

# The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1923

---

## THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEAS OF DANIEL

Before entering upon the discussion of the origin of the ideas of Daniel, several fallacies must first be considered.

Thus it is claimed that it is possible to determine the time of a revelation from its ideas in the same manner as we would determine that of a mere human production. But, for those who believe in a thinking God who has made the universe including man it is impossible to deny the possibility of a revelation to His creatures of Himself and of His plans up to the capacity of those creatures to receive such a revelation. How and why He makes such a revelation it may be impossible for the objects of it to determine or to understand: but that He can reveal what He desires to reveal must be admitted.

Further, to all who believe that God has begun to make such a revelation it is clear that no limits as to the time and manner and order and emphasis, extent and subject-matter, of such a revelation can be set by the creatures who receive it. These are matters for the Revealer to determine and not for the persons to whom the revelation is made.

To those who accept these premises (and we take it that all Christians must accept them), all objections against the book of Daniel on the ground of the character of the revelation that it contains may safely be looked upon as beyond the legitimate realm of discussion. Whether God saw fit to reveal these truths in the sixth or in the second century B.C. must be a matter of comparatively little importance. What is of importance for us is, that He has revealed them.

To object to the fact of a certain alleged revelation that it is too detailed, or that it is written in veiled language, or in an unusual rhetorical style, or in a novel literary manner, is

## “THY THRONE, O GOD, IS FOR EVER AND EVER”

### A STUDY IN HIGHER CRITICAL METHOD

It would be a difficult, even an impossible task to determine which is the most disputed verse in the Bible; but that the late Dr. Driver was entirely correct in calling Ps. xlv. 7<sup>1</sup> a “much controverted passage” no one will deny. The possibilities of Hebrew syntax have been explored, the ingenuity of the critic has been taxed to the utmost, in the endeavor to find a translation or an emendation which will avoid the difficulties presented by the “ordinary rendering.” That these difficulties are largely, if not entirely connected with the interpretation of the passage is obvious. The rendering, “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,” is perfectly justifiable, grammatically. It is the “doctrinal” implications involved in this rendering which make it improbable or impossible in the eyes of many scholars. Thus Giesebrecht remarks: “On this point it seems to me that all things considered there cannot be any doubt that (as Olshausen also asserts) *grammatically* the translation of the LXX<sup>2</sup> is the only correct one and would have to be accepted without qualification were it not that the most significant internal (sachlich) difficulties emerge against it.”<sup>3</sup>

Among the various emendations which have been proposed for this passage there is one which, although by no means

---

<sup>1</sup> The references to the Old Testament are usually to the Massoretic Text (MT). In the English version this is of course vs. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ θεός, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. Cf. Hebrews i. 8, where this passage is quoted, apparently from the LXX with which it corresponds exactly. It may be added that Giesebrecht understands the ὁ θεός as vocative, as is done by most scholars [cf. p. 259].

<sup>3</sup> *Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft*, (1887) p. 290. This statement by one who, as we shall see presently, insists on altering the text to escape the internal difficulty, is noteworthy. It practically amounts to a confession that Ed. Böhl is correct when he says: “Far rather let us with Hengstenberg, Delitzsch and the entire exegetical tradition, hold to ‘Thy throne, O God.’ And it would occur to no one to translate otherwise, were it not for the danger of being obliged to acknowledge here the Deity of the Messiah” (*Zwölf Messianischen Psalmen*, p. 277).

new, is of special interest at present because of the fact that it has recently been advocated in “popular” text-books with a tone of finality which indicates a tendency in influential critical circles to treat it as an assured result of criticism. Thus, in Peake’s *Commentary on the Bible* we find it stated as follows: “For ‘Thy throne, O God,’ the original text must have had ‘Thy throne, O Yahweh,’ ‘God’ being due to the editor of the Elohist Psalter. But ‘Yahweh’ was itself a mistake of the scribe for ‘will be’ (yiheyeh being changed into ‘Yahweh’).<sup>4</sup> Read therefore, ‘Thy throne will exist forever and ever.’”<sup>5</sup> Professor G. A. Barton in his *Religion of Israel*, in discussing the Elohist Psalms, definitely attributes the use of Elohim instead of Jehovah to the redactor who, he tells us, “changed *Yahweh* everywhere to *elohim*”; and he says further regarding the work of this redactor: “He did this [*i.e.*, changed Yahweh to Elohim] with such zeal that he sometimes made mistakes. In Ps. xlv, a non-religious poem written on the marriage of some king, vs. 6, read, ‘Thy throne shall be forever and ever.’ As ‘shall be’ looks in Hebrew, a little like Yahweh,’ the editor inserted *elohim* in its place.”<sup>6</sup> Finally, Professor J. E. McFadyen in his *The Psalms in Modern Speech* (1916) boldly renders the verse: “Thy throne shall stand forever and ever,” without inserting a question mark or adding a single word of comment or explanation.<sup>7</sup> Such unqualified<sup>8</sup> endorsement of this emendation

<sup>4</sup> In the consonantal Hebrew Text the divine name Jehovah (Yahweh) or, as it is often termed, the Tetragrammaton, is written YHWH, while the verbal form “(he) shall be” is written YHYH.

<sup>5</sup> P. 380. The section on “The Psalms” in this *Commentary* is the work of the late Professor W. E. Addis.

<sup>6</sup> P. 198, footnote.

<sup>7</sup> Second edition, p. 68. In an earlier work, *The Psalms of the Old Testament arranged in their natural grouping and fully rendered in paraphrase* (1904), which appeared in “The Messages of the Bible” series (edited by Saunders and Kent) where the same rendering is given, a footnote adds: “In v. 6, for ‘O God’ probably the original was simply ‘shall be.’” Apparently Professor McFayden felt that the rendering advanced as “probable” in 1904 might in 1916 be regarded as so certain as to require no explanation.

