the word will be the third person plural feminine future in Kal, regularly formed from רמם. In the fifth passage, Lamentations ii, 18, the word is תרום; which by no exploit of criticism whatever can be reduced to רמה, a root quiescent Lamed

He. It must be the third person future feminine niph'al of the verb רָמַם, and nothing else. Of the six passages, therefore, produced by Mr Parkhurst; there remains only the sixth, Lamentations iii, 49, in which any necessity, or propriety indeed, appears of introducing the root רָמַה in the sense of רוּם, or רָמַם. In the first indeed the root may be רָמַה, but in its own sense.

In Lamentations iii, 49, the word is תָּרַמָּה. In which Mr Parkhurst says the ה is clearly radical. But I cannot agree with him. The word, disregarding the points, may be the third person singular feminine future of the root רָמַם in kal, with the paragoric ה. The verbs, doubling Ain, in the persons both of the future and the preterite, frequently assume the paragoric ה. And of this we have an instance in this very verb, in another passage of the prophet Jeremiah. See Jer. viii, 14. It is certain, that many roots quiescent Lamed He, doubling Ain, and quiescent Ain Vau, have an intercommunity of signification. But this is not to be extended to all such verbs at pleasure, but confined to those, of the promiscuous use of which we have unexceptionable instances in the sacred text.

## CHAP. XI, 10.

—“ Like a lion he shall roar,” &c. The most learned commentators agree, that this roaring of the lion is the sound of the gospel; and that the subject of this, and the following verse, is its promulgation and progress, the conversion of the Gentiles, and the final restoration of the Jews. “ *Quasi Leo rugiet—Clarâ et maximâ voce prædicabit Evangelium,*” says Piscator. And to the same effect Rivetus and Bochart. “ *Ut Leo rugitu suo advocat animalia sui generis ad participationem prædæ, teste Plutarcho in Libro de Industriâ Animalium; sic Christus, potenti Evangelii voce, vocabit Gentes omnes ad æternæ vitæ societatem.*” Livelye. The preaching of the gospel, reaching the remotest corners of the earth, is frequently represented under the image of the loudest sounds. And this loudness of the sound alone might justify the figure of the roaring of the lion. But a greater propriety of the figure will appear, if we recollect, that the first demonstrations of mercy to the faithful will be the judgments executed upon the antichristian persecutors: to whom the sound of the gospel will be a sound of terror. This seems to have been the no-

tion of Drusius ; who says, “ *Ut rugitus Leonis terret reliqua animalia, sic Deus omnibus metum incutiet, cum supplicium sumet de hostibus Ecclesiæ.*” And this receives much confirmation from a passage in the prophet Joel (iii, 16.) in which, as Rivetus observes, the preaching of the gospel is described as Jehovah’s roaring from Sion. And although the lion is not mentioned by name in that place, yet the word for roaring is that which properly denotes the voice of the lion. This, therefore, is another passage, in which the roaring of the lion represents the preaching of the gospel. And as such it is mentioned by the great Bochart. “ *Non immerito rugitus hîc (nempè Joel iii, 16.) ut et Os. xi, 10, appellatur Evangelii prædicatio ; cum tam sit clara et sonora, ut per totum orbem audita fuerit, nec solum aures, sed auditorum animos, vi suâ perculerit.*”

#### VERSE 11.

—“ shall hurry,” *pavebunt, vel properabunt celeritè se recipere ad eum, nempè Christum. Vatablus.* Such is the consent of the most learned interpreters in the general sense of this passage, as a prophecy of the successful propagation of the gospel. And in this general sense of it even they agree, as appears

by St Jerome upon the place, who look not for a final restoration of the natural Israel: although in the detail they must differ from those, who maintain, as I maintain, the literal sense of the prophecies relating to that great consummation of the scheme of Providence.

### CHAP. XII, 1.

“Every day he multiplieth falsehood and destruction,” *i. e.* in multiplying his falsehoods, he multiplies the causes of his own destruction. The proposition is true, whether the falsehood be understood of their hypocrisy and infidelity towards God, or of their treachery and bad faith in political treaties and alliances. Multiplying their falsehoods in either way, they were daily multiplying the causes of their own destruction. But from what immediately follows, their falsehood in their alliances seems more particularly intended. They are charged with making their court to the Egyptian; at the very time when they were entering into treaty with his enemy and rival the Assyrian.

—“For while—at the same time”— This I take to be the force of the two *vavs*, prefixed the one to the noun כרית, the other to the noun שטן.

## VERSE 7.

“Canaan the trafficker!” In my former edition I had given it more tamely. “A trafficker of Canaan!” For the improvement in the spirit of the expression, which is very great, my reader, with myself, is indebted to the learned critic already mentioned.\*

## CHAP. XIII, 15.

—“Nay in truth.” This I take to be the true force of נַי in this place. Equivalent to *Imo* or *Quinimo*. “Nay truly,” or “nay rather,” or “nay and what is more.” Instead of shewing signs of penitence, he is become a total and professed apostate.

---

\* Monthly Review, March, 1804.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

---

THE Author finds, that he owes apology to the orthodox reader, for an omission, not of any thing essential to the elucidation of the prophet; but in itself of greater moment, than any errata of the press or of the pen. It is, that he has omitted to add this remark, at the end of the long note on the word "memorial," in chap. xii, 5. [See note (F) p. 183.] Namely; That the person, of whom it is said, that the name *JEHOVAH* is his memorial, is no other, than he whom the patriarch found at Bethel, who there spake with the Israelites in the loins of their progenitor. He, whom the patriarch found at Bethel, who there, in that manner, spake with the Israelites, was, by the tenor of the context, the antagonist with whom Jacob was afterwards matched at Peniel. The antagonist, with whom he was matched at Peniel, wrestled with the patriarch, as we read in the book of Genesis,\* in the human form. The conflict

---

\* Ch. xxxii, 24.

was no sooner ended, than the patriarch acknowledged his antagonist as God.\* The holy prophet first calls him Angel† (מלאך), and after mention of the colluctation, and of the meeting and conference at Bethel, says,‡ that he, whom he had called angel, was “Jehovah God of Hosts.” And to make the assertion of this person’s Godhead, if possible, still more unequivocal, he adds, that to him belonged, as his appropriate memorial, that name, which is declarative of the very essence of the Godhead. This man therefore of the book of Genesis, this Angel of Hosea, who wrestled with Jacob, could be no other than the JEHOVAH-ANGEL, of whom we so often read in the English Bible, under the name of the “Angel of the Lord.” A phrase of an unfortunate structure, and so ill-conformed to the original, that it is to be feared, it has led many into the error of conceiving of the Lord as one person, and of the Angel as another. The word of the Hebrew, ill-rendered “the Lord,” is not, like the English word, an appellative, expressing rank, or condition; but it is the proper name JEHOVAH. And this proper name Jehovah is not, in the Hebrew, a genitive after the

---

\* Gen. xxxii, 30.

† Hos. xii, 4.

‡ Chap. xii, 5.



noun substantive “Angel,” as the English represents it; but the words יהוה and מלאך, “Jehovah” and “Angel,” are two nouns substantive in apposition, both speaking of the same person; the one, by the appropriate name of the essence (rendering, by its very etymology, the *λογος της ούσιας*, if it may be permitted to apply logical terms to that which is beyond all the categories); the other, by a title of office. “Jehovah-Angel” would be a better rendering. The JEHOVAH-ANGEL of the Old Testament is no other than He, who, in the fulness of time, “was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary.”

Certain things have lately appeared in print, in a periodical publication,\* for the soundness of its principles, and the ability with which it is conducted, of the highest merit, by which the author thinks himself called upon, in this manner, to supply his great omission. It is very extraordinary, that a writer, not unacquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and professing a just abhorrence of the Socinian blasphemy, should insinuate, that not more than one passage of the Old Testament is to be pro-

---

\* Anti-jacobin Review.

duced, in which Christ is denominated Jehovah. It is more extraordinary, that the attempt to justify the application of that one passage to Christ, should be represented as the attempt of a very modern writer, in which great pains have been *wasted*. When the truth is, that the whole work, in which all these pains have been *wasted*, is comprised in not quite five octavo pages, not closely printed :\* and the object of that short tract, is not to make any new application of the passage ; but to shew, that the rendering of our English Bible, which expressly makes the application to Christ, is so strongly confirmed by the version of the LXX, in concurrence with all the old versions, that it is for that reason to be preferred to another offered by the learned Dr Blaney, of which the defender of the old version, too easily perhaps, admits the Hebrew words to be equally susceptible. It is very extraordinary, that this same writer should speak of Dr Eveleigh's pains, as all employed to prove, that Christ is *once* denominated Jehovah ; when the very short tract, in which Dr Eveleigh defends the old rendering of this one text, is nothing

---


\* See the learned Dr Eveleigh's Appendix to his 10th Bampton Lecture.

more than an Apendix to his “Discourses on the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity,” the 9th and 10th of his Bampton Lectures, in which he produces innumerable instances, from the Old Testament, of the application of the divine name Jehovah to the second person in the Godhead. Indeed, the word Jehovah, being descriptive of the divine essence, is equally the name of every one of the three persons in that essence. It is applied, in the Old Testament, to every one of them, and to no one more frequently than the second. This matter has been so ably, though briefly, touched by a Presbyter of the Episcopal Church in Scotland in the Anti-jacobin Review for May, that it is unnecessary to say more upon it here; except briefly to remark, that the name Jehovah, belonging to the three persons indiscriminately, as simply descriptive of the essence; the compound JEHOVAH-SABAOTH belongs properly to the second person, being his appropriate Demiurgic title; describing not merely *the Lord of such armies as military leaders bring into the field*, but the unmade self-existent Maker and Sustainer of the whole array and order of the universe.

## CRITICAL NOTES

ON

## JOEL.



## CHAP. II.

*Verse 2.* —“ darkness, as the morning,” &c.  
 —“ darkness.

As the grey of the morning spread upon the mountains,  
 [Cometh] a numerous people,” &c.

Bishop Newcombe and Houbigant divide in this manner.

*Verse 5.* “ Like the noise of chariots on the tops of mountains shall they leap”—

A noise as of chariots!

They are bounding on the tops of the mountains!

A noise as of a flame of fire devouring stubble!

A strong people, as it were, set in battle array.

*Verse 6.* —“ the people.” —“ the peoples.”

*Verse 14.* —“ Quis recogitabit, reverteturque, ac resipiscet, ut relinquat”— Houbigant.

*Verse 17.* —“ the people.” —“ the peoples.”

*Verse 18.* “ Then will the Lord be jealous,” &c.; rather, “ And let Jehovah be anxious for his land, and take pity upon his people.” It appears by what follows that this is the conclusion of the prayer. To the same effect Houbigant.

*Verse 19.* “ Yea”— rather “ Then”—

### CHAP. III.


*Verse 11.* —“ thither cause thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord.” For גבוריך, read, with Houbigant, גבוריכם. —“ there will Jehovah bring low your mighty ones.” Compare Bishop Newcombe.

*Verse 13.* —“ get ye down.” The LXX and Syriac read ררכו, (instead of ררי), which Houbigant and Bishop Newcombe approve. —“ tread.”

## CRITICAL NOTES

ON

## AMOS.



## CHAP. II.

*Verse 7.* “That pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor.”

“They bruise the head of the poor in the dust of the earth.”

Vulgate, Houbigant, Bishop Newcombe.

*Verse 13.* —“I am pressed under you,” &c.; rather, with the margin, “I will press your place as a cart full of sheaves presseth.” Or, with Houbigant and Bishop Newcombe, “I will press your place as a loaded cornwain presseth its sheaves.”

## CHAP. III.

*Verse 3.* —“except they be agreed.” —“unless they meet by appointment.” Houbigant and Bishop Newcombe.

*Verse 5.* —“ where no gin is for him ;” rather, “ when there is no fowler ;” or, “ when no one is fowling for him.” —“ si nemo erit, qui aucupetur.” Houbigant.

—“ shall one take up a snare ;” rather, with Bishop Newcombe, “ will a snare spring from the ground when it hath caught nothing ?”

*Verse 12.* —“ in the corner of a bed, and in Damascus on a couch ;” rather, “ in the corner of the divan, and in Damascus on the mattress.” See Parkhurst’s Lexicon, ערש, and נטה.

#### CHAP. IV.

*Verse 1.* —“ which say to their masters [rather their owners], bring and let us drink.” Under the image of these kine, the prophet represents a luxurious people, rioting in plenty, and without any religious regard of God, expecting to be supplied by the care of Providence with the means of enjoyment, as if it was the business of God to minister to their wants, as it is the business and interest of a herdsman to wait upon his cattle.

*Verse 2.* —“ take you away with hooks, and your posterity with fish-hooks.” I would render this passage thus: —“ take you away in fishing-boats, and

the last remains of you in corricles." I think רוגה is to be connected both with צנות and סירות, and that each of these words denote a light boat of a particular construction.

*Verse 3.* —“ and ye shall go out at the breaches —into the palace.” I take the word פּרָצִים, notwithstanding its masculine form, to be a participle in apposition with the ‘kine,’ the subject of the verb תִּצְאָנָה. But this confusion of genders prevails throughout the whole discourse. It expresses the hurry with which the people of Samaria should attempt to make their escape from the captivated town. I think, with Mr Parkhurst, that the word הַהֲרָמוּנָה, rendered ‘the palace,’ signifies the butcher’s ‘shambles,’ or perhaps the slaughterhouse, where the beasts are killed and the meat is cut up. See Parkhurst’s Lexicon, הָרִם. I render the whole therefore thus: “Forcing forward, ye shall go out each by the way which lies straight before her, and ye shall be thrown to the shambles, saith Jehovah.”

*Verse 5.* “And offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven, and proclaim and publish the free-offerings.” The first two words of this verse, וְקָטַר מִחֶמֶץ, I join, with Houbigant, to the verse preceding, taking קָטַר, not for a verb, but a noun. Then



in this verse, for וקראי, I read, with Houbigant, קראי, without the ו prefixed. Rather transpose the words וקראו תורה.

4 -----

And bring your sacrifices every morning,

And your tithes every three years, and suffiments of leaven.

5 And proclaim a thanksgiving; publish free-will offerings.

*Verse 13.* —“ that maketh the morning darkness.” Read, with the LXX and Houbigant, ועיפה, and many MSS; —“ that maketh the dusk and the brightness of the dawn.” שחר and עיפה render two different stages of the dawn; שחר, the obscurity of its first beginning, and עיפה its splendor before sunrise.

## CHAP. V.

*Verse 3.* היוצאה, MS 1, with many others.

—“ the city that went out by a thousand, shall leave a hundred,” &c. —“ the city that mustered a thousand shall have but a hundred left, and the city that mustered a hundred, shall have but ten left.” The words following, לבית ישראל, ‘ to the house of Israel,’ are certainly misplaced, and should follow יהוה, ‘ God,’ at the beginning of the verse.

“ For thus the Lord Jehovah to the house of Israel; the city that mustered,” &c.

*Verse 5.* —“ and pass not to Beersheba;” —“ and travel not to Beersheba;” or, “ make no pilgrimages to Beersheba.” The verb עבר expresses going abroad to another country. Beersheba belonged to the kingdom of Judah.

*Verse 8.* I think it is an idiom of Amos’s style to use the third person plural of the verb for the second, when the verb is preceded by one or more participles in apposition with the pronoun of the second person plural understood, as the nominative of the verb.” See 12, chap. vi, 4, 5, 6.

*Verse 9.* “ That strengtheneth,” &c.

Who causeth devastation to laugh at strength,  
And bringeth devastation upon the fortress.

See Parkhurst’s Lexicon, בלג.

*Verse 11.* —“ burthens of wheat.” Or, “ large gifts of wheat.” See Bishop Newcombe. Or, perhaps “ an excessive price for wheat.” See Houbigant.

*Verse 12.* —“ they affect the just, they take a bribe, and they turn aside the poor in the gate.”  
Rather,

Ye who afflict the just, who take a bribe,  
Ye even turn away the poor in the gate.

See Bishop Newcombe.

—“turn away the poor of the gate,” you drive him from the court of justice, without hearing his complaint.

*Verse 13.* —“in that time, for it is an evil time.” —“in such a season, for it is an evil season;” that is, in such a state of government; when such men are in power.

*Verse 16.* —“streets—highways,” rather “squares—streets.”

*Verse 18.* “Wo unto you that desire”—rather, “Wo unto you that affect to desire”—

*Verse 24.* “But let judgment,” &c.

But judgment shall come rolling on like waters,  
And justice like a resistless torrent.

That is, the irresistible judgment and justice of God shall come upon those hypocrites like an inundation, and sweep them away like a torrent.

*Verses 25, 26.* “O house of Israel, will you plead the merits of your forefathers in arrest of judgment? Will you say that, in devout hope that the promises would be fulfilled to their posterity, they were content to wander in the wilderness forty years, and

continued, under all their afflictions, faithfully attached to my service? Alas! your own disobedience has extinguished your claim founded on their loyalty, allowing it to have been as perfect as you would represent it. You have forsaken me, and addicted yourselves to idols.

*Verse 26.* —“ Moloch and Chiun your images, the star of your gods.” If it were certain that Chiun was the proper name of an idol worshipped by the Israelites, I should, without hesitation, adopt the order of the words which is suggested by the LXX, and St Stephen’s quotation of the passage, Acts vii, 43.

ונשאתם את סכות מלככם  
 ואת כוכב כיון אלהיכם  
 צלמיכם אשר עשיתם לכם :

But ye have borne the tabernacle of your Moloch,  
 And the star of Chiun your god ;  
 Your images, which ye made for yourselves.

But I rather think that *כיון* is an appellative, derived from the root *כיה*, denoting an artificial fire, or the hearth on which it was laid, or the grate or machine containing it, which was kept burning in the tabernacles of the idols, or carried in procession before them, in imitation of the divine flame of the Sche-

chinah. The **כִּיבָב**, I take also to denote that artificial glory produced on the persons of the images by the gold with which they were overlaid, and the clusters of gems with which they were studded. See Parkhurst's Lexicon, **כִּוָּה** and **כִּבָּב**.

But ye have carried about the tabernacle of your Moloch,  
 And the hearth of your images;  
 The glittering of your gods of your own workmanship;  
*ad lit.* which ye have made to yourselves.

## CHAP. VI.

*Verse 1.* “Wo to them that are at ease in Sion.”—  
 The version of the LXX gives some colour to Houbigant's conjecture. For **הַשְּׂאֲנִיִּים** he would read **הַשְּׂאֲטִיִּים**. “Wo unto them that despise Sion.”—

—“which are named chief of the nations, unto whom the house of Israel came.” This obscure passage admits, I think, two readings. 1st, Taking **נִקְבִי** actively :

Marking out the first of the nations,  
 Go unto them, O house of Israel.

—“the first of the nations;” the earliest in time, or the first in power. Such as those mentioned in the next verse, with which, according to this render-

ing, this distich is connected. 2d, Taking נִקְבִי passively :

Distinguished as the first of the nations,

Yet ye resort unto them, O house of Israel.

This prophecy might be delivered in the reign of Jeroboam the son of Joash, who “restored the coast of Israel, from the entering of Hamath unto the sea of the plain.” In the reign of this warlike prince, the kingdom of Israel would naturally be in great consideration among the neighbouring kingdoms. And the successes of his predecessor Joash against Amaziah, had set the kingdom of Israel greatly above that of Judah.

—“ye resort.” See note on chap. v. ver. 7 and 8. Notwithstanding your own superiority, you court the alliance, and worship the idols of heathen nations.

*Verse 3.* “Ye,” &c.

Set apart for the evil day,

Yet ye flatter yourselves with the Sabbath of violence.

—“ye flatter yourselves.” Verbum תְּגִישֻׁן “appropinquare facitis;” idem sonat ac “avide expectatis.” Houbigant ad locum. It rather expresses “confidentissime expectatis.”

—“the Sabbath of violence;” the season when

violence and injustice will enjoy its acquisitions of power and opulence in a state of security and repose.

*Verse 10.* —“ that burneth ;” — rather, “ that anointeth.” — See Parkhurst’s Lexicon, סרף.

## CHAP. VII.

*Verse 2.* —“ when they had made an end of eating up the grass of the land ;” rather, “ when they were making an end of eating up the grass of the land,” *i. e.* when they had eaten a great part, and seemed likely to devour the whole.

*Verse 4.* —“ and eat up a part ;” rather, “ and devoured the cultivation,” or, “ the enclosures.”

*Verses 7, 8.* —“ a plumb-line.” The word אַנָּךְ occurs only in this passage, and its meaning is very doubtful. St Jerome renders it by ‘ trulla cæmentarii,’ a mason’s, or bricklayer’s trowel. And he understands the verb עָבֹר in the next verse, as a technical word for mortaring a wall, which is done by passing and re-passing the trowel. “ Et dixit Dominus, Ecce ego ponam trullam in medio populi mei Israel : non adjiciam ultra supra inducere eam.” This is the best interpretation that I have seen of this obscure text. The chief objection I have to it,

is the unusual sense given to the word שם, namely, that of laying down, or laying aside, a tool for which one has no further use. See St Jerome's comment. It is to be observed, besides, that the expression לא אוסיף עוד עבור לו occurs again, chap. viii, 2, where there seems to be no allusion to the mason's or brick-layer's art.

*Verse 9.* —“ the high places ;” — rather, “ the chapels.”

*Verse 12.* —“ O thou seer, go, flee thee away ;” — rather, “ Look to thyself, flee thee away.”

### CHAP. VIII.

*Verses 1, 2.* —“ of summer fruit— 2. —of summer fruit—The end ;” rather, —“ of the summer's latter fruits— 2. —of the summer's latter fruits—The latter end.” Thus the paronomasia of the singular is preserved between קיץ and קץ. See Houb.

*Verse 3.* And the songs of the temple shall be howlings ;” rather, with Bishop Newcombe (who, with Houbigant, for שירית reads שורית), “ And the singing women of the palace shall howl.”

*Verse 8.* —“ and it shall rise up wholly as a flood ; and it shall be cast out and drowned, as by the flood of Egypt.” I take כלה for a noun, the sub-



ject of the עלתה, as it was understood by the LXX. I take the order of construction to be this :

וכלה עלתה כיאר  
מצרים ונגרשה ונשקה

And the subject of the verbs נגרשה and נשקה, I take to be the pronoun feminine understood, rehearsing ארץ.

And destruction shall come up like a river,

Like the river of Egypt. And [the land] shall be flooded and drowned.

—“ shall be flooded.” The participle נגרש is used in Isaiah lvii, 20, as an epithet of the sea, signifying the heaving of the waves upon its surface. Here the land is the subject of the verb ; and the verb predicates, that the land is covered with a flood, raging and rolling in billows like a sea.

## CHAP. IX.

*Verse 2.* “ Though they dig”— “ Though they burrow”—

*Verse 12.* “ That they,” &c. ; rather, “ That they which are called by my name, may possess the remnant of Edom ; and all the Heathen, saith Jehovah, who performeth this.”

## CRITICAL NOTES

ON

## O B A D I A H.



*Verse 4.* “ Though thou exalt thyself like the eagle ;— rather, “ Though thou tower aloft like the eagle.

*Verse 5.* —“ how art thou cut off.” This clause, instead of making a parenthesis here, would stand well at the beginning of the next verse, where Bishop Newcombe places it.

*Verse 7.* —“ a wound ;” rather, “ a trap.”

**SACRED SONGS.**



## THE LAST WORDS OF MOSES.

---

---

DEUT. XXXIII.

1 THIS is the Blessing, with which Moses, the man of God, blessed the Children of Israel, before his death.

PART FIRST.

2 And he said,

I.

Jehovah came from Sinai,

And his uprising was from Seir (A).

He displayed his glory from Mount Paran,

And from amidst the myriads came forth the

Holy One (B).

On his right hand streams (C) [of fire].

## II.

- 3 O loving Father (D) of the peoples,<sup>1</sup>  
 All the saints<sup>2</sup> are in thy hand,  
 And they are seated at thy feet,<sup>3</sup>  
 And receive (G) of thy doctrine.

## III.

- 4 To us<sup>4</sup> Moses (H) prescribed a law.—  
 Jacob is the inheritance of the Preacher.  
 5 And he<sup>5</sup> shall be king in Jeshurun (I),  
 When the chiefs of the peoples (K) gather them-  
 selves together  
 In union with the tribes of Israel.

<sup>1</sup> —“ of the peoples;” *i. e.* of all mankind.

<sup>2</sup> “ All the saints”— The faithful and godly of all nations.  
 See note (E).

<sup>3</sup> —“ at thy feet”— The attitude of disciples, with respect to the master. St Paul was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel. See note (F).

<sup>4</sup> “ To us”— But though all men receive of the Divine instruction in due proportion and at proper seasons, a particular law is now given to us; and this is the reason of the institution of the law, that the knowledge of the true God might be preserved in one family at least, by miracle. That it should be preserved somewhere in the world, was necessary. The degeneracy of mankind was come to that degree, that the true religion could nowhere be

## PART II.

## I.

6 Reuben shall live—he shall not die.<sup>6</sup>

But Simeon (L) few shall be his numbers.

7 And this for Judah : and he said,

---

preserved, otherwise than by miracle. Miracle (perpetual miracle) was not the proper expedient for the general preservation of it, because it must strike the human mind too forcibly, to be consistent with the freedom of a moral agent. A single family therefore was selected, in which the truth might be preserved in a way, which generally was ineligible. And by this contrivance, an ineligible way perhaps was taken of doing a necessary thing, (necessary in the schemes of mercy); but it was used, as wisdom required it should be used, in the least possible extent. The family, which for the general good, were chosen to be the immediate object of this miraculous discipline, and ultimately the vehicle of salvation to all mankind, enjoyed no small privilege, and is here called, with great propriety, the inheritance of the Preacher, and, in St John's Gospel, "his own."

<sup>5</sup> "He shall be king"—*i. e.* he, the Preacher, shall be king. It is evident that the Preacher here is our Lord Jesus Christ, described in his character of the Teacher of the way of salvation. He has been indeed in all ages the Teacher, the person immediately acting in all immediate communications of Jehovah with the sons of men.

<sup>6</sup> Though Reuben was destined for his crimes never to attain

## II.

Hear, O Jehovah, the voice of Judah ;  
 And bring thou unto him the Mighty One of  
 his people :  
 Great for himself shall be his power,  
 And thou shalt be [his] helper against his ene-  
 mies. (M)

§ And to Levi he said,

## III.

Thy Thummim and thy Urim<sup>7</sup> are for the Man  
 (N), thy gracious (o) Benefactor,  
 Whom thou hast proved at Massah,  
 With whom thou contendedst at the waters of  
 Meribah :

---

the pre-eminence which, as the first-born, he might have expected, yet here it is graciously promised that the tribe shall not be extinct.

<sup>7</sup> “ Thy Thummim and thy Urim,” &c. The eternal high priesthood, of which thine is but the type, belongs to him, who will exhibit in the merit of his intercession, in the perfection of his sacrifice, in the clearness of his doctrine, and in the sanctity of his life, all that is adumbrated in the solidity and lustre of the gems upon thy robe.



- 9 For him,<sup>8</sup> who saith of his father and his mother,  
 I have never seen them,  
 And owneth not his brethren,  
 And his sons he acknowledgeth not ;  
 [But saith] Let them observe (r) thy word,  
 And keep thy covenant.
- 10 They shall teach<sup>9</sup> thy precepts unto Jacob,  
 And thy law unto Israel ;  
 They shall place incense at thy nostrils,  
 And holocausts upon thy altar.
- 11 Bless, O Jehovah, his persevering virtue, (q)  
 And be propitious to the work of his hands.

<sup>8</sup> See Math. xii, 46—50 ; Mark iii, 32—35 ; Luke ii, 48, 49 ;  
 viii, 19, 21.

<sup>9</sup> “ They shall teach”— They, who shall have observed God’s  
 word, and kept his covenant, and shall accordingly be acknowledg-  
 ed by Christ as his brethren and his sons, “ they shall teach,” &c.  
 that is, they shall be employed by him in the propagation of his  
 religion, and called even to the priest’s office. But though the  
 Christian priesthood is principally intended, there is, as I conceive,  
 an indirect retrospective allusion to the zeal and loyalty of the tribe  
 of Levi, in discharging the painful duty of executing judgment  
 upon the worshippers of the golden calf, Exod. xxxii, 25—29.  
 Which good conduct of the tribe is called in the next verse, “ his”  
 (that is, Levi’s) “ persevering virtue.”

Smite the loins of them that rise against him,  
And of them that hate him, that they rise no more.

## IV.

12 Of Benjamin he said,  
The well-beloved of Jehovah  
Shall dwell in security close by him,<sup>10</sup>  
Overshadowed by him (R) all the day,  
And dwelling between his shoulders.<sup>11</sup>

## V.

13 And of Joseph he said,  
[A land] of the blessings of Jehovah is his land,  
Of the rich gifts (s) of the skies above, (T)  
Of the dew, and of the abyss beneath.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> —“close by him.” It has been a doubt among the learned, whether the city of Jerusalem, where Jehovah held his residence in the Temple, belonged to the tribe of Judah or of Benjamin. The fact I take to be, that it belonged to the tribe of Judah, because it was captured from the Jebusites by David, who was of that tribe. But the site of it was within the border of the tribe of Benjamin, as their border was originally drawn in the partition of the land by Joshua. At any rate, the city was on the confines of the two tribes, and this is Benjamin’s dwelling close by Jehovah.

<sup>11</sup> See note (R).

<sup>12</sup> The skies above, and the abyss beneath, are the most general physical agents, in producing, according to the varieties of the soil

- 14 Of choice fruits (s) ripened by the Sun,  
 Of delicacies (s), the growth of every moon. (v)
- 15 Of the chief of the primeval mountains, (v)  
 And of the wealth (s) of the everlasting hills.<sup>13</sup>
- 16 And of the riches (s) of the earth and its plenty,  
 And the favour of those who placed their tent (v)  
 in the bush,<sup>14</sup>

on which they have to act, the proper fruits of the several climates; and as such, are mentioned in the first place here. The influence of the skies (the atmosphere) is universally understood and acknowledged. But that of the abyss is not so generally obvious. But the central abyss is certainly the great reservoir which supplies the far greater part of the fresh water, which fertilizes the surface of the earth. What falls in rain is greatly insufficient for the continual supply, much more insufficient for the first formation of great rivers and fresh lakes.

<sup>13</sup> Crowned with vast forests of useful and ornamental timber, maintaining sheep and cattle on their sides, bearing in some parts rich crops of corn, and containing mines and quarries in her bowels. Although the mountains of Palestine were by no means chief of the primeval mountains in height, yet none abounded more in the articles subservient to the common uses of human life. In this respect they were among the chief.

<sup>14</sup> —“of those who placed their tent in the bush.” That is, the persons of the Godhead.

Shall come upon the head of Joseph,  
 And upon the crown of the outcast of his  
 brethren.

- 17 The beauty of the firstling of his herd (w) is his,  
 And his horns are the horns of the buffalo,  
 With them he shall gore the peoples ;  
 They shall pierce (x) [the nations at] the ends  
 of the world :  
 And they are the myriads of Ephraim,  
 And the thousands of Manasseh.

## VI.

- 18 And unto Zebulun (y) he said,  
 Rejoice, O Zebulun, in thy goings abroad,<sup>15</sup>  
 And Issachar in thy tents.<sup>15</sup>
- 19 The peoples they shall call to the mountain,<sup>16</sup>  
 There they shall sacrifice sacrifices of righteous-  
 ness.

---

<sup>15</sup> —“ in thy goings abroad,” in thy foreign commerce. —“ in thy tents,” in thy domestic occupations.

<sup>16</sup> —“ to the mountain ;” *i. e.* to the mountain of God’s house. They shall be principal instruments in converting the Gentiles to the faith and worship of the true God. The gospel was first preached and the first converts made in those parts. See Mat. iv, 12-16.

Verily they shall suck the overflowing of the  
seas,

And the treasures buried in the sand.<sup>17</sup>

## VII.

20 And of Gad he said,

Blessed be he that enlargeth Gad;<sup>18</sup>

Like a lion he repositeth [in his laire]

When he hath torn the shoulder and the head.

21 For he provided a prime part for himself,<sup>19</sup>

When the commissioner (z) appointed the por-  
tions,

<sup>17</sup> —“the overflowing of the seas,” &c. I agree with Dr Durell, and other learned commentators, that the overflowing of the seas, and treasures buried in the sand, are to be understood with particular allusion to the fish affording the purple dye, and the excellent materials for the manufacture of glass, both abounding on these coasts.

<sup>18</sup> “Blessed be he,” &c. Blessed be God, who placeth Gad in a condition of independence, ease, and security, in an ample territory.

<sup>19</sup> —“a prime part for himself.” A settlement in a fine country of rich pasture in the land of Gilead. See Numb. xxxii, 1—5, 33.

He (AA) was housed,<sup>20</sup> and had lodged (BB) the heads of the people :<sup>21</sup>

He executed the just decrees of Jehovah,  
And his judgments, with Israel.<sup>22</sup>

### VIII.

22 And of Dan he said,  
Dan is a lion's whelp,  
Which springeth from Bashan.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>20</sup> "When the commissioner appointed the portions, he was housed." Gad had received his inheritance in the land of Gilead, and was settled in it, before the general division of the promised land. See Numb. xxxiv, 13—15.

<sup>21</sup> —"had lodged the heads of the people;" viz. in the principal cities of the conquered country. See Numb. xxxii, 34—36.

<sup>22</sup> "He executed"— This tribe, in conjunction with the rest of the people of Israel, executed God's judgments upon the Canaanites. See Numb. xxxii, 18—32; Josh. i, 12—16; iv, 12, 13; and xxi, 43; xxii, 6.

<sup>25</sup> The allusion is to the successful expedition of the Danites against the town of Laish, at a great distance from their proper territory, in the northern extremity of the land. But the circumstance of leaping from Bashan, is an adjunct of the lion, not of Dan. For the tribe of Dan had no possessions in Bashan. See note (cc).

## IX.

- 23 And of Naphthali he said,  
 O Naphthali! satisfied with the favour  
 Of Jehovah, replenish'd with his blessings!  
 Possess thou the sea and the south.<sup>24</sup>

## X.

- 24 And of Asher he said,  
 Blessed in children is Asher,  
 He shall be the delight of his brethren,  
 And shall dip his foot in oil.
- 25 Of iron and brass shall be thy sandals, (DD)  
 And in proportion to thy days shall be thy  
 strength.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> —“ the sea and the south.” The territory of Naphthali beginning north of the sea of Tiberias, occupied the whole coast of that sea on the western side down to the very southernmost corner.

<sup>25</sup> —“ in proportion to thy days shall be thy strength.” This I take to be a promise of increasing wealth and prosperity to the very end of their political existence.

## PART III.

## I.

- 26 None is like the God of Jeshurun.  
 Thy helper is he that rideth (EE) the heavens,  
 And the atmosphere (FF) in his might.

## II.

- 27 The [only] refuge is the eternal God ; (GG)  
 The [sure] sustentacle (HH), the everlasting  
 arms.  
 He shall drive out the enemy before thee,  
 And shall say, Perish. (II)
- 28 And Israel shall dwell in security ;  
 The issue of Jacob, all alone,<sup>26</sup>  
 Upon a land of corn and wine.  
 His skies also shall distil the thick small rain. (KK)

## III.

- 29 Happy thou, O Israel ! Who like thee,  
 O people, preserved by Jehovah ;

---

<sup>26</sup> The enemy being driven out and destroyed, Israel shall remain sole possessor of the country, unmolested by his neighbours.



Jehovah (LL), the shield of thy defence, the  
sword of thy proud victories.

Thine enemies with fawning flattery shall make  
court to thee, (MM)

And thou shalt trample on their heights.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> —“ their heights.” That is, their great men ; their warriors,  
and mighty potentates.

# THE SONG OF DEBORAH.

---

JUDGES, CHAP. V.

1 THEN sang Deborah, and Barak the son of Abinoam, on that day, saying,

## PART I.

2 \* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

## I.

3 Hear, O ye kings; Give ear, O ye counsellors;<sup>1</sup>  
To Jehovah I [will sing, even] I will sing,  
I will chaunt the lay to Jehovah God of Israel.

---

<sup>1</sup> —“ counsellors;” *i. e.* counsellors of state, privy counsellors.

II.<sup>1</sup>

- 4 Jehovah, at thy setting forth from Seir,  
 At thy marching from the field of Edom,  
 The earth shook, the heavens also poured down,  
 Even the thick clouds poured down water.
- 5 The mountains melted down before Jehovah,  
 Sinai itself, before Jehovah God of Israel.

## III.

- 6 In the days of Shamgar, the son of Anath,  
 In the days of Jael,<sup>2</sup> the highways were de-  
 serted;<sup>5</sup>  
 And they who had travelled the highways,  
 Travelled roads of perversity.

<sup>2</sup> "In the days of Shamgar—In the days of Jael;" *i. e.* from Shamgar's time to the present; for Jael was contemporary with Deborah. The circumstance, that this state of weakness and disorder prevailed in the nation in Jael's time, is mentioned to account for the zeal with which this heroine was animated for the deliverance of her country,

<sup>5</sup> —"the highways"—*i. e.* the highways of God's commandments. The sequel justifies this exposition.

7 The rural judge ceased<sup>4</sup> in Israel,  
 Ceased, till what time I Deborah arose,  
 What time I arose a mother in Israel.