<sup>8</sup> In Dummelow (*The One Volume Bible Commentary*, p. 347) this

in books intended for the general reader who is frequently, indeed usually, not in a position to examine the evidence at first hand, could be justified only by the conviction on the part of the critic that the evidence in its favor practically amounts to a demonstration, all the more since this verse is one of the "great texts" of the Old Testament, a verse of very precious Messianic content. The aim of this article is to examine the evidence.

The view that the text of this verse originally read "shall be" instead of the vocative "O God" was first proposed by Bruston in his *Les Psaumes traduits de l'Hébreu* (1865), and re-affirmed in his *Du Texte Primitif des Psaumes* (1873). According to Bruston the change from "shall be" to "O God" was the result of a *misreading*. The redactor clearly mistook the word "shall be" (YHYH) for the Tetragrammaton (YHWH), and according to his "usual custom" substituted for it the word "God" (Elohim).<sup>9</sup> In 1887 the same view was independently proposed by Giesebrecht, except that he attributed the change to mistaken "zeal" on the part of the redactor, who while apparently aware that the text read "shall be," nevertheless changed "shall be" to "God" (Elohim) because "shall be," to use Dr. Barton's phrase, "looks in Hebrew a little like" the Tetragrammaton. Giesebrecht's statement is (almost verbatim) as follows: 1. As frequently in the Elohist Psalms, so also here, Elohim was read by a diaskeuast to replace YHWH. 2. But he erred in his 'zeal' to remove the unutterable name of God, and corrected a YHYH instead of YHWH into Elohim. 3. If according to this view the words originally read "Thy throne

view is advocated, but less positively. After stating that the rendering of the RV margin "Thy throne (is the throne of) God" "gives a good sense and meets the difficulty that the human king who is addressed in the first instance could hardly be called 'God,'" the commentator adds, "There are textual reasons for believing, however, that the original reading was simply, 'Thy throne *shall be* for ever.'"

<sup>9</sup> To the rendering "ton trône sera éternel!" the footnote is added: "Le compilateur, lisant sans doute IHVH (Jéhovah) au lieu de IHIH (il sera), aura comme à l'ordinaire, cru bon de remplacer ce nom par celui de Dieu."

shall be (YHYH) for ever and ever," the Elohim is not only removed, but the verb is also gained. 4. This expression is supported by a parallel passage, 2 Samuel vii. 16, "Thy throne shall be (YHYH) established ( נבון ) forever ( עד עולם )," cf. Lam. v. 19. For the use of "forever" ( עולם ) in the simple accusative, cf. Ps. xlvi. 15, lii. 10, lxi. 8, lxvi. 7, lxxxix. 2, 3, 38, civ. 5.<sup>10</sup>

Since these two scholars are agreed in their fundamental contention that the original reading of this verse was, "Thy throne shall be (YHYH) for ever and ever," and that "God" was substituted for the verb by the Elohistic redactor, and differ only in the account which they give of this substitution, their views may be considered together. There are five questions to be investigated, the first three of which are raised by both Bruston and Giesebrecht, the last two only by Giesebrecht. They may be summarized as follows: 1. The question of the Text. 2. The orthographic similarity between the words "shall be" (YHYH) and the Tetragrammaton (YHWH). 3. The "preference" shown by the Elohistic redactor for the name "Elohim" instead of the Tetragrammaton. 4. The syntax of the verse, (a) the alleged need of a verb; (b) the predicate "ever and ever." 5. The dogmatic difficulty presented by the verse in its present form.

Taking up these points in order, we will consider:

1. The Question of the Text.—This is the fundamental question which underlies all discussion of the emendation of a given passage. Before any revision of the text is even considered it would seem to be a natural and necessary preliminary to investigate the evidence in support of the existing text with a view to ascertaining whether the theory of textual corruption is a likely one. This should be the case if the critic is really desirous of "restoring" the text. If his object is to "improve upon" it, on his own authority, that is a very dif-

<sup>10</sup> *Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft*, VII (1887), p. 290f. Subsequently (Vol. VIII, p. 176) he acknowledged the priority of Bruston's discovery. Cf. p. 264 where J. C. Mathes states that this conjectural emendation had also occurred to him independently, and that he had taught it publicly before it was announced by Giesebrecht.

ferent matter. Bruston and Giesebrecht (and those who have accepted their conjecture) in their eagerness to remove the "dogmatic" objection to the accepted reading do not seem to have paid much attention to the evidence which can be cited in its favor. On the contrary they apparently assume that it is unreliable. It is to be carefully noticed therefore that the evidence in support of the MT is unusually strong. No variant readings in the Hebrew MSS have been cited by Kennicott; and the versions are unanimous in supporting the present text. According to Dr. Briggs "All the versions regard Elohim, God, as vocative; all refer it to the King, except T [=Targum] which thinks of God."<sup>11</sup> The textual evidence for an Old Testament passage as such is therefore strongly against the theory that the text is corrupt. But in this instance we have in addition the witness of the New Testament. This verse is quoted in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is quoted apparently from the LXX which gives a strictly literal rendering of the Hebrew, and investigation of the Text of the New Testament has produced no variations which favor the proposed emendation.

This testimony to the correctness of the MT is very important in view of the tendency of the critic to emphasize the negative rather than the positive side of his task. A good example of the onesidedness of his method and of his tendency to ignore the evidence in favor of the existing Text in the interest of any conjectural emendation which is ingenious or plausible, is furnished by Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*.<sup>12</sup> In the 'Prolegomena' of this critical edition it is stated: "It is characteristic of this edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* that both the most important *variant readings* of the Hebrew codices at the hand of writers and ancient versions, and *proposals (consilia) for emendation* of the traditional text are added to the Massoretic Text in notes." We turn to Ps. xlv, and find that although Professor Buhl cites two out of half a dozen con-

<sup>11</sup> *The Psalms*, Vol. I, p. 387.

<sup>12</sup> *Biblia Hebraica*, adjuvantibus professoribus G. Beer, F. Buhl, G. Dalman, S. R. Driver, W. Nowack, I. W. Rothstein, V. Ryssel, edidit Rud. Kittel (1905).

jectural emendations proposed for verse 7, namely “shall be” for “O God,” and “is established” ( סעד ) for “and ever” ( ועד ), the fact that the versions and the Epistle to the Hebrews *support* the MT is not referred to. It is to be recognized, of course, that the notes added by Professor Buhl are intended primarily to call attention to *variations* and where no variations are referred to, it is to be assumed that the evidence in favor of the MT is good; but if the editor deems it advisable to call attention to two conjectural emendations of the text, it might be regarded as at least proper for him to allude to the fact that the MT has the support of the versions and—what is of the first importance to the Christian—of the New Testament also. To cite *variants* only and give prominence to *conjectural* emendations, while passing by the positive evidence in support of the text as it is, creates a false impression and lays the emphasis on the negative side. It is such methods as this which justify the phrase “destructive” criticism.

2. The Orthographic Similarity between the words “shall be” (YHYH) and the Tetragrammaton (YHWH).—It is obvious that orthographically these two words are very similar. Three of the four letters are the same and occur in the same relative order, and the letters which differ (W and Y) are the two letters which are perhaps more than any others the subject of confusion in the Old Testament Text.<sup>13</sup> This fact clearly gives strong initial probability to the conjecture we are considering, and doubtless accounts for its having suggested itself independently to Bruston and Giesebrecht.<sup>14</sup>

It is important therefore to observe that this emendation as proposed by Bruston and Giesebrecht and as stated by its recent advocates referred to above is a purely “conjectural”

<sup>13</sup> We know that there was a time when W and Y, originally clearly distinguished orthographically, were written practically or exactly alike. But aside from this it must be admitted that in a poorly written or badly damaged MS. the danger of confusing two so similar words might be considerable.

<sup>14</sup> And also to Mathes as stated above.

emendation. Not a single instance of the confusion of these words has been cited by them in support of their theory. This is significant because both of the words under discussion are of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament. The Tetragrammaton is found nearly 7000 times, the verbal form "shall be" (YHYH) about 400 times. Hatch and Redpath in their *Concordance of the Septuagint* give twenty-four different words (not counting several variants) rendered by "lord" (κύριος) in the LXX. Of these the Tetragrammaton is of course by far the most frequent; but "shall be" (YHYH) is not found among them. And the recent discussion of the Divine Names in the Pentateuch (especially Genesis) by Wiener, Dahse, Skinner and others has not apparently produced a single proved example<sup>15</sup> of this alleged confusion or change. No evidence in its favor is furnished us by the Samaritan Pentateuch. And there is but a single example to be found in the parallel passages in the Old Testament.<sup>16</sup> It is

<sup>15</sup> In Gen. xxviii. 20 where the MT reads "if will be (YHYH) God with me," the LXX renders, "if will be the Lord God with me ( ἐὰν ᾖ Κύριος ὁ θεὸς μετ' ἐμοῦ ). It has been suggested that this variant should be taken to mean that the Hebrew text originally read YHWH and that the LXX has preserved the correct reading. This is the view of Dahse (*Textkrit. Materialien*, I, 49, 96). While it is not to be denied that the testimony of the LXX is of great value where a variation of W and Y is concerned, there is good warrant for regarding the MT as correct in this instance. The construction of the sentence in the Hebrew is more natural with the verb expressed. The Samaritan-Hebrew text and the Samaritan and Peshitto versions support the MT. The LXX rendering also contains the verb and as there are other examples of the rendering of the simple "Lord" in the Hebrew by "Lord God" in the LXX, it is probable that the explanation is to be found in this fact, and not in any difference between the Hebrew text used by the LXX and the MT. In Hosea xii. 6, however, we have what seems to be a clear example of the alleged confusion on the part of the Greek translation. The MT reads "The Lord of hosts, the Lord (is) his memorial." The LXX has "the Lord of hosts shall be his memorial." Here the LXX translators have apparently read YHYH instead of YHWH. But that the reading of the MT is better is indicated by the analogy of Ex. iii. 15 (cf. Isa. xlvii, 4, xlviii. 2, li. 15, liv. 5, Jer. x. 16, xxxi. 35, xlviii. 15, li. 57). [I am indebted to Professor R. D. Wilson for calling my attention to this latter passage.]

<sup>16</sup> Professor Wilson has called my attention to the fact that in the



remarkable that this should be the case, in view of the close resemblance between the two words, but being the case it goes a long way toward disproving the accidental confusion which forms the basis of the theory as stated by Bruston. It also militates against the theory of intentional change as advocated by Giesebrecht. For if such accidental or intentional change were a probable explanation of this passage, we might certainly expect that out of about 7250 occurrences of the two words, a number of instances of the alleged confusion would actually be found.