## IV.

8 He<sup>5</sup> chooseth new gods.—  
 Strait the besieger (B) at the gates.—  
 Is shield seen, or javelin,  
 Among forty thousand in Israel?<sup>6</sup>

## V.

9 The leaders of Israel have my heart ;  
 You, who were foremost in the public cause,  
 bless Jehovah.  
 While (c) so many in Israel declined the honour-  
 able danger,  
 For the volunteering of the people, bless Jehovah.

<sup>4</sup> “ The rural judge ceased.” There was no regular administration of justice. See note (A).

<sup>5</sup> “ He,” *i. e.* Israel.

<sup>6</sup> “ Among forty thousand in Israel ;” *i. c.* in the whole tribe of Naphtali. In the enumeration of the Israelites in the plains of Moab (Numb. xxvi), Naphtali mustered 45,400 effective men. This tribe was probably the immediate and principal subject of Tabin’s oppression.

## VI.

- 10 You that ride the asses with sleek shining skin,<sup>7</sup>  
 You that sit in judgment,  
 And you that walk by the way, concert your  
 measures :
- 11 For the watering places resound with the noise  
 of battalions forming. (D)  
 There they shall celebrate the justice of Jehovah,  
 Justice signally displayed in the cause of Israel.(E)

## VII.

- 12 Strait the people of Jehovah go down by the  
 gates.  
 Awake! Awake Deborah!  
 Awake! Awake! was the general cry. (F)  
 Arise Barak! and captivate  
 Thy captives, O son of Abinoam.

## VIII.

- 13 Then went down the remnant of each bold lead-  
 er's troop; (G)

---

<sup>7</sup> "You that ride the asses," &c. *i. e.* governors of cities. See chap. x, 4, and xii, 14.

<sup>8</sup> —"the remnant." The remains of their forces harassed and wasted under the oppression of the Canaanites.

The people of Jehovah went down with me  
against the mighty. (H)

14 “ From Ephraim was their beginning at Mount  
Amalek,”<sup>9</sup>

After him (I) followed Benjamin with his (I) nu-  
merous troops.

### IX.

From Machir went down the delineators,<sup>10</sup> (K)  
And from Zebulon they that draw the pen of the  
scribe :

15 And the princes of Issachar [went] with Debo-  
rah,

And Issachar strengthened Barak,<sup>11</sup>

“ Sent close at his feet into the valley.”

<sup>9</sup> “ From Ephraim,” &c. This, and all other lines in my translation, marked with inverted commas, and any single words so marked, are taken from Dr Kennicott.

<sup>10</sup> —“ delineators.” Who were the delineators, and how were they different from the scribes? I apprehend, at this time, two sorts of writing, the hieroglyphic and the alphabetic, were both in use among the Jews, as among other people of the east. The latter was indeed by this time an invention of very great antiquity; but the other, far more antient, was not yet laid aside. The delineators I take to be those who excelled in the first; the scribes were such as practised the second.

## X.

“ At the separation of Reuben great were the impressions of the heart ! ”

16 Wherefore didst thou abide between the hillocks ? (L)

To listen to the shrill bleatings of the flocks ?

At the separation of Reuben great were the searchings of the heart.

## XI.

17 Gad (M) kept close at home upon the banks of Jordan.

And Dan, wherefore slunk he like a coward to his ships ? (N)

Asher sat still by the haven of the sea,

And kept close at home beside his creeks.

## XII.

18 “ Zebulon was the people, who exposed their lives to death,

“ And Naphtali on the heights of the country.”

---

<sup>11</sup> “ Issachar strengthened Barak.” Barak’s own force consisted of the men of Zebulon and Naphtali. See chap. iv, 6—10. The tribe of Issachar rose at Deborah’s call, and was an addition to Barak’s strength, forming his rear.

## PART II. THE BATTLE.

## I.

19 The kings came—they were brought to action ; (o)  
 Then were the kings of Canaan brought to action,  
 In Tanaach, by the waters of Megiddo.  
 No ransom was taken in money. (P)

## II.

20 From heaven the stars were engaged in the  
 battle,<sup>12</sup>  
 From their orbits (Q) they were engaged in the  
 battle with Sisera.

---

<sup>12</sup> Josephus says, that as soon as the two armies were engaged, a heavy storm came on, with much rain and hail ; that the wind set to drive the rain in the faces of the Canaanites, so that they could not see before them ; that the wet rendered the bows and the slings useless, and the cold benumbed the soldiers to that degree, that they could not strike with their swords, while the Israelites suffered little from the storm, the wind sitting in their backs.—*Antiq. lib. v, c. 25.* Certainly the song alludes to extraordinary commotions in the atmosphere, produced by the influence of the heavenly bodies.



- 21 The river Kishon swept them away,  
 The overtaking (R) river, the river Kishon.  
 O Deborah (s), thou tramplest upon strength!

## III.

- 22 Then were the hoofs of the horses "battered,"  
 By the scamperings,<sup>13</sup> the scamperings of his  
 mightiest chiefs. (T)

## PART III. THE VICTORY.

## I.

- 23 Curse ye Meroz, saith the Angel of Jehovah,  
 Curse ye bitterly the inhabitants of that place,<sup>14</sup>  
 Because they came not to the help of Jehovah,  
 To the help of Jehovah against mighty warriors.

## II.

- 24 Blessed above women  
 Shall Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, be;  
 Above women in the tent shall she be blessed.

<sup>13</sup> —"the scamperings," namely, in flight. —"his," *i. e.* Sisera's.

<sup>14</sup> What place it was, is totally unknown.

25 He asked water, she gave him milk ;  
 She presented butter in a princely bowl.

### III.

26 Her hand she stretches it forth to the nail,  
 Her right hand to the workman's hammer.  
 She hammers Sisera, making deep impression on  
 his head,  
 And she drives in the nail, and pierces quite  
 through his temples.

### IV.

27 Between her feet he sunk, he fell, he stretched  
 himself at his length,<sup>15</sup>  
 Between her feet he sunk, he fell ;  
 Where he sunk, there he fell, a ruin !

### V.

28 Through the window looked out the mother of  
 Sisera,  
 And cried through the lattice,

---

<sup>15</sup> —“ he sunk, he fell, he stretched himself at his length.”  
 The three verbs describe the progressive phenomena of violent death. First, the body sinks in an heap ; then falls to the ground ; and, lastly, stretches itself at full length.

Why lingers his chariot to return?

Why so tardy the wheels of his chariot?

## VI.

29 One of the most accomplished of her ladies (u)  
- answers her,

She even returns answer to herself;

30 Are they not conquering? dividing the spoil?

A delicious damsel the prize of each (v) valiant  
chief.

A particoloured piece [is] Sisera's prize,

A particoloured piece of embroidery,

A particoloured piece of double embroidery,

“For my neck a prize!”

## VII.

So perish all thine enemies, O Jehovah,

But let them that love thee be as the rising of  
the Sun in his full strength.

## HANNAH'S THANKSGIVING.

---

1 SAMUEL II, 1—10.

### I.

1 My heart leaps with joy through Jehovah,  
 My horn is exalted by Jehovah ;  
 My mouth is opened wide against mine enemies,  
 For by thy deliverance I am made joyful.

### II.

2 There is none holy like Jehovah,  
 Verily there is none just but thee:  
 There is none strong like our God.

### III.

3 Wrangle no more: talk no more so lofty, so  
 lofty,  
 Let perversity no more issue from your mouth:  
 For Jehovah is the God universal in knowledge,  
 And by him events are regulated.]

## IV.

- 4 The bows of mighty warriors he withholds from  
action,  
But they that tottered as they went are girt with  
strength.
- 5 They that were fed to the full hire themselves  
out for bread,  
But the hungry are ceased for ever.  
The barren hath born seven children,  
While the prolific woman is waxed feeble.

## V.

- 6 Jehovah killeth and maketh alive,  
He bringeth down to the grave, and raiseth up.
- 7 Jehovah maketh poor and maketh rich,  
He bringeth low, he also setteth high.

## VI.

- 8 Raising up the poor from the dust,  
He exalteth the beggar from the dunghill,  
To seat them with nobles,  
And he will cause them to inherit the throne of  
glory :  
For to Jehovah belong the instruments of the  
earth's solidity,  
And he hath set the world upon them.

## VII.

9 The footsteps of his Saint he will guard,  
But the impious shall be kept quiet in darkness,  
For not by strength shall any one become mighty.

## VIII.

10 Jehovah ! his adversary shall be broken to pieces ;  
Against him he shall thunder in the heavens ;  
Jehovah shall judge the extremities of the earth,  
And he shall give strength to his king,  
And exalt the horn of his anointed one,

## DEATH OF SAUL AND JONATHAN.

2 SAMUEL I, 17—26.

### I.

- 17 AND this was the Lamentation of David over  
Saul and Jonathan his son.
- 18 And he commanded, that the children of Israel  
should learn it, (*viz.*)  
The bow. Behold it is written in the Book of  
Jasher.\*
- 19 O pride of Israel, upon the heights of thy own  
country slain,†  
How are mighty warriors fallen!

---

\* See Lowth's Prelections.

† Or, "O pride of Israel, slain upon thy native hills."

20 Tell it not in Gath,  
 Publish not the tidings in the streets of Ascalon,  
 Lest the daughters of the Philistim rejoice,  
 Lest frantic joy transport the daughters of the  
 uncircumcised.

## II.

21 Ye hills of Gilboa, upon you be neither rain nor  
 dew,  
 Nor harvest heaps for spontaneous offering;  
 For there was thrown away the shield of mighty  
 warriors,  
 The shield of Saul—armour anointed with oil.  
 22 The bow of Jonathan turned not back,  
 The sword of Saul returned not,  
 Till drenched with the blood of the slain,  
 Glutted with the marrow of the mighty.

## III.

23 Saul and Jonathan were united in affection,  
 They were the delight of each other in their lives,  
 And in their death they were not separated.  
 Fleeter they were than eagles,  
 Stronger than lions.



IV.

- 24 Daughters of Israel! weep over Saul,  
Over him, who clothed you in scarlet, with all the  
luxuries of dress,  
Over him, who covered your garments with orna-  
ments of gold.
- 25 How are mighty warriors fallen in the battle!  
O Jonathan, slain upon thy native hills!

V.

- 26 It grieveth me for thee, my brother Jonathan.  
Pleasant beyond measure hast thou been to me;  
Inestimable thy friendship, beyond the love of  
women.
- How are mighty warriors fallen!  
The weapons of war destroyed!

## THE LAST WORDS OF DAVID.

---

2 SAMUEL XXIII, 1—7.

### I.

1 DAVID, the son of Jesse, saith,  
 And the man saith who hath been raised up on  
 high,  
 The anointed of the God of Jacob,  
 And the sweet psalmist of Israel :<sup>1</sup>

### II.

2 The Spirit of Jehovah speaketh by me,  
 And his word is upon my tongue ;  
 3 The God of Israel saith,  
 To me speaketh the Rock of Israel.

---

<sup>1</sup> Literally, "He that is sweet in the songs of Israel." — "Israeliticorum carminum deliciæ." Castalio.

## III.

The JUST ONE ruleth<sup>2</sup> over men,

He ruleth<sup>3</sup> *by the fear* of God.

- 4 And as the light of the morning [he<sup>4</sup>] shall arise,  
The sun of a morning without clouds,  
Shining after rain upon the verdure of the  
ground.<sup>5</sup>
- 

<sup>2</sup> Or, "shall rule"— and so in the line following.

<sup>3</sup> בִּירָאָה, MSS.

<sup>4</sup> "He," the Just One. I see no necessity for inserting Jehovah here, to be the nominative of the verb יִזְרֶה. The ellipsis of the pronoun of the third person is frequent in all languages, when the subject of the verb cannot be mistaken, which is the case here, when the lines are properly divided.

<sup>5</sup> "Shining after rain upon the verdure of the ground."  
—"Shining upon." מִנְּגִהָ, participle hiphil of the verb נִגַּה.  
—"after rain." The air is generally in the purest state after heavy showers in the spring, and the Sun shines with heightened lustre. —"the verdure of the ground." Literally, "the young herbage from the ground." This mention of the herbage, or verdure, presents the idea of spring. What an assemblage of pleasing images! the dawn—sunrise—sunshine after rain—the vernal season.

## IV.

- 5 Is not my house established with God,  
 Inasmuch as he hath settled with me an everlasting covenant,  
*Regular and guarded*<sup>6</sup> in every article.  
 Verily my salvation is complete, complete is my wish,<sup>7</sup>  
 Will he not make him to grow?<sup>8</sup>

## V.

- 6 The profane<sup>9</sup> are all of them, like the thorn, to be extirpated,<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup> “Regular and guarded.” ערוכה—ושמורה. I take these words for forensic terms.

<sup>7</sup> For חפץ, I read, with Houbigant, חפצי.

<sup>8</sup> “For God shall make him to grow.” For יצמיח : ובליעל, I read בליעל : יצמיחו, taking כי again interrogatively. —“Him to grow.” “Him,” that is, the Just One, the subject of the third stanza, and the principal subject of the covenant here mentioned, who is perpetually spoken of in prophecy under the image of a growing plant or branch. See Jer. xxxiii, 15; xxiii, 5; Zach. iii, 8; vi, 12; Is. iv, 2. In these passages, and particularly in Jer. xxiii, 5, an allusion may well be supposed to this original prophecy of David.

For they will not be taken by the hand.<sup>11</sup>

7 And whoever shall approach unto them shall be filled

With iron and the wood of a spear,<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> “The profane.” Houbigant is mistaken when he says the word בליעל is never used but when attached to some noun substantive, as איש, בן, דבר, &c. It is evidently used as a collective in Nahum ii, 1. As a collective, the plurals יקהו, כלהם, &c. are properly joined with it. The insertion therefore of the word בני is unnecessary. Neither the sense nor the syntax demand it; and it is without authority either of MSS or versions. בליעל, ‘the profligate, the profane, the graceless, the reprobate.’

<sup>10</sup> —“the thorn to be extirpated.” בקוץ מנר, quasi spina evellenda.

<sup>11</sup> “For they will not be taken by the hand.” They will not accept of the Redeemer’s help.

<sup>12</sup> “And whoever——with iron and the wood of a spear.” Dr Kennicott very properly supposes an allusion to the iron-spikes which fastened our Lord’s body to the cross, and the spear which pierced his side. But as these sons of Belial persecuted not our Lord only, but others, the first preachers of Christianity who came unto them, as he had done, with words of friendly admonition and reproof, as before the times of the gospel they persecuted the prophets who were sent to them upon the like merciful errand, I think the word איש is rather to be rendered by the indefinite pronoun,

But in the sabbath<sup>15</sup> they shall be utterly burnt with fire.

---

‘siquis,’ or ‘whoever,’ for which it often stands, than by ‘*The Man,*’ as Dr Kennicott renders it, understanding it specifically of Christ. Prophecy, I think, rather delights in very general expressions, with very particular allusions.

<sup>15</sup> —“in the sabbath;” *i. e.* in the end of all things: that final sabbatism of the people of God, of which the apostle speaks in Hebrews iv, 9.

## CRITICAL NOTES

UPON

## THE LAST WORDS OF JACOB.

---



---

 GENESIS, CHAP. XLIX.
*Verse 2.*

“COME together”— This introductory couplet, composed of tetrameters, containing seventeen letters each, is the proem of the whole song.

*Verses 3, 4.*

“Reuben,” &c. Reuben’s part consists of two stanzas, each a triplet. The first enumerates the privileges of his birth-right; the second declares his crime, and denounces his punishment.

(A) “First fruit of my manly vigour.” ראשית אוני. That this expression signifies an eldest son is certain. It occurs in this sense in Deut. xxi, 17;

Ps. lxxviii, 51, and cv, 36. In the two last places it is rendered by the LXX, ἀπαρχὴν πονου, or πονων. That פִּי<sup>8</sup> particularly signifies the generative vigour of the male in procreation, see my Hosea, Critical Notes, chap. ix, note (F).

(B) —“in might.” So I render פִּי, not ‘violence.’ By rendering it ‘violence,’ Dr Durell has, in my judgment, destroyed the principal beauty of this part of the poem; which consists in a sudden transition from the enumeration of Reuben’s privileges to the denunciation of his punishment. To preserve this, there should not be the least intimation of his ill desert in the first triplet. The noun פִּי primarily signifies the natural strength and vigour of any thing, animate or inanimate: but, applied to men, it more frequently denotes that union of bodily strength and mental valour, which is rendered by the English word ‘might.’

(C) “Unrestrained”—פָּרוּ. Whether this word, in its natural and primary sense, express the fluidity of water in general, or the rapidity of a torrent, seems uncertain. It is difficult therefore to decide whether it be used here to signify the levity of



Reuben's character, as a man of pleasure and gallantry, or the unbridled impetuosity of his passions. The LXX take it in the latter sense. They seem to have followed the reading of the Samaritan פחות, which Dr Durell too adopts: "Thou hast been unrestrained."

*Verses 5—7.*

"Simeon and Levi"— To Simeon and Levi three stanzas are allotted. The first, an introductory couplet; the second, two couplets declaring their crime; the third, two couplets denouncing their punishment.

(D) —"true brethren." אחים. —"tam moribus quam partu gemelli. Non tam germanitatem respicit, quam simile ingenium." Jun.

(E) "Their swords"— If the noun מברתיהם be referred to the root מבר, and the sense be fetched from the Chaldee dialect, in which מבר signifies 'desponsare,' (see Castell), מברתיהם may signify 'their marriage-contracts;' and the sense will be

"Their marriage-contracts are instruments of violence."

Thus the passage is interpreted by Rivetus, and nearly to the same purpose by Kennicott. This exposition agrees well with the story. But I greatly prefer the rendering I have given, as the best of all, because the simplest, and brought out of the words in their genuine Hebrew sense :

“ Their swords are weapons of violence.”

—“ swords.” The noun *מכרה* (plural of *מכרה*) I refer to the root *כרה*, ‘ to cut, or stab ;’ thence *מכרה*, any cutting or stabbing instrument, ‘ a knife,’ or ‘ sword ;’ and hence the Greek *μαχαίρα*.

(F) —“ my valour.” *כברי*, ‘ my liver.’ Compare Ps. lvii, 9. But perhaps *כבר* may signify any of the larger entrails, as well as the liver, especially the heart. The liver, however, was probably esteemed the seat of the passions in general, before men refined so far, as to make the heart the seat of the mental passions, and the liver that of the appetites only. See Æsch. Agamemnon, line 801.

(G) —“ the prince.” For *שור*, I read, with Dr Kennicott, *שר*. Note, that the words *איש* and *שר*, which are evidently antithetic in this distich, are to be understood collectively of classes, not of indivi-

duals; אִישׁ, ‘plebem;’ שָׂר, ‘domum regiam.’ Simeon and Levi, in the affair of Sichem, made slaughter of the common people; and the royal family they extirpated root and branch.