3. The Preference for Elohim.—It must be carefully observed that the marked preponderance of Elohim over Jehovah in the Elohistie Psalms indicates at the most a relative and not an absolute preference. The name Jehovah has not been completely "eliminated";<sup>17</sup> it appears forty-three times in Psalms xlii-lxxxiii,<sup>18</sup> as against Elohim two hundred times, *i.e.*, in nearly twenty per cent of the total instances. While this ratio may, and apparently does, indicate a decided preference for Elohim, it can not justly be claimed that it points to a positive aversion to Jehovah.

In proof of this we turn to Psalm lxx which, as one of the two psalms that appear in what is claimed to be a "double recension," is regarded by the critics as furnishing the strongest proof of an Elohistie redaction of this group of psalms. Yet in it we find nothing to justify so drastic an inference as Giesebrecht's theory requires. Jehovah occurs twice and Elohim three times in Ps. lxx, as against Jehovah three times, Adonay (Lord) once, and Elohim once in Ps. xl. 14-18. If as is claimed the change is due to the editor, he has changed

---

Edict of Cyrus as cited in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 23 the closing words are "(let be) the Lord (YHWH) his God with him and let him go up," whereas in Ezra i. 3 we read, "let be (YHY) his God with him," etc. In both cases the reading of the LXX is "shall be his God with him." This would seem to indicate that in Chronicles "shall be" has been misread as the Tetragrammaton.

<sup>17</sup> It has been pointed out above that Dr. Barton states that the redactor "changed *Yahweh* everywhere to *elohim*."

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Driver, *Introduction*, p. 371. It is distributed over twenty-five of the forty-two psalms of this group.

Jehovah or Adonay three times into Elohim and Elohim once into Jehovah. This certainly indicates no very strong aversion on his part to the use of the word Jehovah. On the contrary, the testimony of this Psalm favors the view that the reason for the change was, at least in part, literary and not dogmatic. The Deity is referred to by name twice in the first verse, once in the fourth verse, and twice in the last verse. In the first verse of Ps. lxx, one of the two Jehovah's of xl. 14 is changed to Elohim;<sup>19</sup> in the fourth verse, the Jehovah is changed to Elohim; in the last verse in which Ps. xl. 18 has Adonay in the first part and Elohim in the second, in Ps. lxx, Elohim<sup>20</sup> takes the place of Adonay in the first part and Jehovah is substituted for Elohim in the second part. This would seem to indicate that the redactor or better the author<sup>21</sup> aimed at variety and that having changed the Adonay to Elohim, he preferred to change Elohim to Jehovah in the last clause, rather than to have two Elohim's so close together.<sup>22</sup> It would seem then that his "zeal" was by no means blind, but was frequently tempered by other considerations. Hence while it must be admitted that this collection shows decided preference for Elohim and that consequently the possibility of a substitution of Elohim for Jehovah must be reckoned with,<sup>23</sup> there is not the slightest warrant for making the

<sup>19</sup> In the MT it is the first; according to the LXX the second.

<sup>20</sup> It should be noted that Kennicott cites thirty-one MSS. as reading Jehovah (and one, Jehovah Elohim) instead of Elohim—an array of evidence which ought not to be ignored by the advocates of an Elohist redaction.

<sup>21</sup> That Ps. lxx is a variant form of Ps. xl. 14-18 seems clear, but that it is *merely* an Elohist redaction can be definitely denied in view of the facts cited above. There are nine variations (not all supported by the LXX) between the two texts aside from the Divine Names. There is no good reason why these changes should not go back to the author himself. It is easier to attribute "editorial" changes to David than to believe that a later redactor ventured to "edit" a *Davidic* psalm.

<sup>22</sup> Such alternative use of the Divine Names is by no means unusual. In this so called *Elohist* group of Psalms we find it in Pss. xlvi. 6, lv. 17, lvi. 11, lviii. 7, lxviii. 17, lxix. 14.

<sup>23</sup> Giesebrecht, *Über die Abfassungszeit der Psalmen* (ZATW. I, p. 317) calls attention to "God thy God" in verse 8 as a clear example of this change. Like many other scholars, he is certain that the text origin-

“editor” a blind fanatic, who could not endure the presence of the Tetragrammaton and removed it and everything which suggested it at all costs. Such a contention is absolutely incompatible with the fact which the critic should not allow himself to forget that the Tetragrammaton does occur 43 times in this Psalm collection.

If the redactor allowed the Tetragrammaton itself to remain 43 times, it would be surprising, to say the least, were he to remove a “shall be” from this verse just because it “looked like” the Tetragrammaton. The improbability of such an intentional elimination of “shall be” is increased by the following considerations. It is to be noted in the first place that the verb “to be” is used relatively infrequently in the Psalter,<sup>24</sup> and that the form “shall be” (YHYH) is found only *four* times in the entire Psalter. It is still more remarkable that one of these four rare occurrences (lxxxii. 10) is found in this very group of Elohist psalms, from which the “zeal” of the redactor is supposed to have eliminated it. Further it

---

ally read “Jehovah thy God” (cf. Driver. *Introduction*, p. 372, note) as so frequently elsewhere in the Old Testament. It is to be observed therefore (1) that while this same expression occurs a few times elsewhere in this group of Psalms (xl. 4, l. 7, li. 16, lxxvii. 7, lxxviii. 9; cf. xl. 15, lxxiii. 2), the expression “Jehovah, God” is found slightly oftener (lix. 6, lxxii. 18, lxxvi. 12, lxxx. 5, 20, lxxxii. 11; cf. lxxviii. 19); and (2) that in 2 Chronicles a document in which the name Jehovah occurs about four times as often as Elohim (cf. Article by Prof. R. D. Wilson, “Names of God in the Old Testament,” in this REVIEW, July 1920, p. 461), this same expression occurs (though unsupported by the LXX) in xxxiv. 32, facts which confirm us in the contention that in this group of Psalms the preference for Elohim is a *relative* and not an *absolute* one, and that the alleged Elohist redaction does not satisfactorily account for the facts before us. Whether in this instance it is due to the Elohist character of the Psalm or whether there is another reason cannot be determined with certainty. The repetition of the same word might be for the sake of emphasis, or the first Elohim may be intended as a vocative like the Elohim of verse 7, a view which has been defended by able scholars.

<sup>24</sup> It occurs in all its forms only about one hundred times in the Psalms, which is less than half the average frequency for the Old Testament in which this verb occurs about 3500 times in all. The imperfect occurs in the Psalms fifty-seven times of which thirteen follow *wayw* *conversive* and twenty-two are recognizable as jussives.

is to be noted that it does not once occur in Book I of the Psalter, a collection of about equal length with the Elohist collection, and preponderatingly Jehovistic. This is especially significant. For if the critic were to argue that the infrequent occurrence of this word in Psalms xlii-lxxxiii is due to the "zeal" of the Elohist redactor, how would he explain its total non-appearance in Book I? It is rather to be regarded as characteristic of the Psalter as a whole. Consequently while the fact that there are but four occurrences of this word in our present text of the Psalms does not make it impossible<sup>25</sup> that the word may have originally stood in this verse, it does make it, to say the least, decidedly improbable; and when we set this fact alongside of the other two stated above that one of the four actual occurrences of the word "shall be" is in this very group of Elohist psalms, and that the Tetragrammaton appears 43 times in this collection, the theory of an intentional alteration of the text of this verse for the purpose of "eliminating" it, becomes extremely improbable. To say the least it would make the redactor such a bungler that his action must be regarded as practically unaccountable.

While admitting ourselves at a loss to account for, or to find convincing proof of, the alleged "zeal" of the Elohist editor of this group of Psalms, it may not be amiss to consider the policy of another "editor" to whose activities the critics often attach great importance, and one of whose alleged "peculiarities" is of importance for our present investigation. It is a fundamental of criticism that according to the P document the name Jehovah was not known in Israel before the Exodus (Ex. vi. 3.). Since on this interpretation, its appearance in the Genesis narrative of P would be an "anach-

---

<sup>25</sup> The plural occurs in verse 17 of Ps. xlv. and the apocopated form (YHY) occurs four times in this group of Psalms and fourteen times in the entire Psalter. Of course if the plural appears in verse 17 the singular might equally well appear in verse 7. But none the less the fact that the singular (YHYH) occurs only four times in the entire Psalter, should make the critic hesitate to assert as a mere "conjecture" that this word originally occurred in this verse.

ronism,” we can readily understand that both writer and redactor of P might be careful to avoid it up to this point of the narrative, and as a matter of fact the name Jehovah is carefully “eliminated”<sup>26</sup> by the critics from the document P in Genesis. Now according to Giesebrecht the editor of the Elohist Psalms, despite the fact that Jehovah occurs forty-three times in his collection, showed such “zeal” in the avoidance of the Tetragrammaton that he even eliminated the form “shall be” in Psalm xlv.7 because it “looks like” Jehovah. Might we not expect to find traces of a like zeal on the part of the writer of P, who shared his aversion to the use of the Tetragrammaton? Yet when we turn to P in Genesis we observe the striking fact that the word “shall be” (YHYH) occurs seven times in this document. It is found only twenty-five times in the entire book of Genesis, yet seven of these instances are in P, which indicates that P or the redactor of P apparently had no objection to the use of this word at which our Psalm redactor is supposed to have taken such offence. Furthermore it is to be noted that while the critics, if their interpretation of Exod. vi. 3 be adopted, can give a very evident reason for the avoidance of the Tetragrammaton in the P document in Genesis, they can give no convincing reason why the psalm editor was so zealous as they claim.

The attempt has been made to show that already in the later books of the Old Testament that tendency to avoid the use of the Tetragrammaton, which is characteristic of later Judaism, can be traced. Thus Professor König in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (Col. 3321) makes the following statement: “As early as the beginning of the third century B. C. יהוה seems to have been regarded as ἄρρητον at least beyond the sacred precincts. Thus is to be explained to a considerable extent the avoidance of the Tetragrammaton in the latest books of the Old Testament, as *e.g.*, in Daniel, (except chap. ix), to some extent in Chronicles, and in consequence of editorial revision in Ps. xlii-lxxxiv, as well as in the Apocrypha

<sup>26</sup> “Eliminated” is the only word which fits such a passage as Genesis vii. 16 (last clause).

generally." In view of the fact that in *Chronicles* the Tetragrammaton appears 347 times as against *Elohim* 197 times, the "extent" to which the author of *Chronicles* avoided the Tetragrammaton is not very apparent. In *Ezra-Nehemiah*, which stands in close relation to *Chronicles*, the Tetragrammaton occurs 54 times, as against *Elohim* 21 times. Regarding *Daniel* it is to be noted that the name "Jehovah" is used six times in the prayer recorded in chapter ix, the place where we would most naturally expect to find it. In the first six chapters which deal with the intercourse of Daniel and his companions with heathen kings and their officials it is not surprising that the national covenant name of the God of Israel should not be employed. In the last six chapters the true God is referred to or addressed, aside from chapter ix, only a few times. The statement regarding the Apocrypha is also much too strong.<sup>27</sup> But even admitting, for the sake of argument, that the tendency to avoid the use of the Tetragrammaton appears within the canonical books and is responsible for the preponderance of *Elohim* in the Elohist collection of the Psalms, it is important to note that there is apparently no effort on the part of writers alleged to have this preference for *Elohim* to avoid the form "shall be" because it "looks like" the Tetragrammaton. *Ecclesiastes*, which the critics are unanimous in regarding as late, might well have been cited by Professor Hölmg as a remarkable example of the avoidance of the use of the Tetragrammaton, since in it *Elohim* occurs thirty times, while the Tetragrammaton is not found once. Yet, in this book, which might be expected to show the utmost *shemol-piryon* most markedly, the word "shall be" (YHVH) occurs fourteen<sup>28</sup> times. And it may be added that it is found seventeen times in *Chronicles*, three times in