*Verses 8—12.*

“Judah”— Judah’s part takes up four entire stanzas. The first, a triplet, declaring the superiority of the tribe of Judah in military prowess: the second, composed of two couplets; in which the same subject is amplified, and the strength and grandeur of the kingdom of Judah are signified, under images taken from the actions of the lion. The third stanza is again composed of two couplets, declaring the duration of the political existence of Judah, as the head of the true church. The fourth, in three couplets, describes the fertility of his territory.

(H) —“lion’s dam.” לְבִיא, properly a lioness suckling her young.

(I) —“his foal.” The Samaritan, and several MSS of Dr Kennicott’s, read עִירו, with the masculine suffix.

*Verse 13.*

“Zabulon”— Zabulon has a single stanza, a triplet, describing the situation of his district.

(K) —“a haven for ships.” I read, with the Samaritan, and many MSS, אַנְיוֹת. Dr Durell, in his note upon this passage, maintains that the Carmel, which is mentioned in the book of Joshua as the boundary of Asher’s portion on the south-west, is not the mountain of that name, but a plain, which, in later times, was called the Plain of Sharon. This plain lies on the northern side of the river Belus. And if this was the extremity of Asher’s land, the fine haven, between the mouths of the Belus and the Kishon, was in Zabulon’s portion.

*Verses 14, 15.*

“Issachar”— Issachar has a single stanza, of three couplets, describing the genius of his posterity, their territory, and their occupation.

(L) —“two panniers.” משפתיים. I refer this word to the root שפה, which signifies ‘to stick up,’ or ‘to be prominent.’ Hence the substantive משפה may signify any gibbosity, or prominence. And the

panniers of the laden ass form prominences, sticking up on each side above the back of the animal, when he is pleased to lie down upon his belly; which is the posture here described. Possibly some oblique allusion may be intended, in this word, to the mountains, which on two sides, on the north and on the south, bounded the fair valley of Jesrael, in which Issachar had his portion.

(M) —“the settlement.” מנחה. In this sense the LXX seem to have taken the word; for they render it by ἀναπαυσιν, by which is to be understood, not the condition, but the place of rest.

(N) —“tribute service.” I have endeavoured to preserve the ambiguity of the original expression. It seems uncertain whether the words מם עבר signify a tribute paid, instead of a service to be performed; or a service performed, instead of a tribute to be paid. See Josh. xvi, 10, and 1 Kings ix, 21. Perhaps they may occasionally denote either; and the first sense seems the best adapted to this place.

The LXX have και ἐγένθη αὐτης γεωργος, as if, instead of למם, their copies had לאיש. This reading is well consistent with what precedes. Issachar,

finding himself in a fine champaign country, devotes himself, according to the LXX, to agriculture.

*Verses 16—18.*

“Dan”— Dan has two stanzas, and a monadic close. The first stanza consists of a single couplet, declaring that Dan, though the son of a slave, should be upon a footing with the sons of Leah and Rachel. The second, of two couplets, expressing the genius of the Danites for stratagem. The monadic close, a devout declaration of the patriarch’s faith in the promises of the final deliverance.

*Verse 19.*

“Gad”— Gad has a single stanza, of one couplet, describing the tribe, from its extreme situation, as exposed to frequent incursions of invaders, but always making reprisal on the enemy in his retreat.

*Verses 20, 21.*

Asher and Naphtali have each a single stanza of one couplet, describing the fertility of the territory and the opulence of the tribes.

(O) —“marrow of bread.” For שמנה לחמו, I

read שמן הלחמו, that ה may be the sign of the genitive case, and the ם merely paragogic.

(P) —“ spreading oak.” אילה, ‘ the evergreen oak,’ or ‘ ilex.’ The participle שלחה, which applied to a hind, might properly render ‘ let loose ;’ applied to a tree, expresses the circumstance of its extending its branches in all directions.

(Q) —“ graceful shoots.” אמיר is the ‘ extreme shoot’ at the top of a growing tree ; and אמר seems to be used here in the same sense, if indeed the true reading be not אמירי. The poetry of any language will hardly afford a more pleasing image of strength and vigour, than an ilex with an ample head, still putting forth fresh shoots. Bochart was, I believe, the first who thought of this interpretation of this distich.

*Verses 22—26.*

“ Graceful is the person of Joseph” — Joseph has four stanzas. The first, a triplet, commending the beauty of his person. The second, composed of three couplets, describing the difficulties with which he had struggled through the malice of his enemies,

and referring his deliverance and exaltation to the immediate interposition of Providence. The two last stanzas, consisting of five lines each, promise a continual manifestation of the favour of heaven in all manner of temporal blessings.

(R) “ Graceful is the person,” &c. For פִּרְתָּהּ, I read, with Houbigant, and many of the best of the Jewish critics, פִּאֲרָתָהּ. The verb פָּאֵר signifies ‘ to decorate, to adorn, to make glorious.’ Hence come the nouns פֶּאֵר, תִּפְאָרֶת, תִּפְאָרָה, which signify ‘ beauty, glory, ornamental dress,’ in general; or, in particular, certain ornamental parts of the head-dress. Hence I think that פִּאֲרָהּ, or פִּאֲרָתָהּ, may denote that attractive grace of person, which is the result of natural beauty heightened by the ornaments of dress. For this we have no one word in our language. It is true, that פִּאֲרָהּ occurs in the sense of ‘ a bough,’ in which our public translation takes it in this place. But this sense of the word is figurative, because boughs are the ornamental dress of trees.

Dr Durell’s interpretation may seem, in some degree, countenanced by the parallel place of the last words of Moses, where Joseph is described under the image of a young bullock. But where is the



propriety of setting the bullock by a well? He would be more fitly placed in a rich meadow. The necessity we shall be under, of placing our bullock by a well, seems an insuperable objection to that interpretation. Unless indeed it could be supposed, that the meadow might be expressed by the well, or spring of water, which might be in the meadow, and might contribute to the richness of the pasture. But this appears to me a very harsh metonymy.

(S) “ Upon him are the eyes ” — Although I render, as if the reading were עליו עין, yet I propose not any alteration of the text. עליו עין would render that ‘ eyes are upon him ; ’ עין עליו renders that ‘ he is under the eyes, ’ which is the very same thing. Either expression denotes that he was the object of the attentive and interested inspection of the ladies.

(T) — “ when they walk. ” The plural noun בנות may seem to require that the adjective זערה should be plural. But the anomaly of the construction is not indefensible. In the best Greek writers, particularly the Attic, when two nouns occur one under the government of the other, it is not unusual, for an adjective, which ought to agree wholly with the

one, to be made to agree partly with the one, and partly with the other. Thus, — *ἀκουα φθογγον ὀρνιθων κακω κλαζοντας οἰστρω*. Soph. Antig. lin. 1013. Here *ὀρνιθων* is under the government of *φθογγον κλαζοντας*, which should entirely in concord with the former agree in number with that, but with the latter in case. So in the Hebrew, *בנות* being under the government of *עין*, the adjective *צערה*, which ought to agree entirely with *בנות*, is made to agree in number with *עין*.

(U) “They have borne him ill will—shafts.” In this couplet I have taken the liberty of making a conjectural emendation, which consists however merely in a transposition of the words, which in the printed Bibles stand thus ;

וימררהו ורבו וישטמהו בעלי חצים

Here are five words composed of twenty-six letters, which are twice as many as are usually contained in any couplet of trimeters of the mean length, and more almost by a third part than are to be found in any tetrameter in this poem. Of these five words therefore, since they would make a single line too long, a couplet must be formed. But, preserving the order in which they stand, it is impossible to

form them into two lines, which may be nearly of an equal length. For if the three verbs be put into one line, and the two nouns into another, the first line will contain eighteen letters, the second no more than eight. Again, if the first line be formed of the two first verbs, and the third verb with the two nouns be thrown into the second, we shall then have but eleven letters in the first line, while in the second we shall find fifteen. An inequality so rarely to be found in the corresponding lines of the couplet, that wherever it occurs, it may be considered as a symptom of a corrupted text. I therefore venture to change the order of the words, for one which seems more natural, at the same time that it is more consistent, with what we know of the laws of Hebrew verse :

וישטמהו וימררהו

ורבו בעלי חצים

Thus we have a couplet, of which the first line has fourteen letters, and the second twelve. But the first word of the second line, the verb **ורבו**, evidently wants two letters, to bring it to an exact correspondence with the two other verbs; namely, the **י**, the characteristic of the tense, and the **ה** of the suffix. Restore these two letters, (for which we

have the authority of the Samaritan, which gives (ויריבהו), writing וירבהו, and the two lines become exactly equal.

In the order in which these five words stand in the printed Hebrew text, the noun בעלי appears to be the common subject of all the three verbs. But if that order be the true one, in which I place them, the noun בעלי is the peculiar subject of the verb ירבהו, and the other verbs have the indefinite nominative understood; and the literal rendering of the couplet is this:

But they have borne him ill will, they have despitefully treated him,

The masters of archery have taken aim at him.

—“taken aim at him.” So I render וירבהו. The LXX have expressed the same sense; — εὐσεβῶς αὐτῷ.

(V) —“recoiled.” תשב from שוב, not from ישב.

(W) “While the arms of his assailants were enfeebled.” This interpretation has the sanction of the version of the LXX, and all the antient versions, except the Vulgate. In the Hebrew text we find only these two words ויפּוּ זרעֵי. The shortness of the line, as well as the form of the word זרעֵי, which

is evidently in construction, requires that a third word should follow **וְרַעִי**. If **יְרִי** be brought back from the following line, the equality of the lines of the next couplet will be destroyed, without any advantage to the sense of this; for “the arms of his hands” is, in any language, an absurd, an inexplicable image. It seems therefore almost certain, that a word in this place, under the government of **וְרַעִי**, has been lost out of the text. To restore it, it will be necessary to ascertain whose arms are the subject of the proposition, whether Joseph’s, or his enemies; and this perhaps cannot otherwise be ascertained, than by settling distinctly, what the proposition is, of which arms are the subject. According to modern interpreters, the proposition is, that arms were strengthened; which can be understood of no arms but Joseph’s. According to the LXX, the Syriac, the antient Italic, Jonathan, and the Samaritan, the proposition is exactly the reverse, that arms were weakened; which can be understood of no arms but those of Joseph’s enemies. According to the Vulgate, the proposition is, that arms were released from fetters; which, again, can be understood of no arms but Joseph’s. The version of the Vulgate, and the other antient versions, although they present

such different senses, seem to have been all formed upon one and the same reading of the Hebrew text; in which the word, that should be under the government of **וְרָעַי**, was wanting, as it now is; but the verb in some other way expressed relaxation.

Ludovicus Capellus, and Houbigant, in the persuasion that **פָּנָה**, the root of **יִפְנוּ**, the verb we have in our modern text, predicates corroboration, concluded, that some other verb occupied the place of this in the copies which the antient translators used, and set themselves to guess what that other verb should be. Capellus thinks it was **יִפְצוּ**. Houbigant prefers **יִפְנוּ**.

But upon what ground has the sense of strengthening been affixed to **יִפְנוּ**, the word of our present text? As a verb, the root **פָּנָה** occurs nowhere in the whole Bible but in this single passage. The participle hophal **מוֹפְנֵי** occurs once (1 Kings x, 18) as an epithet of gold. The participle piel **מוֹפְנֵהוּ** occurs once (2 Sam. vi, 16), where some lexicographers give it the sense of exerting strength or agility. But it is applied to King David dancing before the ark, and seems to express the extravagant frantic motions of a man dancing for joy; a sense more allied to relaxation, than to strength or firmness. Wherever else

the word occurs, it is as the noun  $\text{זָהָב}$ , signifying the purest gold, and nothing else. Hence I should conjecture, that the primary meaning of the verb is to refine a metal by fusion in the crucible: and that that ‘best gold,’ with which Solomon overlaid his ivory throne (1 Kings x, 18), was properly fused gold; that is, gold which had undergone fusion in the assayer’s furnace, and had so been brought to its greatest purity. Now, if the primary sense of the word be ‘to melt down,’ that is, to destroy solidity and cohesion; its figurative sense will naturally be ‘to relax, to weaken, to enfeeble.’ And there will be no occasion to feign a variety of the antient copies to reconcile the antient versions with the Hebrew text. Nor will there be any reason to suppose, that the author of the Vulgate had a reading of his own. It only appears, that he has interpreted the same word less accurately. He understood it to signify ‘dissolvere;’ but imagined that it might express a dissolution of external confinement, as well as of natural strength; not aware, that the former sort of dissolution has no connection with the primary meaning of the word.

Admitting therefore that we have in the version of the LXX (with which, as hath been observed, the

Syriac, the old Italic, Jonathan, and the Samaritan, agree) the true exposition of the verb יפּוּ, the proposition is, that arms were enfeebled. The arms, of which this is affirmed, must have been the arms of Joseph's enemies; and of those persons the lost word, under the government of ורעי, must have been descriptive. If I could allow myself to offer a conjectural emendation, without the authority of any MS, and with the authority of the antient versions against me, I should say that צררי is the word to be supplied: a word in sound, as well as letters, so nearly resembling ורעי, that it might the more easily be lost. But although I have nothing but conjecture for the word, and for that reason would not venture to insert, I have the authority of all the antient versions, except the Vulgate, for rendering as if it were inserted.

(X) "His strength is from the strength"— יריו מירי. See a similar use of ירים, in the plural, for 'strength, power, or ability,' in Joshua viii, 20.

(Y) There is something so animated in the elliptical form of these sentences, and in the sudden transition from the third to the second person; the



diction, though so highly figured, is so perspicuous ; and the dependence of the latter sentences upon the preceding is so obvious ; that it is amazing that the learned Houbigant should find any difficulty in the sense or construction of this passage.

(Z) —“ from the Almighty God.” For ואת שדי, some MSS have ואל שדי, and some מאל שדי. See De Rossi.

(AA) The three last lines of this stanza stand thus :

ברכת שמים מעל  
ברכת תהום רבצת תחת  
ברכת שדים ורחם

The middle line of the three is so much longer than either of the other two, and indeed than any other line of this stanza ; that I am inclined to think that the order of the lines has been inverted, and that what is now the last should precede the other two, that so the long line may close the stanza.

With blessings of the breasts and of the womb,  
With blessings of the heavens above,  
With blessings of the deep, which lie beneath,

*Verse 27.*

“ Benjamin ”— Benjamin has a single stanza, a triplet, descriptive of a warlike, but ferocious character.

## CRITICAL NOTES

ON

THE SONG OF THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL

UPON

THE OVERTHROW OF PHARAOH

IN THE RED SEA.

---

EXODUS, CHAP. XV, 1—21.

I CONCEIVE that this song was sung in stanzas, by Moses and the children of Israel. The men-singers were followed by the women in procession, with Miriam at their head; and at the end of every stanza, the women came in with the chorus, Miriam leading as the first female voice. This general idea of this grand musical performance I gather from the 20th and the 21st verses of this chapter. I have given the division of the stanzas by conjecture; and have marked the places where the chorus, as I conceive, came in, by the word chorus put between brackets.

(A) —“ my song.” The word זמרה is properly applied only to a song, composed in measured verse, and divided into musical bars.

(B) —“ and I will make him my home.” וְאָנֹכִי. That is, secure of his protection, I shall not be impatient for a settlement. See Parkhurst, נוה. The sentiment is the same, although the words are different, which occurs in Psalm xc, 1 : —“ Lord,” says the psalmist, speaking in the person of the Israelites, “ thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations.” —“ Strangers and pilgrims, as we hitherto have been in every successive generation from the days of Abraham ; first, sojourners in Canaan ; then, bondmen in Egypt ; now, wanderers in this dreary waste ; we nevertheless find the comforts of a home and settlement in thy miraculous protection.” The same image is used in Deut. xxxiii, 27. Nor is it unknown to profane writers. Sophocles, in the *Œdipus in Colon*, makes *Œdipus*, speaking of the comfort he received from the attention of his daughters, use these words :

Κἀκ' ταινδε δ' οὔσαιιν παρθενοιν—

—————και τροφας ἔχω βιον,

Και γης ἀδειαν, και γενους ἐπαρχεσιν. l. 458.

—*της ἀδείας* is the security of condition of a person living unmolested in his native land. Here it is to be taken figuratively. Œdipus says, that, by means of his virgin daughters, he was not only supplied with the necessaries of life, and had that support and assistance, which he might have expected from his male relations, but that their affectionate attention to him compensated the loss of a secure settlement in his native land; insomuch that, in his wandering state, he hardly missed the comforts of his home. The image however, though of the same kind, is not equally bold with those of Moses and the Psalmist.

(C) —“ he led into the sea.” As he had promised, chap. xiv, 17, 18. See Parkhurst, ירה, II.

(D) —“ the coral sea.” The sea, commonly called the Red Sea, is supposed to take its Hebrew name of ים סוף from the quantity of weeds with which it abounds; for סוף is generally supposed to signify ‘ sea-weed.’ And it has been proposed to render this Hebrew name of the Arabian Gulf in English, ‘ the Sea of Weeds,’ or, ‘ the Weedy Sea.’ But Mr Bruce positively asserts, that, in the Red

Sea, (of which, as Mr Parkhurst observes, he had seen the whole extent), he never “saw a weed of any sort.” He therefore delivers it as his opinion, that “it was from the large trees or plants of white coral, spread everywhere over the bottom of the Red Sea, perfectly in imitation of plants on land, that the Red Sea obtained its Hebrew name.” The word  $\eta\sigma$  may certainly signify any aquatic plant continually swept and brushed by the waves; not weeds particularly. And Mr Bruce’s opinion is confirmed by the description which Strabo and Pliny give of the *plants* growing at the bottom of the Red Sea, which agrees well with corallines, but not at all with weeds. —Καθ’ ὅλην δε την της Ερυθρας παραλιαν, κατα βυθου φυεται δενδρα ὁμοια δαφνη και ἔλαια, ταις μεν ἀμπωτεσιν ὄλα ὑπερφανη γιγνομενα, ταις δε πλημμυρισιν ἐσθ’ ὅτε ὄλα καλυπτομενα· και ταυτα της ὑπερκειμενης γης ἀδενδρου οὔσης. Strabo, lib. xvi, p. 766, edit. Casaub. And Pliny says expressly, that the productions of the bottom of the Erythrean Sea were not “*alga*,” but “*frutex*.” See Pliny, lib. xiii, cap. 25. I render therefore “the Coral Sea.”

(E) —“the raging waves.” תהמת. The generality of the old lexicographers make the noun תהמת

itself a root. But I am persuaded it comes from the root הוים, ‘to disturb;’ and in niphah, ‘to be disturbed, to be in confusion, to make a roaring noise:’ and that the noun so derived, when applied to the sea, involves the idea of the perpetual agitation and tumult of its waves.

(F) —“the wide waters.” מצולה. The word is generally rendered ‘bottom.’ But deriving the word from the root צל, or צלל, (from which also, with Mr Parkhurst, I deduce צולה), I think it rather signifies the broad covering of a wide bottom, than the bottom itself; and, applied to the sea, involves the idea of its vast breadth.

(G) —“shook them off.” נערמו. Our public translation [“were gathered together”] supposes this verb to be the third person plural preterite niphah of the verb ערם. But I take the verb to be נער, and מי to be the affixed pronoun plural, rehearsing קמיר in the 7th verse. —“shook them off,” namely, off their seats in their chariots, or on their horses. See chap. xiv, 27. The apparent discord of the verb and the noun, in this exposition of the passage, is no objection; מי being one of those

plural nouns which are sometimes constructed with singular verbs. See Gen. ix, 15.

(H) —“[which love their level.]” These words I add, as included in the idea of the word גוליים, which would be imperfectly rendered without that addition. See Critical Notes on the Song of Moses, note (c).

(I) —“took a form of consistency.” קפאו. —“were congealed” is the public translation. But this gives an idea of the operation of frost. The Hebrew verb properly signifies ‘to be coagulated.’ But this is too technical a word for poetry. ‘To be condensed’ would express too little; ‘to be consolidated’ too much. I have rendered the word therefore by a periphrasis, which gives neither more nor less than its exact sense.

(K) —“shall thin their numbers.” Literally, “shall impoverish them.” The diminution of their numbers by slaughter is the impoverishment meant.

(L) —“thy breath.” The hurricane miraculously setting in, and subsiding again, at the critical



moment, in a given direction, with a given force, for the purpose intended, is represented under the image of God's own breath.

(M) —“ danced about like particles of dust upon the boisterous waters.” If a handful of light dust be thrown upon the waters, the particles separate in an instant, and recede from each other in all directions, with prodigious velocity, as if they partook of the expansive nature of the waters on which they float. A very striking image of the sudden disjunction of Pharaoh's host; the men, the horses, and the chariots, upon the surface of the waters, suddenly released from the force which restrained them, and swelling and tossing with more than their usual vehemence.

—“ danced about,” were vibrated. —“ set a quivering,” tossed with vehemence. The word is never used of sinking.

—“ particles of dust.” So I understand עופרת. The word is sometimes used as the appropriate name of lead: but this is because lead is composed, as appears by the chemical analysis of it, of very small particles of dust, united only by phlogiston; or by

whatever new name French pedantry may be pleased to describe the principle of cohesion.

—“among the gods.” Read with the Samaritan, and 70 MSS, באלים.

(N) —“striking with amazement in sudden manifestations.” So I render the words נורא תהלה. See Parkhurst, under the root הלה. I am inclined to think with him, that the “manifestations” here allude to what is mentioned in chap. xiv, 24. The word נורא is applied to whatever excites admiration or amazement, though unmixed with fear. Therefore I render “striking with amazement,” though the particular manifestation here alluded to was terrible, and produced a panic.

(O) —“claimed and rescued.” I know not how to render the word גאלת by any one word. It signifies not simply ‘to rescue or redeem,’ but a rescue by the successful assertion of the owner’s claim, against the wrongful possessor.

(P) —“shall be petrified with dismay.” Hebrew, “shall be like a stone.” See Critical Notes on Hosea, Appendix, No. 3.

(Q) —“ fix their settlement.” Hebrew, “ plant them.”

—“ upon them.” Read, with 32 MSS, עליהם,

(R) —“ led the band.” תעניה. See the exposition of this word, see Critical Notes on Hosea, chap. ii, note (N).

## CRITICAL NOTES

ON

## THE ODE OF TRIUMPH.

---

NUMBERS XXI, 27—30.

(A) “Chapels.” *במות*, the plural of the feminine noun *במה*, which always signifies a place, or in the plural, places of worship of the smaller sort, whether appropriated to the worship of God, or of idols. Quite a distinct word from *במות*, (which makes its plural *במותים*), ‘a height, or high place.’ See Bishop Lowth on Isaiah liii, 9.

(B) —“the fire.” For *אשר*, I read, with the Samaritan and LXX, *אש*.

## CRITICAL NOTES

ON

THE PROPHETIC EFFUSIONS OF BALAAM.

---

NUMBERS XXII, 41—XXIV, 25.

CHAP. XXIII.

(A) —“him.” The pronominal suffix, though not expressed in the original, must be understood.

(B) —“in the square of Israel.” I read, with the Samaritan, מרבע, which may signify any thing of a square figure. The Israelites encamped in a square. See Numb. chap. ii. and iii. Therefore “the square of Israel” is a natural expression for the whole encampment, which met the prophet’s eye in that shape.

(C) “And when I am gone, be the fortunes of my family”— All this seems to be contained in the

Hebrew word אַחֲרֵיָי, ‘quæ post funus erunt.’ The wish of Balaam has no respect to the state of his mind, upon his death-bed, in prospect of futurity; but merely to the fortunes of Abraham, the ancestor of the Israelites, in this world. He wishes to die, like him, full of years and of the blessings of this life, and to leave behind him a numerous and flourishing posterity.

(D) I follow the LXX in the interpretation of the names of Zophim and Pisgah. Pisgah seems to have been a small hill, in which were quarries: and the field, in which it stood, from the prospect which the eminence commanded, was called ‘the Prospect Field,’ or, ‘the Field of the Lookers-out.’

(E) —“will meat.” אַקְרָה. This seems to have been a technical word of the diviner’s profession.

(F) “I must bless”— I read, with Samaritan and LXX, אַבְרָר.

(G) —“to be discerned—to be seen”— The verbs in the original, הַבִּיט and רָאָה, are both active, with the indefinite nominative אִישׁ understood. But

the sense is best given, in English, as by the LXX in their Greek, by passive verbs.

(H) —“ the state of royalty.” The literal rendering of the Hebrew text is, “ the sound of the royal trumpet is with him.” For the word תרועת, which our translators render ‘ shout,’ is more properly ‘ the voice of the trumpet.’

(I) “ God bringeth him out of Egypt,” &c. I give this passage as it stands in the public translation. I take it to be an interpolation here, and shall give what I take to be the true sense of it in chap. xxiv, where it stands in its proper place:

CHAP. XXIV.

(K) —“ the divinatory invocation.” ולא הלך כפעם בפעם לקראת נחשים; literally, “ and went not as time upon time to the invocation of diviners.” —“ the invocation of diviners,” *i. e.* the invocation used by diviners, or the divinatory invocation. So I understand the words לקראת נחשים. I imagine that some set form of invocation is intended, used in those times for the purposes of divination, or enchantment. Balaam retired not, as before, to try

the power of any mystic rites, or of any secret invocation; but, patiently waiting the event, he staid with Balak by the sacrifices, with his face toward the wilderness of Jeshimon, where the Israelites were encamped.

(L) —“strong in the secret eye.” הגבר שתם העין. I take שתם, which occurs only in this place, to be an unusual orthography of the word סתם, ‘abditus, intus absconditus.’ The holy Psalmist says, (li, 8), “Behold, thou delightest in truth in the inward parts, and shalt teach me wisdom.” בסתם. ἐν τῷ ἔσω ἀνθρώπῳ, as Mr Parkhurst well explains it. So the prophetic gift, of foreseeing things to come, is here described under the image of a secret internal eye. And, in the same language, Æschylus makes Orestes, in the Choëphoræ, describe the oracular prescience of Apollo:

ὄρῶντα λαμπρὸν ἐν σκοτῶ νωμῶν γ’ ὄφρουν. 1. 283.

(M) —“scene of the Almighty.” מַחֲזֵה שְׂרִי. That which is seen by God, and by God alone, and and those to whom he is pleased supernaturally to display it. So I understand the expression, not of any extraordinary appearance of the Divinity to the



prophet ; which is the idea, that the English words, “ vision of God,” which our translators have used as answering literally to the Hebrew, are most likely to suggest to the English reader.

(N) I cannot be of opinion, with the learned Bishop Newton, that the characters, by which Balaam describes himself in this stanza, have any reference to the occurrences of his journey with Balak’s messengers. This notion seems to me to destroy the whole sublimity of the exordium of this and the next song, in which the prophet bespeaks attention, to the prediction he was about to deliver, by an animated amplification of the gifts and privileges of his office. His strength in the secret eye is an habitual strength in the prophetic endowments. He who heareth is he, who is accustomed to hear the speech of God. He who seeth the scene, is he who is accustomed to see the scene. He is laid at his length, it often happens to him to fall down entranced, and in that state his secret eye is always set open to the visions of futurity.

(O) “ And knoweth the knowledge of the Most

High." The proem of the last song is exactly the same with this, except that it wants this line.

(P) —“inclose within his wall.” So, with Oleaster, I understand the word קרקר, in this place. This verb comes from the noun קיר, ‘a wall,’ and, like many verbs derived from nouns, may, according to the exigence of the context, bear the opposite senses, either of demolishing a wall, or of walling round. In Isaiah xxii, 5, it seems to be used in the first sense, in the other, as I think here. Those who, in this place, would give it the sense of demolition (and they are indeed the majority of interpreters), are under no small difficulty, to determine who these sons of Seth might be, who were all to be involved in this destruction, and are little agreed upon the question. Calvin supposes, that the Seth here mentioned is not Seth the son of Adam, but some descendant of Moab of the same name, whose progeny might form some principal branch of the Moabitic nation. But as we hear of no such descendant of Moab, nor of any such branch of the Moabitic nation in history, this is to be considered as a mere hypothesis without any foundation.

(Q) —“ left without the city,” or, “ cast out of the city.” For this sense of the word שרר, see Schindler.

(R) “ The wiles”— For ער מה, I read, with the LXX and Houbigant, ערמה; or rather (*in regimine*) ערמה, παρουσια.

(S) —“ when God bringeth upon him desolation.” Literally, “ Who shall live in spite of God’s desolating him?” I derive the word שמו from שם, ‘ to desolate,’ rather than from שום; and I understand the pronominal suffix of a person, rather than of a thing.

(T) This stanza, as it stands, is difficult of exposition. The subject of the verb ‘ oppress,’ in the second line, must be some noun in the preceding line, for in this line we find nothing that may be its subject. And, since the verb is plural, its subject must be plural. Again, it is probable, that it is of this subject of the verb ‘ oppress,’ in the second line, that ‘ appointment to destruction’ is predicated in the third. For if this appointment to destruction is predicated of any other subject, it must be of Heber,

But if the assertion be understood of any of Heber's gentile descendants, why should their destruction be rather mentioned, than Ashur's, who is equally destroyed. Of the Jewish nation the assertion would be false. For the Jews are not destroyed; nor are they at any time appointed to destruction. It remains therefore, that they are the oppressors of Ashur and Heber, who are threatened in the third line of the stanza with utter extirpation. And the authority both of the LXX and the Vulgate evidently stands with this conclusion. But the immediate subject of destruction is the singular pronoun masculine **הוא**. The subject therefore of the plural verb 'oppress' being also the antecedent of the singular pronoun 'he,' must be some noun, which may be connected both with a plural verb and a singular pronoun. It must therefore be a collective noun, or a noun which may carry, in this place at least, a collective signification; that is, in the singular number may signify many. But no such noun shall we find in this whole triplet, as the text now stands. And yet neither the MSS nor the Versions, (except the LXX) suggest any plausible emendation, though none of the versions, except Onkelos and the Vulgate, agree with our present text. For **וַיִּצַח מִיָּד**,

I would read **וּצְמִים יִר**, which gives the sense I have expressed in my translation. The alteration is nothing more than the transposition of a single letter, the **ו** being removed from the beginning of the word **מִיר** to the middle of the preceding word.

If this emendation should seem to rest too much upon conjecture, we might adopt what may seem to have been the reading of the LXX, **וַיָּצֵא מִיר**, —“he is coming from the quarter of Chittim.” But this differs much more, than the reading I propose, from the present text.

The similitude which the present reading, **צִים** in the sense of ships, creates between this prophecy and that of Daniel, of the “ships from Chittim,” which should intimidate Antiochus, is a circumstance not at all in its favour. Daniel’s prophecy is a minute detail of the tyranny and overthrow of the Macedonian kings of Syria. Balaam’s prediction rests in generals. In this last song, he declares in the most brief and general terms, the fate of the kingdoms which flourished at that day in the neighbourhood of Palestine; and, in this last triplet, in a still more general style, he touches upon the successive rise and overthrow of the principal empires of the world; of which the most antient, the Assyrian,

was then subsisting, and had hardly attained its height. The appearance therefore of the ships of Chittim, upon the Syrian coast, was too important an incident to be omitted in Daniel's circumstantial detail, and too minute to have a place in Balaam's general prediction.

It is worthy of remark, that this triplet is not prefaced, as the preceding stanzas of this last effusion, with any mention of the object in the prophet's view. The reason is, that the scene, to which it alludes, broke suddenly upon his imagination, and called him abruptly off from his former subject. Nor was it a single object that might be easily defined; this king, or this nation, or this event: but a complicated exhibition of the infinitely varied business of the whole world, from the prophet's own time to the fall of the Roman empire.

## CRITICAL NOTES

UPON

[THE SONG ENTITLED

THE SONG OF MOSES.

---

DEUTERONOMY, CHAP. XXXII. 1—43.

(A) THIS is rather God's song, than the song of Moses. In the preceding chapter, God commands Moses "to write this song, and to teach it the children of Israel, that it might be a witness for God against them." (chap. xxxi, 19.) Accordingly, "Moses wrote this song the same day, and taught it the children of Israel." (ver. 22.) It seems therefore to have been a form of words dictated by God himself. Moses, however, is the speaker.

(B) "My lessons"— This is the only word, which I can find, to convey any thing like the idea of the original word לקחי; literally, "what I have recorded," *i. e.* the doctrine communicated and committed to me by divine revelation.

(C) —"spread abroad." I am much mistaken if what the verb ניל properly predicates of water, is not that characteristic property (the symptom of perfect fluidity) of diffusing itself infinitely upon a level, when it is left to itself without confinement. In the first passage in which the noun נילים occurs, namely, Exodus xv, 8, it names the waters of the sea, by that property of level expansion, which was the most opposite to the effect miraculously produced, of their standing on a heap. And in most passages in which the word occurs, the mention, or insinuation of the property, is particularly pertinent. When it is applied to the liquefaction of solid substances, it presents the idea of their subsidance, or sinking down into an even surface. And here, in the application of the word to the dew, its wide diffusion seems to be the thing intended. No two images can more strongly represent the copious, although gradual communication of divine knowledge



by successive revelation, and the perpetual preaching of the word, than the quick and close succession of the drops, in showers of rain, and the wide dispersion of the dew over the field. The word ‘distil’ of our public translation, answers but ill to the original word, and conveys perhaps a false notion of the formation of dew, by a precipitation of the moisture of the atmosphere. Many circumstances indicate a rise of the dew out of the earth, in a much larger proportion than a fall of it from the air. Dew seems to be the perspiration of the heated earth, condensed upon the surface by the chill of the atmosphere in the absence of the sun.

(D) “The mighty God!” literally, “The Rock!” This word **צור**, occurs six times in this song, as an appellation of the Deity; namely, in this place; in verse 15 and 18; twice in verse 31; and once again in verse 37. In all these six places, it is an appellation of the true God, except in the second place of verse 31, where it is applied to the gods of the Gentiles. But in none of these six places, either the LXX, or the Vulgate, express it by any word rendering ‘a Rock;’ but the LXX express it by **Θεος**, and the Vulgate by Deus. Aquila rendered it by

Στερεος, Symmachus and Theodotion by Φυλαξ. See Hexaplar, verse 31. Aquila's rendering is the best, as it gives the sense without losing the image of the original word. The original word expresses the immutability of purpose, the unassailable strength of power in God, and the stability of effect, under the image of the solidity of a rock. The English Geneva renders it in verse 15, "The strong God," and in three other places, "The mighty God." The English language has certainly no one word which will clearly and adequately convey the same idea under the same image. The different expressions of, "The mighty God, the irresistible God, the unchangable God, the Strength," may be used as one or another of them may best suit the particular passage where the word occurs.

(E) "For all the measures of his providence are right." This is the reason that his work is perfect, that all his measures are well taken. The rendering of this line, though somewhat paraphrastic, gives, I trust, neither more nor less, than the full meaning of the original. The literal rendering, given in our Public Translation, "all his ways are judgment," conveys either no meaning, or an imperfect mean-

ing, to the English reader. The words in the original, *פעלו*, and *דרכיו*, both signify universally. The former, ‘his work,’ whatever is effected by God’s overruling providence, both in the material and in the moral world; *דרכיו*, his ways; both his physical and his moral ways. The general principles and rules of his acting, both in ordering the motions of matter, and in his dealings with moral agents. The word *משפט*, therefore, is to be taken in its largest sense, for ‘rule,’ or ‘principle.’ (See Critical Notes on Hosea, chap. vi, note (F)). The sense is, that all the acts of providence are wisely directed to an end, and the means employed are always the best for the attainment of the end; insomuch, that he acts by fixed rule and principle, not by arbitrary will. The passage is excellently rendered by Castalio, —“*rectæ sunt omnes ejus rationes.* ‘Rationes’ is the true Latin word for *דרכים*, as it is used here; and, “the measures of providence,” is the only English expression to render the same idea intelligible.

(F) “A blemish,” &c. literally, “A blemish unto him [is] their mark of his Not-sons.” In this way of expounding the passage, I suppose an ellipsis of the verb substantive only. I take *מום* as the sub-

ject of the verb substantive understood, and שחת as another noun, a nominative after the verb substantive, and the predicate of that subject.

The passage might be expounded in another way, by dividing it into two clauses, with an ellipsis in the first of the verb substantive in the third person plural, with the pronoun of the third person plural for its subject; and in the second clause, an ellipsis of the verb substantive in the third person singular, מוס being its subject. Thus,

שחת לו [המה היו] לא בניו [חיה] מוס

They are corruption in his sight. Their mark is of his  
Not-sons.

But I prefer the former as more simple.

—“his Not-sons.” The negative לא prefixed to a noun substantive often forms, as it were, a compound noun, expressing the *steresis*, or privation of that which the noun by itself would express, having indeed the exact force of the privative alpha in the Greek language.

The reading of this line in the Samaritan text deserves attention. It gives an easy construction, and a good sense; it is followed in the versions of the

LXX and Syriac, and is adopted as the true reading by Houbigant and Kennicott.

שחתו לא לו בני מום

They are corrupted; they are not his; children of pollution.

(G) —“ devoid of thought.” See Critical Notes on Hosea, chap. xiii, note (κ).

(H) The only meaning of this passage which occurs to me is, that in the partition of the habitable earth among the different nations, the distribution was so made, and the several boundaries so fixed, as to leave a certain tract unallotted, as the domain of Jehovah himself, sufficient for the accommodation of his own people, the race of Israel.