<sup>27</sup> For the Old Testament see the Article by Professor Wilson referred to in footnote 26. For the Apocrypha see his article "Use of the Words for God in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Literature of the Jews" *The Review*, Vol. LXIII, 1 (January 1921), p. 207ff.

<sup>28</sup> Nine times alone and five times in combination with the relative *lo*. Cf. note 27.

Nehemiah and once in Daniel (viii. 19)<sup>29</sup> All of which seems to indicate that even if an author or redactor preferred, for whatsoever reason, to use the divine name Elohim instead of the Tetragrammaton, there is nothing to show that he would have intentionally avoided the use of the verbal form "shall be" (YHYH) because of its resemblance to the Covenant name. When we remember that, as has been stated, the preference of the Elohistie Psalms for Elohim is a relative and not an absolute preference, the Tetragrammaton appearing forty-three times in this collection, that the word "shall be" while occurring but four times in the entire psalter

<sup>29</sup> The suggestion of Meinhold and Bevan (Strack, *Grammatik der Biblisch-Aramäischen*, p. 34) that the use of ׀ with the third masc. of the imperfect of the verb "to be" in Biblical Aramaic is intended to avoid the possibility of the confounding of the third masc. sing. with the Tetragrammaton should be mentioned in this connection. It is to be observed, however, at the outset that the cases are not strictly analogous. In the Aramaic the two words might be written exactly alike (YHWH), while in the Hebrew the one is written with W and the other with Y. The suggestion itself is questionable for several reasons: (1) The fact that ׀ is used with the imperfect as a cohortative or jussive particle in Aramaic, Assyrian and Arabic and is found "without distinctive jussive force" in later Aramaic indicates that the reason may be a more general one. (2) Since the 3 mas. imperfect is in the Biblical Aramaic written both with "Aleph" and "He" as final letter, the confusion might have been avoided more easily by simply adopting uniformly the writing with "Aleph." (3) The plural forms are clearly distinguished from the Tetragrammaton by the ending -on or yon, yet they have the ׀. This also points to a broader reason although it might of course be explained as due to a tendency toward uniformity. (4) Since the Tetragrammaton does not occur in Biblical Aramaic, it is not certain that any such confusion would have arisen as this usage is supposedly intended to avoid. In the Elephantine (Sachau) Papyri, the covenant name is regularly written YHW (not YHWH) and it is especially significant that in both of the letters to Bagoas the phrase occurs "and it shall be (YHWH) righteousness unto thee before YHW the God of heaven." This indicates that the covenant name was not written in Biblical Aramaic in the same way as in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and does not support the theory that the use of the ׀ was due to disinclination to use a form of the verb "to be" which was written in the same way as the Tetragrammaton. While it may be claimed of course that Daniel might be expected to be more particular in this regard than the Jews of Elephantine, this also is far from certain. The theory seems on the whole more ingenious than probable.

is found once in this collection, and finally that no evidence has been produced to show that an Elohist writer would avoid the use of the word "shall be," while on the contrary evidence strongly favoring such a use is easily obtainable, it would seem that there is very little to say for the theory of an intentional avoidance of the word "shall be," except what Kilpatrick has said of Bruston's theory—"most ingenious."

#### 4. The Syntax of the Verse.

a. The "need" of a Verb.—It will be recalled that Giesebrecht in arguing for "shall be" as the original rendering, says that by this change "the Elohim is not only removed, but the verb is also gained." This statement would seem to imply that the sentence as it stands in the MT is incomplete, or at least that the literary form or the sense of the passage would be improved by the presence of a verb. It is important to notice, therefore, that the emendation proposed by Giesebrecht would make a fundamental change in the character of the sentence. As it stands, verse 7 is a simple *nominal* sentence, composed of the subject, "Thy throne," and the predicate, "ever and ever." The predicate, according to the usual rule of the nominal sentence, follows the subject, and the two would be in immediate juxtaposition, but for the vocative, "O God,"<sup>30</sup> which is inserted between them.

That in the nominal sentence the verb is superfluous is too generally recognized to require proof. According to Albrecht, who has made a careful and complete investigation of the nominal sentence in Hebrew, the usual order of words is simply Subject—Predicate, and he regards the absence of the copula as an "essential difference" between the Semitic and the Aryan noun sentences.<sup>31</sup> The nominal sentence is de-

<sup>30</sup> *Elohim* occurs as vocative in: xlii. 2, xliii. 1, xliii. 4 (O God, my God), xliv. 2, 5, xlv. 7, xlvi. 10, 11, li. 3, 12, liv. 3, lv. 2, lv. 24, lvi. 2, 8, 13, lvii. 2, 6, 8, 12, lviii. 7, lx. 3, 12,<sup>2</sup> lxi. 2, 6, lxii. 2, lxiv. 2, lxv. 2, lxvi. 10, lxvii. 4, 6, lxviii. 8, 10, 11, 25, 29, lxix. 2, 6, 14, 30, lxx. 2, 6, lxxi. 12, 17, 18, 19,<sup>2</sup> lxxii. 1; *Lord* (Adonay) is found in: xliv. 24, lv. 10, lvii. 8, lix. 12 (?), lxii. 13; *Jehovah* appears in lix. 4, lxx. 2, lxxi. 1.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft*, VII, 218ff., VIII, 249ff., especially p. 249. If on the contrary it be contended that the nominal sentence originally contained a verb, which seems to be the view of Ed.