An emendation was offered not long since, in a periodical publication, \* which, if admitted, would certainly give a clear, a true, and strong sense. It consisted in a transposition only of the words עמי and עמים. The singular, עמי, was brought from the ninth verse into the place of the plural, עמים, in the eighth; and that plural was carried into the ninth and placed after יעקב. Thus the sense would be,

---

\* British Critic for the month of August 1802.

He set the bounds of his own people  
 According to the number of the sons of Israel;  
 For the portion of Jehovah is Jacob,  
 The peoples are the measured lot of his inheritance.

The pronoun *his* in the last line was expounded of Jacob, not of God, and thus the passage was made to describe the call of the Gentiles as their incorporation with Israel, not without an implied allusion to the exaltation of the natural Israel above all the nations of the earth in the last ages.

I certainly agree with the critic who proposed this alteration, that transposition is an allowable species of conjecture. And there is nothing violent in the transposition proposed in this instance. Nevertheless, I scruple to adopt it, as all the antient versions represent the order of the words as they stand in our present text; and the sense it gives, if I have rightly expounded it, is perhaps full as much to the purpose as that which is drawn from the emendation.

The reading, which the version of the LXX offers, of "the angels of God," instead of "the sons of Israel," must come from a corrupted text, as it gives no meaning at all, but what is founded on the absurd heathen notion, of a delegation of power to

the angels, as a sort of viceroys, or lordlieutenants, over the several nations.

(I) —“ a desert land, the howling waste,” &c. I have said in my explanatory notes upon Hosea, note (N), that the waste howling wilderness (according to the Public Translation), in which God is here said to have found Israel, is the wilderness of idolatry, and that the image expresses the weak, and it should be added, the ill-informed state of the Israelites, when they lived intermixed with idolaters, as strangers in Canaan, and afterwards as slaves in Egypt. And by this opinion I abide, decidedly rejecting the reading of the Samaritan, which Houbigant adopts, ימזארו אמצרו, and ישמנו for ישמן, which would give this sense :

He sustained him in a desert land,

In the howling waste he fed him plenteously with luscious food.

Referring, indeed, to the wilderness through which the Israelites were led to the promised land. The version of the LXX conveys the same general notion; but neither the Syriac nor the Vulgate confirm it.

(K) —“ he stretcheth his wings,” &c. The Public Translation gives, “ spreadeth abroad *her* wings, taketh them—beareth them.” But the pronominal suffixes of the two verbs, ‘ taketh,’ ‘ beareth,’ in the original, are singular, and can rehearse no other noun than ‘ Jacob,’ or ‘ Israel,’ as the singular suffixes of the verbs in the preceding verse. The young of the eagle are expressed by the plural noun גִּלְיִם, which could be rehearsed by none but plural pronouns. Instead therefore of ‘ taketh them,’ and ‘ beareth them,’ I render, ‘ taketh him,’ and ‘ beareth him.’ *Him*, namely, Jacob. Jacob therefore being the person taken and borne; Jehovah, not the eagle, must be the taker and bearer. The passage is rightly rendered by the Vulgate and Houbigant.

(L) —‘ the hard stony soil.’ אֶלְמִישׁ צִיר, rather renders ‘ chips,’ or ‘ small fragments of stone,’ mixed with the vegetable mould, than a large mass of solid rock. The soil which the olive loves, is a lean sandy clay abounding with small pebbles.

‘ Difficiles primum terræ, collesque maligni,

‘ Tenuis ubi argilla, et dumosis calculus arvis,

‘ Palladiâ gaudent sylvâ vivacis olivæ.’



(M) [Bullocks] the breed of Bashan," literally, "sons of Bashan," which, with the LXX, and Ken- nicott, I take to be young bullocks.

(N) In this part I have changed the order of the lines, and restored from the Samaritan a line omitted in our present text. The change in the order of the lines is, that I make what stands, in the printed text, as the second line of the fifteenth verse, the last of the fourteenth. The omitted line I make the first of the fifteenth verse. Thus, what stands as first becomes the second, and at the third we fall again into the order of the printed. The learned reader will perceive, that, by this arrangement, the regularity of the composition, which the omission of one line, and the misplacing of the other, had much impaired, is completely restored. Inasmuch as, according to this emendation, the whole passage will stand thus :

ודם ענב תשת חמר

שמנת עבית כשות :

ויאכל יעקב וישבע 15

וישמן ישרון ויבעט

ויטש אלוה עשהו

וינבל צור ישעתו :

(O) —“ [imagined] benefactors.” שרי, “ pourers forth.” The powers of nature deified, and worshipped as the pourers forth of all temporal blessings, rich crops, and increase of the flocks and herds. The same powers which the adulteress in Hosea calls her lovers.

(P) —“ bitter plagues of the solstitial disease.” The solstitial disease, קטב. See Critical Notes on Hosea, chap. xiii, note (w). But in this, there is a very singular collocation of the words קטב מררי, if there has been no transposition; the governing word being placed after the governed. For the order is, ומררי קטב.

(Q) —“ ravenous beasts of prey.” Literally, “ the tooth of beasts.”

(R) —“ can make the distinction.” Literally, “ being distinguishers.”

(S) —“ berries of the aconite.” See Critical Notes on Hosea, chap. x, note (E).

(T) —“ immured, or at large.” עצור עוב, *i. e.*

in garrison, in walled town, or left out and straggling in the open country. So I understand this proverbial expression.

(U) The 37th and 38th verse contain the taunts of the enemies of God's people, related in the third person in verse 37, and the first line of verse 38; but in the sequel of that verse, delivered in the person of the enemies speaking. This change of person is highly animated and poetical.

The word אלהים, though the true God be meant, yet in the speech of the heathen, is constructed with plural verbs as with plural adjectives and participles, in 1 Sam. iv, 8.

—“your place of safe retreat.” Literally, “a hiding place over you;” *i. e.* let them afford you that security which ye might find in a den or cave, where you would lie concealed, under cover. The image is of the same kind with that which is used, Exod. xv, 2, and Ps. xc, 1. See the notes upon the former place.

(V) —“with me is no god associated.” Literally, “no god standing by me.”

(W) I place the Soph Pasuk at אֲרַפֵּא, and make the next line the first of the 40th verse ; that the sense may be, When I declare my purpose, and bind myself to the execution of it, no one can rescue from my hand.

(X) “Flesh—blood and flesh.” The liberty I have taken in supplying these words in the translation, is certainly a greater one than I usually take ; but not greater than the sense of the passage, and the idiom of the poetry in this place demand. That of the two words, ‘blood and flesh,’ at the beginning of the last line of the stanza, one must of necessity be supplied, viz. ‘flesh,’ has been seen and admitted by the most scrupulous critics. See Parkhurst, פֶּרַע. VIII. That this word ‘flesh’ must be supplied in the preceding line, I shall presently show ; whence the propriety of supplying both at the beginning of the last line will be evident.

The first distich of this 42d verse declares, that ‘arrows’ shall be drunk with blood, and ‘the sword’ devour flesh. ‘Arrows’ were the weapons of distant fight, the sword of close engagement. The arrows, therefore, discharged in battle at the distant enemy, were to be drunk with the blood of the

slain. But when a prisoner was taken, if his life was not to be spared, he was not set at a distance to be a mark for the archers, but dispatched by the sword, the devourer of flesh. The arrow, therefore, had nothing to do with the captive, who is the victim of the sword. For this reason, **בשר** (flesh), must be supplied before **שביה** (the captives). But the head of the enemy was equally the object of the arrow in battle, and of the sword raised against the prisoner. Therefore, before **ראש** (head or scalp), the two words **דם** and **בשר** (blood and flesh), are both to be supplied.

When I say these words are to be supplied, it is not that I think they were ever in the text, and have been lost out of it, but that they are to be supplied by the reader's understanding of the place, which the English reader would not be likely to apprehend, if they were not inserted in the translation.

(Y) —“ O ye heathen with his people.” Not more than two MSS have **את** before **עמי**. I follow this reading, as it is confirmed by St Paul, Rom. xv, 10. It has been well observed, in a periodical publica-

tion which I have before had occasion to cite,\* that the import of the passage is much the same, whether אֵת be inserted, or omitted as in the printed text. If it be inserted, the passage insinuates the call of the heathen, and their union with the chosen people. Without אֵת, their incorporation into it, in such sort as to make an integrant part of the Israel. For if אֵת be not admitted, גוֹיִם (not *in regimine* observe) is in apposition with עַמּוֹ. And the literal rendering is, 'heathen, his people,' *i. e.* heathen nations now become his people by their conversion. And so Rosenmuller seems to have understood the words. Some indeed, in this and some other passages, would expound גוֹיִם of Israel, as composed of various tribes. But the plural word is never so used. It is used only of the heathen nations, and of them in a worse sense than עַמּוֹ. The verb עָמַד describing them simply as distinct from the Israelites; as not in covenant with God; but not as positively discarded from mercy. The other describes them as avowed active members of the atheistical confederacy, and objects of wrath and judgment. עַמּוֹ are the nations not yet called, and in

---

\* British Critic, August 1802.

a state of ignorance; גוים are the nations in rebellion. See the Psalms passim, particularly the 9th and 10th. It is true, that this plural word is applied to Israel in Ezek. ii, 3; but not applied to them as composed of various tribes, signified by the plural גוים. It is there applied to Israel in highly figured speech, without any consideration of the composition of the nation out of various parts, as a term of the keenest reproach and opprobrium; intimating, that, by their disobedience, they were become mere heathen, apostates, and outcasts. “Son of Man, “I send thee to the children of Israel—to heathen—“the disobedient, which have disobeyed me. They, “and their fathers, have been in open rebellion “against me to this very day.”

(Z) —“the land of his people.” I read with the Samaritan, ארמת, without the suffix.

## CRITICAL NOTES

ON

### THE LAST WORDS OF MOSES.

---

DEUT. XXXIII.

THIS is evidently a metrical composition; the diction highly poetical, and the structure of the verse regular. The whole may be divided into three parts. The first part respects the people of Israel generally. It consists of three stanzas; the first, composed of five lines, commemorating the awful display of the tokens of the Divine Presence at Sinai; the second stanza celebrates God's parental care of all mankind, manifested in the communications with the patriarchal families in general in the earliest ages, and again in the promulgation of the gospel; the third stanza asserts the selection of the Jewish people,



predicts the sovereignty of the Messiah, and the adoption of the Gentiles.

The second part consists of the appropriate blessings of the several tribes.

The third and last, composed of four stanzas, returns to the general subject of the happiness of the people, under the special protection of Jehovah.

(A) “His uprising was from Seir.” זרח in this line, as אשרת in the fifth, I take to be a noun substantive, and in both places I suppose an ellipsis of the verb. The ׁ, at the end of both lines, I take for the pronoun of the third person singular, rehearsing the proper name Jehovah. Of this use of ׁ, for ׁ, Bishop Lowth, in his Third Prelection, has produced many instances. The construction of the Hebrew, according to my notion of it, may be more exactly represented in the Latin language than in the English: “Exortus ei erat a Seir; a dextrâ ejus [prorumpebant] ei [ignes.]”

(B) —“from amidst the myriads came forth the Holy One.” —“from amidst the myriads.” I read, with the Samaritan, and many of the best MSS and printed editions, not les than 80 in all, מרבכות.

—“came forth the Holy One.” —“Il est sorti d’entre les dix milliers des saints.” Ostervald. To bring out the sense which I express, it would seem necessary to read קרוש, (a necessity which I admit not). This would not be a greater alteration than Dr Kennicott would make, to get the proper name of Meribah-cadesh. To Dr Kennicott’s alteration I have two objections. The one is, that the appearance at Meribah-cadesh was not public, but to Moses and Aaron by themselves. The other is, that the attendance of the angels is a circumstance which the sacred writers usually touch upon, whenever they have occasion to speak of the promulgation of the law, which makes it improbable that so great a circumstance should be passed over unnoticed here: and this will be the case, if Dr Kennicott’s alteration be admitted. I must add, that his emendation is purely conjectural. The change of קרש into קרוש, if it be necessary, besides that it would be supported by the parallel passage in Habakuk, chap. iii, 3, is the reading of three of Kennicott’s MSS.

(C) —“streams [of fire].” For אש רת, I read, with the Samaritan text, a great number of the very

best MSS, and with Dr Durell, אשרת. Perhaps the best of all would be אשריות, which some copies of the Samaritan text give. But whether אשריות, or אשרת, the word is certainly plural. It occurs twice in Deuteronomy, and in four places in Joshua. In Deuteronomy it is written without the ו, in Joshua with it. The singular אשר occurs but once, namely, in Numb. xxi, 15. Its constant sense is that of streams, torrents, springs. By its etymology it may signify whatever flows, or issues with force and rapidity. If in any place in which it occurs, circumstances exclude streams of water; it must denote some other streams, which circumstances admit. In this passage circumstances admit no streams but of fire, or light.

But when it occurs, that the streams, or streamings, at God's right hand, must be streams of light or fire, the imagination of a modern critic will be apt to fasten upon flashes of lightning, as the fire or light particularly intended; for which, the name of 'streams,' or 'streamings,' seems an awkward metaphor. But may not light of some other kind be intended? for which 'streams' or 'streamings,' to those to whom the appearance was familiar, might be a proper and significant name. The subject of

the poetical description, in this stanza, is the appearance of the Shechinah. Of this we have no particular description; and therefore we know only, in general, that it was light. But is it not probable, that it was distinguished from other lights, by many peculiarities in its appearance, besides its degree of brightness? Is it improbable, that what the first idolaters substituted for it, the Sun, actually bore some faint resemblance of it? That the Shechinah therefore was a mass of unparalleled splendour, shooting out long rays in all directions: Might not these rays of the Shechinah, in their shape and undulating motions, resemble the meteor which, in our own language, at this day, goes under the name of 'STREAMERS?' And might not this resemblance of the things be the occasion of an analogy in the names of them in different languages? These rays of the Shechinah seem to be mentioned, in the parallel place of Habakkuk, under the name of 'horns;' which the prophet describes, as Moses describes the streamers, as issuing from God's hand.

From the translation of the LXX it appears, that for the two words of the Masoretic text אש דת, their copies had but one. If that one was אשדת, the LXX understood the words to be the genuine

appellation of any emanations of any kind; and they took it to be used figuratively here of the angels, as emanations from the Father of Spirits. But this notion of angels, as emanations of the First Intellect, savours too much of the Platonism of a late age to be Mosaic.

It once occurred to me, casting about in my mind for some plausible exposition of the Masoretic reading of  $\aleph \aleph$  in two separate words, that it might not be insusceptible of interpretation, if  $\aleph$  were taken, not for the peculiar law of the Jews, but for the general law of God's wisdom and power, by which the universal system of Nature is upholden.  $\aleph \aleph$ , 'the fire of law,' I thought might be a periphrasis for the lightning, as the weapon of God's government, the sword of his empire, by which all things are kept in awe and subjection.

Σοι δε πας ὁδε κοσμος ἐλισσομενος περι γαιαν,  
 Πειδεται, ἠκεν ἀγης, και ἐκων ὑπο σειο κρατειται.  
 Τοιον ἔχεις ὑποεργον ἀνικη, σαις ὑπο χερσιν,  
 Ἀμφηκη, πυροεντα, ἀειζωντα κεραυνον.  
 Του γαρ ὑπο πληγης φυσέως παντ' ἐρρίγασι,  
 Ω συ κατευθυνεις κοινον λογον, κ. τ. λ.

Hymn. Cleanth.

But this notion of the lightning is pagan. The reading אֶשְׁרֵת in one word is sufficiently authorised, and the sense founded upon it is far more simple, and more to the purpose. The joining of two words of our modern text in one is hardly to be deemed an alteration, especially as this is one of the fifteen instances mentioned by the Masora of words written together which should be read separately; which is a confession of the Masoretes that these words were written as one in their MSS; and for the separation we have only their authority.

(D) For אֶה, I read, with the Samaritan, with Kennicott and Durell, אֶב.

(E) “The saints”— I read, with the LXX and Vulgate, קִרְשִׁים, without the suffix.

(F) I read, with the Samaritan, and a great number of Kennicott’s best Codd. לְרִגְלֵיךְ.

(G) —“and receive”— I read וַיִּשְׂאוּ, upon the authority of the Samaritan version, the Syriac, Arabic, Chaldee, and Kennicott.

(H) —“ Moses” — The name of Moses seems to be introduced here in a very singular manner. It seems very strange that he should speak of himself in the third person, and of the persons to whom he gave the law in the first person plural, as if he included himself among those who received the law from him. For this reason, I should readily agree with Dr Kennicott and Dr Durell in expunging the word Moses, if the omission had the authority either of MSS or versions. But being merely conjectural, without any such authority, I have not ventured to adopt it. Dr Durell very pertinently remarks, in favour of it, that no line in this whole song (this first part), except this, contains more than three words.

If the word Moses be omitted, the second stanza will form a parenthesis between the first and this last; and the subject of the verb ‘prescribed’ must be the pronoun of the third person, ‘He,’ understood, rehearsing ‘the Holy One’ of the fourth line of the first stanza. “He, the Holy One, to us hath prescribed a law.”

The sense however of this last stanza will be the same, whether the name of Moses, in this first line, stand or be omitted.

(I) —“in Jeshurun.” The LXX render “Jeshurun” by *ὁ ἀγαπημενος*, which is very consistent with the senses they give to the root. “The justified” seems to be the meaning of the word. In either sense, of “the well-beloved,” or “the justified,” it denotes the whole family of the faithful, and it is no patronymic of the Israelites. When it is applied to them, it is in their spiritual character, as for a time they made the whole of God’s acknowledged church. The LXX and Vulgate give the verb substantive at the beginning of this line in the future.

(K) —“the peoples.” I read, with the LXX, *עמי* in the plural. And I understand this distich of the communion of the two churches of the circumcision and the uncircumcision in the latter ages. Dr Kennicott in this place follows the Masoretic text, reading *ע* in the singular; and he renders the third line of this stanza, “And he became king in Jeshurun,” which he expounds of God, who, at the same time that he gave the Israelites a law, became their King. The proposition, it must be confessed, is true; but I much doubt whether the terms in which it is supposed to be contained are those which Moses would have used to convey this mean-



ing. I remember no passage that describes the relation between God and the Israelites, in which God is simply called their King. “They shall be to me a people, and I will be to them—What? a King? More than a King—A GOD.” This I think is the constant language. The expression in 1 Sam. viii, 7, cannot be allowed to make an exception. The occasion required only, that the Israelites should be reminded that God was to them *instar regis*. In Hos. xiii, 10, we read in our English Bible, “I will be thy King:” but in the Hebrew, in the LXX, and in St Jerome, we read something very different. See my Hosea. A further objection to Dr Kennicott’s exposition is, that there is very little significance in the definition of the manner, in which this monarchy was erected; which, in this view of the passage, is contained in the subsequent distich. The “gathering together of the chiefs of the people with the tribes of Israel” is surely a frigid periphrasis for a general assembly. I must add, what has been already observed at the end of note (1), that the LXX and Vulgate give the verb substantive at the beginning of the third line with me in the future, not with Dr Kennicott in the preterite.

(L) —“ Simeon” — The tribe of Simeon, as the Hebrew text now stands, has no share in this prophetic valediction of Moses. Many commentators have attempted to account for the omission. But of the various reasons that have been imagined, some are manifestly false, and none in my judgment satisfactory. We have the express testimony of Josephus and Philo, as Dr. Durell has observed, that Moses blessed every one of the tribes separately. And as neither of them make an exception of any tribe, it is reasonable to conclude, with Dr. Durell, that Simeon's name was in the copies which those antient writers used. And if this be admitted, we must of necessity go to this further conclusion, that the omission of Simeon is a defect, and an error of our modern text. But if Simeon's fortunes, like those of Judah, Levi, or Joseph, were the subject of a separate stanza of some length, the error was less likely to happen, than if he was joined in a short stanza with some other tribe, as Issachar and Zebulun are joined, so that the bare omission of his name would produce the defect. This therefore probably was the case. But with which of his brethren could he so properly be joined as with Reuben, to whom he was next in age? It is true, in the last words of

Jacob, he is joined with Levi. But that is on account of the participation of the two brothers in the same crime, and the similarity of the judgment with which for that crime the posterity of both was visited. But the tribe of Levi in some measure atoned the crime of their ancestor by their obedience. And although what Jacob had predicted as a judgment took place, yet under that judgment the tribe was blessed. But the Simeonites continued to the last refractory and profligate. And it is to be observed, that in the two prophecies of Jacob and Moses the whole arrangement of the matter is different, as will appear by comparing the order in which the tribes are mentioned.

BY JACOB.

- 1 Reuben.
- 2, 3 Simeon and Levi.
- 4 Judah.
- 5 Zebulon.
- 6 Issachar.
- 7 Dan.
- 8 Gad.
- 9 Asher.
- 10 Naphtali.
- 11 Joseph.
- 12 Benjamin.

BY MOSES.

- 1 Reuben.
- 3 Judah.
- 4 Levi.
- 5 Benjamin.
- 6 Joseph.
- 7, 8 Zebulon and Issachar.
- 9 Gad.
- 10 Dan.
- 11 Naphtali.
- 12 Asher.

Adding to these considerations, that the name of Simeon appears in this place in the LXX, according to the Alexandrine MS; another MS of Dr Holmes; and the Aldine and Complutensian editions; that the name of Simeon was in the Latin Bible of St Ambrose in this place, as it is quoted by him, “*Benedixit etiam Moses tribum Reuben, sicut habes scriptum ‘Vivat Reuben et non moriatur, et SIMEON multus in numero;’*” upon these grounds I have no hesitation, after the example of Houbigant and Dr Durell, to introduce the name of Simeon in this place. For thus I reason: The tribe of Simeon certainly was mentioned by Moses in this his last prophecy. For the antient writers, who say he spoke of the fortunes of each tribe separately, make no exception of Simeon. We have no authority at all for introducing his name in any other part of the prophetic song. For introducing it here, we have the authority of the LXX, and the Latin Bible of St Ambrose.

I would add, that if it was of Simeon that it was predicted that his numbers should be few, the prediction, as is well observed by Dr Durell, was strictly verified. For Simeon came out of Egypt 59,300

strong,\* and forty years after, in the plains of Moab he mustered only 22,200.†

(M) The latter distich is the key to the true meaning of this whole stanza. It is so evidently characteristic of the Messiah, who, with greatness of power of his own, in his human nature depended upon God's support, that it can be understood of no other person. And the preceding distich will appear to be equally applicable to the Messiah exclusively, when it is delivered from an obscurity in which the Masoretic pointing has enveloped it, which has been the means indeed of disfiguring the meaning of the whole, and given rise to forced and unnatural interpretations even of the latter part, of which the most obvious and literal rendering is that which I have given. But in the former distich, abandoning those blind leaders of the blind, the Masorettes, we shall find the Messiah mentioned under an appellation, which most properly belongs to him, the appellative לַאֲדָמָה, which the Masorettes, by their mispointing, have turned into the preposition

---

\* Numb. i, 23.

† Numb. xxvi, 14.

אל. But point the word with tzere instead of segol, and the entire verse must be thus literally rendered:

And this for Judah. And he said,

Hear, O Jehovah, the voice of Judah,

ואל עמו And the Mighty One of his people תביאנו bring

Thou unto him.

Great for himself shall be his power,

And Thou shalt be help from his enemies.

תביאנו, 'bring him;' *i. e.* bring to him. The verb 'bring,' and some others, which in Latin require a dative of the person and an accusative of the thing; in Hebrew, as in English, often admit two accusatives, one of the thing, and another of the person.

אל עמו, 'the Mighty One of his people.' So Ezek. xxxi, 11, אל גוים, 'the Mighty One of the heathen.' אל, applied to man, is more than גבר. See Ezek. xxxii, 21. The plural אילים is frequently used for 'leaders.' And here perhaps, and in Ezek. xxxi, 11, the singular אל might be rendered 'the leader, the captain, or the chief;' but I prefer 'Mighty One,' because the Hebrew word seems to involve the idea of pre-eminence in valour, and power to help, rather than in rank. See this exposition of the text, in preference to others, argued

more at large in my Critical Notes upon Hosea, chap. xi, note (B).

(N) —“ the man.” —“ In hâc de Levi benedictione opponitur sacerdotium Levi sacerdotio Messiaë futuro. Sic dicit igitur Moses ‘ Thummim tuum et Urim tuum Viri Sancti tui est quem tu tentâsti.’ Perfectio illa et doctrina illa, quam præ se ferunt tui sacerdotes, non tua est; ut illam vel in te habeas, vel aliis impertiaris: illa erit propria Sancti tui, ejus quem Dominus non dabit videre corruptionem; quem tu tentâsti; eundem de quo Paulus apostolus, ‘ Neque tentemus Christum;’ quem Moses tentavit, cum percussit petram hesitanter; quem Aaron simul et Moses, cum Moses dixit, ‘ Num poterimus aquam de petrâ hâc educere?’ Qui dicturus est patri et matri, non novi eum; idem, qui sic aiebat, ‘ Quæ est mater mea?’ Qui facit voluntatem patris mei, hic meus frater, et soror et mater est.” Houbigant ad locum. Compare Kennicott’s Post. and Spencer De Leg. Heb. lib. iii, diss. 7, cap. 8.

(O) —“ thy gracious benefactor.” חסידך. See the radical meaning of the word חסד, largely explained in my Critical Notes upon Hosea, chap. vi,

note (D). The noun חסיד, here and in other passages, is not well rendered in our Public Translation by "Holy One." In any case in which that rendering is in any degree proper, which can only be in the application of the word to a person in respect of his religious conduct, to denote a course of life, and a character sanctified by the warmth and constancy of habitual piety to God and charity to man, in every instance of this application of the word, 'Saint' would be the better rendering; as in Ps. xvi, 10. But when the word is applied either to God or Christ, in respect of merciful dealing with mankind in general, or of particular favour to certain persons, either "Holy One," or "Saint," is altogether improper, and the idea of the original word will be best given by "gracious benefactor."

I am much mistaken if this word חסיד is not sometimes written without the Jod.

(P) —"Let them observe"— Houbigant, after וי, would insert אס; and he connects this with what precedes in this manner: "Ille filios suos "non alios cognoscet, quam eos qui verbum tuum "custodiunt." But the alteration is quite unnecessary. The force of וי here is imperative, or hor-



tatory; and it might be rendered in Latin by ‘*scilicet*,’ or ‘*nempe*.’ A full stop should be placed at ירע, at the end of the preceding line, and האמר is to be understood again, at the beginning of this verse, before בי.

(Q) —“ his persevering virtue.” See Cocceius and Parkhurst, under the word חיל.

(R) —“ overshadowed by him—and dwelling”—  
In the grammatical construction, and the interpretation of this distich, I follow the authority of the Syriac and the Vulgate, taking the words חפף and שכן as participles, the first the participle present Poel of the verb חפף, the other the participle Benoni of the verb שכן, both agreeing with the well-beloved, of whom it is affirmed, that he is sheltered, or overshadowed, and that he dwells between Jehovah’s shoulders. If these two words be taken as active verbs, of which Jehovah is understood to be the subject, the sense will be much the same; for the assertion will then be, that Jehovah shelters the beloved, and dwells between his shoulders. The want of the pronoun of the third person to rehearse Jehovah, is perhaps no insurmountable objection to this way of

expounding the passage. And it might be removed, by adopting what Houbigant conceives to have been the reading of the LXX, עֲלִיּוֹן (the Most High) for the first עָלָיו. But there seems to be some discordance in the imagery, if it be said first of the beloved, that he dwells close by Jehovah, and then of the beloved, that he dwells between Jehovah's shoulders. And the change of עָלָיו into עֲלִיּוֹן, is little better than a mere conjecture of Houbigant's. The single authority of the LXX would not be sufficient, when the text as it stands admits so easy an exposition. But this single authority seems to be wanting.

But what were these shoulders of Jehovah, between which, according to the exposition of the Syriac and Vulgate, which I follow, the beloved dwelt? I say, the high mountains near Jerusalem on the south, projecting their shade over the adjoining territory of Benjamin.

(S) —“ rich gifts—choice fruits—delicacies—wealth—riches”—— By these different expressions, I render the Hebrew word מִנְּרָה in its different applications. We have no one word in the English language to render it with propriety in all. It sig-

nifies whatever in its kind is “excellent, valued, delighted in.”

(T) —“the skies above.” In the original, I insert the word *ממעל* after *שמים*, upon the authority of the Syriac. It is evidently required by the law of the parallelism, to answer to *תחת* in the following line. I would wish to omit the word *מטל*, and read *מעל* instead of it, if there were authority for the alteration. But I have found none that I deem sufficient in the MSS, and the Syriac expresses both words. Perhaps the dew itself is one of the gifts of the abyss. Certainly, in the greater part, it is an exsudation of the earth. Very little of it falls from the skies.

(U) —“of every moon.” This I take to be the force of the plural *ירחים*.

(V) —“who placed their tent.” So I render *שכני*. For although the verb *שכן* renders, ‘to dwell or inhabit,’ generally, and the noun *שכן*, ‘an inhabitant,’ yet, strictly, the verb is to ‘dwell in a tent,’ and the noun is one so dwelling. And the exhibition of the Godhead in the bush was temporary.

The word שְׁנַיִם is most evidently a plural *in regimine*, and as such it ought to be rendered. It is an unwarrantable liberty to render it in the singular, and still more unwarrantable to expunge, as some would do, the plural Jod.

(W) —“ his herd.” I take the word here as a collective, as it is used in Gen. xxxii, 5.

(X) “ They shall pierce ”— They, *i. e.* his horns—shall pierce. So I render יַחַרְוּ as the third person plural future of the verb חָרַר in Pihel (to pierce or penetrate). I confess I have no other instance to produce of the verb so used.

(Y) The name of Issachar is wanting after Zebulun, as the stanza of which this is the title relates to both tribes. This, therefore, is an instance of a proper name lost in our modern Hebrew text, and not supplied by any MS, or any version. We have a second instance of the same kind in Hosea v, 13. And these two instances go far to justify the introduction of the name of Simeon in the sixth verse of this Song, upon the authority of the LXX and St Ambrose.

(Z) —“ the commissioner.” מְחֹקֵק. “ A delineator.” One who traces and marks out. “ A definer,” or “ determiner ;” and hence perhaps, “ a lawgiver.” But in this place the word denotes a public officer, appointed to set out the boundaries of the allotments of the different tribes. One such person was named by Moses out of each of the tribes and half-tribe, among which the land of Canaan was to be distributed, after the tribes of Reuben and Gad and the half-tribe of Manasseh were *housed* in the conquered kingdoms of Sihon and Og, Num. xxxiv, 17—19. And in the progress of the business, after the death of Moses, when the tabernacle was placed at Shiloh, three were appointed out of each of the seven tribes, which at that time remained unsettled, Joshua xviii. It appears that these persons made a survey of the country, and marked out the districts in a map, Joshua xviii, 9. Each of these persons was literally מְחֹקֵק, ‘ a tracer of boundaries.’ I use the word ‘ commissioner,’ as the only one for the office, which the English language affords. It is the name given in acts of Parliament, for the inclosure of commonable lands, to the persons authorised to make allotments of such lands among the different proprietors, or persons in any

way interested in the lands, according to their respective interests. If a word might be coined for the occasion here, ‘determinator’ would more precisely denote the office, and better correspond with the etymology of the Hebrew word.

—“appointed the portions.” I take שׁוּם for the verb, not for the adverb of place. מְחֻזָּק is the nominative case before the verb, and חִלְקָתָהּ the accusative after it.

(AA) “He was housed.” סָפַן. The three verbs, צָפַן, שָׁפַן, and סָפַן, seem nearly allied. צָפַן, signifies, generally, ‘to hide,’ in any way, or under any sort of cover. שָׁפַן, to hide in holes of the ground. But סָפַן, is a term of architecture, and signifies, to form the inside covering of a house—to line the sides and top with boards. The participle סָפַן, applied to a building, signifies this finished state of it; —‘wainscoted and cieled.’ Applied to a person (of which application this text is, I believe, the only instance), it would literally signify, that he was comfortably lodged in a house so finished. It is here used figuratively, and expresses the complete settlement of the tribe of Gad, in the “prime portion” he had chosen for himself in the plain, on the east

of Jordan; not without allusion to the sheltered situation of that country, under the towering hills of Gilead on the east and north.

(BB) —“ and had lodged,” ויִּתַּח, from the sense of the noun תַּח, ‘ a chamber.’

—“ of the people.” I read with the Samaritan, הַעַם; for the individual people of the tribe of Gad is meant.

(CC) It is objected by Dr Durell, that before we apply the springing from Bashan to the lion’s whelp, it ought to be proved that Bashan bred and harboured lions; which he seems to doubt. But although the lion might not be an inhabitant of Palestine in the time of Aristotle, and other later writers of natural history, it is evident, from the frequent allusions to the lion, and the similies taken from it in the Old Testament, that, in the time of the Hebrew writers, it was frequent in that country; otherwise, how should they become so well acquainted with it, as they appear to have been? Add the recorded feat of Benaiah, one of David’s mighty men (2 Sam. xxiii, 20), who “ slew a lion in a pit in a snowy day.” Now, since we must admit, that, in the days

of the writers of the Old Testament, the lion was an animal of Palestine, where is the improbability that it was found in Bashan? And if there be no improbability in the thing, the text is a sufficient argument, in my judgment, that it really obtained. The Hebrew words will not bear the grammatical exposition, by which Dr Durell attempts to apply this springing from Bashan to the Danites. And if his grammatical exposition were admissible, the sense, which the words so expounded would give, would be inadmissible, unless Bashan had lain in the line of march of the Danites from their own territory to Laish, which is far from the truth.

(DD) “Of iron and brass shall be thy sandals.” I think the literal rendering of the Hebrew is, “iron and brass shall be thy shoeing, *i. e.* these metals shall be the material of thy sandals.

(EE) Riding the heavens and the atmosphere, is a figurative expression of God’s dominion and controul over all the powers of nature, inciting or restraining their energies, as a rider manages his steed with the spur and bridle.



(FF) —“ the atmosphere.” So I render שחקים, not ‘ clouds.’ שחק, is ‘ to beat or grind to powder,’ ‘ to pulverise.’ Also *colluctari*, ‘ to struggle together,’ ‘ to wrestle,’ but in sport, rather than in earnest. (The Masoretes make two words, שחק and שחק, but I consider them as one.) Hence שחקים in the plural, and sometimes as שחק in the singular, is a name for the atmosphere, from the minuteness and perpetual intestine agitation of the *elastic* particles of which it is composed.

(GG) I would read מען האלהי. And I suppose with most interpreters, not any defect or ellipsis of the pronoun of the second person. I take the sentiment to be, that God is the only safe refuge for any one; and his arm the only sure support.

(HH) —“ sustentacle.” I take the word מתחת here to be equivalent to a noun substantive, rendering, ‘ id quod subtus est;’ the under-prop.

(II) “ Perish.” So the LXX Απολοιο.

(KK) —“ the thick small rain.” The word טל, generally rendered ‘ dew,’ signifies dew only from

the circumstance of its covering the surface of the ground. For the root טלל, is merely to cover, to strew thick. Hence it may be applied to any other moisture, covering the herbage with equal spissitude of the drops; and when it is applied to a moisture falling from the skies, from which the dew falls not in any great proportion, it must be understood of that which we call a 'growing rain;' which, from the minuteness and closeness of the drops, and their adhesive quality, the consequence of their small size, wets more than hard rain, and is more conducive to vegetation. And it sits upon the herbage, and the leaves of plants, and low shrubs, like the dew.

(LL) "Jehovah." Instead of the pronoun of the original, I repeat the proper name, which it rehearses. With the pronoun in our language, the sentence would be tame and frigid, and without either the pronoun or the noun, it would be in some degree obscure.

(MM) —"with fawning flattery shall make court to thee." This I take to be the exact force of the expression יכחשו לך. The verb is applied in the

same manner in four other places, viz. 2 Samuel, xxii, 45. Ps. xviii, 44. lxvi, 3. and lxxxii, 15. In this passage, our Public Translation has, “shall be found liars unto thee.” In which, by an attempt to preserve what was conceived to be the literal meaning of the word (but see my Critical Notes on Hosea, chap. vii, note (E), the sense of the passage is much obscured. The margin gives, “shall be subdued;” in which the particular force of the Hebrew word is totally lost. In the other four passages, the text has, “submit themselves;” the margin, “yield feigned obedience.” But the original word expresses not a feigned obedience, but a feigned complacency, in a state of complete subjection, and necessary obedience. The falsehood, in short, of flattering professions of duty and affection practised on a superior to win his favour.

**CRITICAL NOTES**

ON

**THE SONG OF DEBORAH.**

---

**JUDGES, CHAP. V.**

THE occasion of this song was the memorable overthrow of Sisera, the leader of the armies of Jabin, the Canaanite king, which is related in the preceding chapter of this book. By which victory, the Israelites were delivered from the oppression of that tyrant, who had fixed the seat of his kingdom at Hazar, a town in the heart of the territory of the tribe of Naphthali, and held the people in subjection twenty years.

The entire song consists of three parts. The first, after a short exordium, comprised in the third, fourth, and fifth verses, describes the disorders and

weakness of the Jewish state, under Shamgar, Deborah's immediate predecessor, and the preparation for the war; the second describes the battle; the third the victory.