scriptive and timeless, deriving its time value from the context. In the verbal sentence the emphasis is upon the action, and the verb is therefore usually placed at the beginning of the sentence. The difference between “Thy throne, O God, (is) for ever and ever,” as a descriptive statement of that which is to be regarded as characteristic of the throne as such, and “Thy throne shall be<sup>32</sup> for ever and ever,” as a declaration or promise of the eternal duration of that throne, must be obvious to the reader. Numerous examples might be cited and the difference between the two constructions is very marked. A few must suffice: Ex. xxix. 28, “For it (is) a heave offering: and it shall be a heave offering from the children of Israel of the sacrifice of their peace offerings, even their heave offering unto the Lord.” Here the descriptive sentence precedes and states the essential nature of the offering, and is followed by a declarative sentence which has to do with the observance of the rite by Israel. Similarly in Ex. xxx. 32 it is said of the anointing oil, “It (is) holy and it shall be holy unto you.” Ex. ix. 29: “And the thunder shall cease, neither shall there be any more rain that thou mayst know how the earth (is) the Lord’s”—the events which are to take place will simply demonstrate what is actually the case “that the earth *is* the Lord’s.” A “shall be the Lord’s” would not merely change the meaning materially, but also greatly weaken the impressive climax produced by the simple nominal sentence. Compare the phrase which is characteristic of Ezekiel, “And ye (they) shall know, that I (am) the Lord.” In the Psalms we find frequent examples of the nominal sentence used to describe what is characteristic of the subject. Ps. viii. 1: “O Lord, our Lord, how excellent (is) thy name in all the earth.” Ps. xxiii. 1: “The Lord (is) my shepherd, I shall

König (*Lehrgebäude*, III. § 326 i, k), it must at least be admitted that the omission of the copula is so frequent—we may even say, so usual—that it cannot occasion surprise. And König expressly denies that the absence of a verb in Ps. xlv. 7 is at all suspicious (§ 277f).

<sup>32</sup> Even if this sentence is regarded as “closely approximating” the nominal because the subject precedes, “shall be” is a better rendering than “is.” An examination of the more than 400 occurrences of *YHYH* shows that it usually speaks of a future, actual or potential.

not want." Ps. xxvii. 1: "The Lord (is) my light and my salvation." To change the nominal sentence into a verbal sentence and say "How excellent shall be thy name," "The Lord will be my shepherd," "The Lord will be my light," would not merely change the thought but weaken it very greatly. The Psalmist is thinking of an existing condition or state not of a future event. Contrast, for example, Ps. xxiii, 1, "The Lord is my shepherd," with Ezek. xxiv. 23: "I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them," cf. Ezek. xxxvii. 23-24: "And I will be to them for God, and my servant David (shall be) king over them, and one Shepherd shall be to all of them." These examples will suffice to illustrate the fact that the difference between the verbal and the nominal sentence is very marked; and the following statement is by no means too strong: "The above distinction between different kinds of sentences—especially between noun and verbal clauses—is indispensable to the more delicate appreciation of Hebrew syntax (and that of the Semitic languages generally) since it is by no means merely external or formal but involves fundamental differences of meaning."<sup>33</sup> If then the critic is prepared to assert that the verb "shall be" originally stood in the place of "O God," he should not ignore the fact that this change in phraseology involves a very important change in the nature of the sentence: the change of a descriptive nominal sentence, which asserts the nature of the throne, viz. that eternity is its characteristic, into a predictive verbal sentence, asserting that it shall endure forever.<sup>34</sup> This is a change for which there is no warrant in the Psalm itself, as in it both verbal and nominal sentences occur frequently. And while it is to be recognized that the predictive and hortatory element is prominent in this psalm, it should also be remembered that the descriptive element is hardly less prominent. Indeed it is the description of the transcendent greatness of this king and the splendor of his "court," which

<sup>33</sup> Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar* (1898), § 140 e; but cf. § 142 a.

<sup>34</sup> Edgehill (*Evidential Value of Prophecy*, p. 252) rejects the emendation on the ground that the emphasis is on the nature not the duration of the throne.

furnishes the warrant for the predictions regarding him and the exhortations addressed to him.

Giesebrecht, as we have seen, cites 2 Sam. vii. 16 as favoring the theory that this sentence was originally verbal. It is to be noted, therefore, that in the verse referred to the phrase is not “Thy throne shall be for ever,” but “Thy throne shall be established for ever.” The difference is important. The word “throne” occurs in the same construction as here (i.e. as subject of the sentence) only about a dozen times in the Old Testament. In eight of these instances the verb “establish” ( כּוּן ) is used, three times in combination with the verb “to be” (YHYH) five times without it.<sup>35</sup> In Psalm xciv. 20 another verb “to have fellowship with” is used (cf. Isa. xlvi. 1 where the substantive verb אָזַן occurs). In the five remaining instances (2 Sam. xiv. 8, Ps. xi. 4, xlv. 7, lxxxix. 36, Lam. v. 19) no verb is expressed, though in the last two the verb of the preceding sentence is probably to be regarded as supplied. In one of these last the verb of the first clause is “shall be” (YHYH).<sup>36</sup> This does not indicate that there is anything in the usage to require the view that a simple “shall be” originally occurred in this verse. This statement finds further confirmation when we consider the predicate “(for) ever and ever.”

b. The Predicate “(for) ever and ever.”—As they stand in the MT, the words “(for)ever and ever” (literally “eternity and continuance”) are two nouns, which are apparently to be regarded either as (1) a direct predicate, or (2) an adverbial accusative.