The beginning of the whole is evidently at the third verse of the chapter. The distich, therefore, which forms the preceding verse, is misplaced. I remove it to the ninth, where the sense of it will be considered.

(A) "The rural judge." So I render, instead of "the inhabitants of the villages. פְּרוֹן. The words derived from the root פָּרָה, which occur in the Old Testament, are these five, viz. פָּרוּ, פָּרוּי, פְּרוֹוִים, פְּרוֹוֹת, and פְּרוֹן.

The first, פָּרוּ, occurs with the pronominal ו suffixed, Habak. iii, 14. It is rendered by our English translators, "his villages," but in the Vulgate, "bellatorum ejus;" by the LXX, *δυναστων*; and in the other Hexaplar versions, *ἀμαρστων*. It is remarkable, that they all render it by a plural; whence it should seem, that the word in their copies was פְּרוֹוִי, which is still the reading of many MSS.

The second, פָּרוּי, occurs with the prefix ה, הַפְּרוּי, Deut. iii, 5. and 1 Sam. vi, 18. In the first of these

two places, it is rendered in the English Bible by the word “unwalled;” and in the second, “country villages;” and to the same effect in the Vulgate. It is rendered ἀτειχιστων in the first place by Aquila, and ἀτειχιστου in the second by Symmachus. But in both passages, particularly in the last, it may, for any thing that appears to the contrary from the context, be the proper name of a people, the Perezites, and so it is taken by the LXX.

The third, פרוזים, occurs with the prefix ה, and in apposition with the gentile noun היהודים, Esth. ix, 19. היהודים הפרוזים. The words are properly rendered in the English Bible, “The Jews of the villages;” and by the LXX and Vulgate to the same effect.

The fourth, פרוות, occurs in three places, namely, Esth. ix, 19. Ezek. xxxviii, 2. Zech. ii. 4. In the first place with the prefix ה; in the two last, without prefix or suffix. In the first place it is connected with other words, which, taken all together, are expositive of the expression היהודים הפרוזים. Thus, היהודים הפרוזים הישבים בערי הפרות. The expression בערי הפרות, is well rendered in our English Bible, “in the unwalled towns;” and the sense of the whole passage is given by the LXX thus: *of*

Ἰουδαῖοι διεσπαρμένοι ἐν τῇ χωρᾷ τῇ ἐξῶ; and thus in the Vulgate, “Judæi, qui in oppidis non muratis et in villis morabantur.”

In the second place, ארץ פרוזות, is rendered in our English Bible, “the land of unwalled villages;” in the Vulgate, “terram absque muro;” by the LXX, γῆν ἀπερριμμένην.

In the third place, the word seems to be used adverbially. It is rendered in our English Bible, “as towns without walls;” in the Vulgate, “absque muris;” by the LXX, with what sense I know not, κατακαρπῶς.

The word פרזון occurs only in this place, and again in verse 11, where it is probably, as will be shown, a false reading. In the 11th verse, Symmachus renders it by ἀπειχιστοί; and, after him, modern translators have adopted the sense of, “the inhabitants of the villages.” But Houbigant properly observes, that פרזון cannot be a plural noun in the Hebrew language. Adhering, however, to the sense of the villages, he changes פרזון into פרוזות; and, it must be confessed, that some few of Kennicott’s MSS have this reading. From the texts, in which this word פרוזות occurs, it is evident that, connected with ערים or ארץ, or with the proper name of any

particular city or country, it may express the absence of walls or fortifications. But it by no means appears that it is a plural noun by itself rendering ‘villages,’ or ‘unwalled towns,’ or ‘scattered houses,’ or any thing of that sort. The use of the word in Zechariah in particular renders this very disputable. In the passage under consideration, whatever may have been the original reading, Symmachus is the only one of the antient interpreters, who seems to have thought of ‘the inhabitants of villages.’ The Vulgate, both here and in the 11th verse, has ‘forts.’ The LXX, according to the Roman edition, in this place has *δυνατοι*. Other of the Hexaplar interpreters have *κατοικοῦντες*. From this variety of interpretation, we may reasonably conclude, that the true sense of the Hebrew word was a matter of much uncertainty and disagreement.

If *פרוזה* be adopted as the true reading, and that word be supposed to render ‘villages,’ the sense that will arise, which is that which is given in the English Bible, will but ill suit the context. The disorder mentioned in this verse, whatever it really was, appears to have been of such a sort, as to be set to right upon Deborah’s assuming the govern-



ment. But the desertion of villages was an evil that would continue till the fear of the perpetual incursions of the Canaanites, which was the cause that produced it, was removed. This was removed, not by Deborah's assuming the government, but by the successful termination of her war with the Canaanites. In this part of the song, the subject is the disorders previous to Deborah's government, not the advantages of the victory which she gained. The desertion therefore of villages cannot be the thing mentioned here as an evil redressed as soon as she arose to be a mother in Israel.

It is very remarkable, that, in the Alexandrine copy of the LXX, we have the Hebrew word rendered by the Greek participle  $\phi\rho\alpha\zeta\omega\upsilon$ ; and the verb, which should render  $\text{חרלו}$ , is twice put in the singular number,  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\lambda\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$ , to agree with the singular nominative. There is great reason to believe, that Aquila used the same word  $\phi\rho\alpha\zeta\omega\upsilon$  in this place, since we find he used it in the 11th verse. It should seem therefore, that we have the authority both of the LXX and of Aquila to pronounce, that  $\text{פריון}$ , rather than  $\text{פרוות}$ , is the true reading in this 7th verse; and that, in the judgment of those learned interpreters, it is either the name of something for which the

Greek language has no name, or of something which might be rendered in Greek by a word of the very same letters and the same sound. For, in using the word *φραζων*, they either retain the Hebrew word without translating it; or they retain, and retaining, translate it. If it were a word capable of being translated, they certainly would rather have translated than retained it, unless the Greek language afforded them the means of doing both. This we may perhaps find to have been the case.

I find that, in the Arabic dialect, the verb *פָּרַו* signifies ‘to decree, to form an opinion, to judge, to prescribe a rule to, to settle a dispute.’ See Castellus. Hence the noun *פְּרוֹן* may signify ‘a forensic judge;’ such, as by the law, Deut. xvi, 18, were to be appointed in all the cities. I call them ‘rural judges,’ to distinguish them from the supreme judges, from whom this book takes its title; who had a general authority, not confined to particular cities, but extending over the whole country; and a superintendance in every department of government, civil, military, and religious: whereas the office of the rural judge was confined to the business of trying and deciding causes, criminal perhaps, as well as matters of property, within a particular district. This pro-

vincial judge (*qui jus dicebat*) the LXX and Aquila might think well described in Greek by the participle *φραζων*, ‘the expounder, the utterer, the declarer of the law.’ This disorder, stated in this verse, is, that this officer ceased; either none such were appointed, or those who were appointed neglected their duty, till Deborah arose to reform this, with other abuses, in the internal government. This connects well with what immediately precedes.

The noun *פְּרוֹיִן*, as descriptive of persons in a particular office in the state, of which there were, or ought to have been many at the same time, may be considered as a collective, and its verb may without impropriety be plural in the Hebrew language, though the Greek *φραζων* requires a singular verb. I would not therefore propose to change the plural *חרלו* into the singular *חרל*, without authority of MSS, which I do not find.

(B) —“the besieger;” literally, “the fighter.” See Ps. xxxv, 1, and lvi, 2, 3, where the word indisputably signifies ‘a fighter;’ one that is fighting with another. I doubt whether any instance occurs in which this word is equivalent to *מלחמה*.

(C) "While so many," &c. This I take to be the true place of the distich, which in our modern text forms the second verse of this chapter. I have given the sense of it somewhat paraphrastically. The verb פָּרַע signifies generally 'to set free,' or 'to be free,' from any force or restraint physical or moral. Hence, in kal, it signifies, transitively, 'to strip,' *i. e.* to free any part of the person from the confinement of dress, or ornaments; 'to exempt, or excuse from punishment;' 'to discard, neglect, reject,' as we might say in English, 'to make free with' any advice, rule, or precept, (Prov. i, 25; xiii, 18; xv, 32); 'to avoid, keep clear of.' Intransitively, it signifies 'to be a libertine,' (Prov. viii, 33); 'to break loose;' 'to start aside' from any obligation or duty; 'to apostatize' from the true religion. In hiphil, it signifies, transitively, 'to cause to apostatize, to disengage, or to cause to break loose' from the burthen of any stated toil; and, intransitively, 'to cause apostacy.' Hence the noun פִּרְעָה will naturally signify 'a starting aside from any duty;' 'a breaking loose from any coercion or restraint;' 'a declining of any service' by excuses, just or unjust, real or pretended. Thus the literal rendering of the distich might be,

Amid the refusing refusals in Israel,

Bless Jehovah for the volunteering of the people.

This interpretation is confirmed by the history, as it appears in the sequel of the song. Several tribes, either from cowardice or a selfish policy, as being by their situation out of the reach of the oppression of the Canaanite, withdrew themselves from the general confederacy. A great majority however of the people entered with alacrity into the war.

(D) —“concert your measures, for the watering places,” &c. More literally,

—“take much thought,

Because of the sound of battalions forming in the watering places.”

—“battalions forming.” So I render מַחְצִימִים, not ‘archers.’ I conceive that the word describes the forces of the enemy, in the act of *dividing* into distinct battalions, and taking each their respective stations. See Parkhurst, חֲצִיץ, v.

(E) “Justice signally displayed in the cause of Israel.” In the Hebrew text we have the word פָּרוּזִין with the suffix, פָּרוּזִינוּ. Kennicott’s best MSS have פָּרוּזִינוּ, and one or two of inferior note פָּרוּזִינוּ.

Aquila renders the word by the Greek  $\phi\rho\alpha\zeta\omega\nu$ , and the Roman LXX, which in verse 7 had  $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$ , here has  $\phi\rho\alpha\zeta\omega\nu$ . It seems therefore indisputable that  $\text{פרונו}$ , or  $\text{פרונו}$ , was an antient reading; of which however it is so difficult to make any tolerable sense, that I have little doubt that it is a corruption, which has arisen from the great similitude between the true word and the word  $\text{פרוין}$  of the 7th verse.

In the Alexandrine copy of the LXX, we find the word rendered here by the plural verb  $\epsilon\nu\omicron\sigma\chi\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ . Theodotion rendered it by the imperative singular of the same verb  $\epsilon\nu\omicron\sigma\chi\upsilon\sigma\omicron\nu$ ; and other of the Hexaplar translations have  $\alpha\upsilon\acute{\xi}\eta\sigma\omicron\nu$ . Hence we may conclude, *1st*, that the LXX found different words here and in the 7th verse: *2dly*, that the word, in this place, was taken by them, by Theodotion, and by other interpreters of less note, for a verb: *3dly*, that the verb was in such a form, that it might be understood either as an indicative, or an imperative, since some interpreters took it for the one, some for the other: and, *4thly*, that the word bore a near resemblance to  $\text{פרוני}$ . Upon these grounds, I venture to read  $\text{תפרצנה}$ , which is the first person plural feminine future of the verb  $\text{פרץ}$ . The alterations in the reading of the printed text are these: *1st*, the restitu-

tion of the initial ה, which might easily be lost, as the next preceding word ends with that letter: 2d, the change of י into ז, letters which in many instances seem to be used promiscuously for each other: 3d, the omission of ו after this letter upon the authority of Kennicott's best MSS: the change of the final letter ו into ה. For the grammatical exposition of the text thus corrected, I would not take the noun צדקת itself as the nominative of the verb, but taking this noun as the accusative under the verb יתנו understood as repeated; I take the pronoun אשר understood, rehearsing צדקת, for the nominative of the verb תפרצנה. Thus the literal rendering of this and the preceding line will be,

There they shall celebrate the justices of Jehovah,

[They shall celebrate] justices [which] shall burst out upon  
Israel.

—“justices.” The word in the original is plural. It is very exactly rendered in the English Bible, “righteous acts.” For ‘justices’ in the plural must signify manifestations of justice, not justice itself. But by that easy metonymy, which puts the cause for the effect, I use the singular noun ‘justice,’ as I can find no way of expressing the force of the verb תפרצנה (which is very material), if ‘righteous acts’

be retained. The English Geneva has 'justice' in the singular.

(F) —“ was the general cry.” רברי שיר, ‘ the burthen of the song :’ a proverbial expression, denoting what is in every one’s mouth. I take רברי not for the imperative feminine of the verb, but for the plural of the noun *in regimine*.

(G) —“ the remnant of each bold leader’s troop.” לארירים שריר id quod reliquum erat לארירים ducibus fortissimis. τοις ἀρξιστοιχοῖς.

(H) —“ at Mount Amalek.” In justification of this rendering, which is Kennicott’s, see Judges xii, 15.

(I) —“ him—his”— For אחריר and בעממיר, I read, with Houbigant, אחריו and בעממיו.

(K) —“ delineators.” ζωγραφοι, delineators of symbolical figures.

(L) —“ hillocks.” The noun משפתים is from the root שפה, ‘ to stick up,’ or ‘ to be prominent ;’



and it is in the dual form. It is used in Jacob's last words to signify the two panniers of a laden ass lying down, and those panniers are the ridges of hills which were the boundaries of his territory. See Critical Notes on the Last Words of Jacob, note (L). In like manner, I think, it is to be taken here to signify 'hills in double parallel ridges.' Reuben is asked why he abode between **המשפתיים** to hear the bleatings of the flocks. And where should any one abide to hear the bleatings of the flocks, but among hills, where flocks range? The word **שפתיים**, another noun from the same root, and in the dual form, is used in Ps. lxxviii, 13, as I think in the same sense, for 'hills in parallel ridges,' though in the English Bible it is rendered 'pots.' "Though ye have lain among the pots." To be lodged among pots, I confess might be an image of the most abject slavery. But the psalmist, in this passage, is not speaking of the Israelites in slavery. Having in the preceding part of the psalm brought them out of Egypt, having mentioned the miraculous manner of their deliverance, their miraculous support in the wilderness, and the victories, not less miraculous, which they gained upon their march, and upon their first entrance into Canaan; comes in the 13th verse to

speak of their condition settled in peaceful possession of the promised land. And this line should be rendered,

“ When ye dwell between the ridges of hills.”

The Israelites, settled in the promised land, dwelt between hills, in valleys or straths bounded on each side by ridges of hills : for such was the land of Palestine in the inland parts. The LXX, St Jerome, and the Vulgate, seem never to have dreamed of the sense of ‘ pots,’ which our translators have imposed upon the word in this passage of the psalmist, upon no authority that I can find, but that of an obscure passage in the prophet Ezekiel, where the same word signifies pots, or andirons, or stoves, or something else. But the sense of ‘ double ridges of hills ’ arises naturally from the etymology of the word, and is perfectly consistent with the context.

(M) “ Gad ”— So I read with Houbigant and Kennicott,

(N) —“ slunk he like a coward to his ships.” This I take to be the force of יגור אניות. It may seem, that, to give this sense, a preposition is wanted before the noun. But a preposition is equally

wanted in any other sense that may be affixed to the verb. And the ellipsis of prepositions is frequent in all the poetical parts of scripture, and nowhere so much as in this ode.

(O) —“brought to action.” This I take to be the force of the passive verb *נלחמו* in this place.

(P) “No ransom was taken;” literally, “they took no ransom.” The nominative of the verb is the indefinite pronoun plural understood. I render the verb therefore by a passive, with the accusative after the active verb for its nominative case, to express that no ransom was taken on either side; which is the thing expressed by the form of the sentence in the original.

(Q) —“their orbits;” literally, “their highways. The Hebrew word *כוכבים*, I take to be a general name for planets and fixed stars without distinction. And the antients applied the word orbits, not only to the orbits of the planets, to which it is now confined, but they called the parallel of declination, described by the apparent diurnal motion of any particular fixed star, ‘the orbit’ of that fixed

star. At the same time, it is difficult to conceive, how the fixed stars should exert any *occasional* influence upon our atmosphere. I only mean to remark, that they are not of necessity excluded by the mention of the ‘orbits’ of those stars which were engaged in this battle. Mr Parkhurst’s observations upon this passage deserve attention. See his Lexicon, סל, iv.

(R) “The overtaking river”— Overtaking. קרומים. I am much in doubt about the sense of this epithet. Some render it ‘antient,’ some ‘eastern.’ But with what propriety the river Kishon could be distinguished as an antient or an eastern river, I cannot comprehend; nor why the word, in either of these senses, should be plural. The Vulgate renders it as the proper name of a people, ‘Cadumim.’ And if the traces of any such people were to be found in antient geography, upon the bank of the Kishon, this rendering might be preferable to any other; though it would be an objection, that the word, as the proper name of a people, ought to have the ה prefixed. The Syriac interpreter had another word, קרומים, which he renders as the name of another stream, ‘Carmin.’

The root קרם properly signifies ‘antevertere, anticipare, præire, prævenire, obvenire.’ Hence it is applicable to priority either of time or place; and hence nouns derived from it get the sense either of ‘antiquity,’ or ‘the east.’ But going back to the primary sense of the root, I think נחל קרומים may be rendered literally, ‘the river of preventions,’ or ‘of anticipations,’ describing the river as, by its rapidity, when swoln with the rain, *preventing* every one that attempted to escape, getting before him if he ran straight forward, or rising faster than he could climb if he attempted to get upon the rising grounds. To express this sense, I render, ‘the overtaking river.’ And this sense agrees well with the accounts which travellers give of the Kishon at this day, or at least not long since.

(S) “O Deborah”— Heb. “O my soul.” But this in Hebrew is merely a form of self-compellation. And in many places, of which this is one, is best expressed in English by making the person speak to himself by his own proper name. It is very harsh in our language to speak to the soul as ‘trampling upon;’ an action in which the soul cannot be the immediate agent.

(T) “Then were the hoofs,” &c. “Ungulæ equorum ceciderunt, fugientibus impetu, et per præceps mentibus fortissimis hostium.” Vulg.

(U) “One of the most accomplished,” &c. “Una sapientior cæteris uxoribus ejus hæc socrui verba respondit,” Vulgate. “Est חכמה חכמה idem ac חכמה nisi perperam fuit ׀ interpolatum. Numero singulari interpretantur Syrus, Vulgatus, et Arabs. In תענינה vero est ׀ alterum epentheticum, ut solet fieri post ׀ prius.” Houbigant *ad loc.* Many of Kennicott’s best MSS read תענינה.


(V) —“each valiant chief.” ראש לראש גבר. ראש is used here as ‘caput’ in Latin and *καφα* in Greek, ‘to the stout head,’ *i. e.* ‘to each stout head,’ *fortissimo cuique.*

FINIS.









BS1151 .H818 v.4  
Biblical criticism on the first fourteen

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00038 3812