<sup>35</sup> נָכוֹן יהיה (2 Sam. vii. 16, 1 Kings ii. 45, 1 Chron. xvii. 14); נָכוֹן (Psalm xciii. 2); כּוּן (Prov. xvi. 12, xxv. 5, xxix. 14); וְהוּכַן (Isa. xvi. 5).

<sup>36</sup> The verb “established” ( כּוּן ) is also used in five other passages where throne (not as subject) occurs (Ps. ix. 8, ciii. 19, 1 Chron. xvii. 12, xxii. 10). Other verbs which are used with “throne” are קוּם (1 Kings ix. 5, 2 Chron. vii. 18), שָׂם (Ps. lxxxix. 30, cf. 1 Kgs. iii. 19, Jer. xliii. 10, xlix. 38, Esth. iii. 1), סָעַר (Prov. xx. 28), בָּנָה (Ps. lxxxix. 5), יָשַׁב (Ps. cxxii. 5, cf. ix. 8, cii. 13, cxv. 1). Cf. also the use of עָמַד in Ps. xix. 8, cii. 26, cxi. 3, 10, cxii. 39, and of the jussive of היה in Ps. lxxii. 17, lxxx. 15, lxxxix. 36, civ. 31.

(1) In favor of "ever and ever" as predicate (*i.e.*, as standing in the nominative case) is the generally recognized fact that a noun may take the place of an adjective as predicate of a nominal sentence. The grammarians tell us that, "Specially characteristic of the Semitic mode of expression are the cases in which both subject and predicate are substantives, thus emphasizing their identity . . .,"<sup>37</sup> and that "The employment of a substantive as predicate of a noun clause is especially frequent when no corresponding adjective exists, (so mostly with words expressing material . . .), or when the attribute is intended to receive a certain emphasis."<sup>38</sup> Not merely do we find expressions such as Ps. cix. 4, "For my love they are my adversaries, while I (am) *prayer*"; Ps. xix. 10, "The judgments of Jehovah (are) *truth*" (cf. Ps. cxix. 160);—sentences in which nouns are used for which there are no corresponding adjectives. But we also find the noun used in *preference* to the adjective: *e.g.*, Ezra viii. 28, "Ye are *holiness* . . . the vessels are *holiness* also (קדוש for קדש, cf. also Ex. xxix. 33, xxxi. 14, Numb. xviii. 17); Ps. cxix. 172, "All thy commandments (are) *righteousness*" (צדק for צדיק); Ps. cxx. 7, "I (am) *peace*, but when I speak, they are for war"; Prov. iii. 17, "And all her paths (are) *peace*"; Eccles. x. 12, "The words of a wise man's mouth (are) *grace*." Cf. Ps. xxv. 10, Prov. xxiv. 9. In some at least of these sentences it seems clear that there is special emphasis on the predicate.<sup>39</sup> "That the language, however—especially in poetry—is not averse to the boldest combinations in order to emphasize very strongly the unconditional relation between the subject and predicate, is shown by such examples as Psalm xlv. 9 *myrrh and aloes and cassia are all*

<sup>37</sup> Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 141 b.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, § 141 c.

<sup>39</sup> Closely akin to such examples as are cited above are the cases in which the *figurative* or *pictorial* idea is prominent. *E.g.* Isa. lvi. 3, "I (am) a dry tree." This expression seems much stronger than Ps. i. 3, "And he shall be like a tree" (cf. Isa. lxv. 23, Jer. xvii. 8). On the other hand it is to be remembered that in a highly figurative work such as Canticles, simile and metaphor alternate frequently, without any obvious difference in emphasis.

*thy garments* (i.e. so perfumed with them that they seem to be composed of them).<sup>40</sup> This last example is especially valuable because it occurs in the same psalm with the phrase under discussion. We have good warrant then for accepting the rendering “Thy throne, O God, (is) ever and ever.” Both of the reasons stated above would then account for the use of nouns as predicate. On the one hand, there are no adjectives in the Hebrew of the Old Testament formed from the roots from which these two nouns are derived, and there are no other adjectives which would suitably express the idea.<sup>41</sup> On the other hand, the predicate nouns may justly be regarded as not merely asserting but emphasizing the fact that eternity is of the very essence of this throne.

(2) In favor of the view that “ever and ever” is to be regarded as an adverbial accusative, the equivalent of a prepositional phrase, we have the well known fact that an adverbial accusative can take the place of the preposition with its noun. Thus, to confine ourselves to the matter in hand, not merely do we find “ever and ever”<sup>42</sup> used adverbially instead of the somewhat more frequent “for ever and ever.”<sup>43</sup> but we also find “ever”<sup>44</sup> used several times instead of the very frequent “for ever.”<sup>45</sup> Whether this adverbial use is in any sense the result of the frequency of the similar expressions for “continually,” etc. ([ הַיּוֹם ] כֹּל־הַיּוֹם and תָּמִיד)

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, § 141 d.

<sup>41</sup> אֵתֵן would probably come the nearest to it, but hardly seems appropriate.

<sup>42</sup> “Ever and ever” (עוֹלָם וָעֶד) occurs aside from the passage under discussion only five times in the Old Testament. In three of these it is used *adverbially* in a *verbal* sentence (Ps. xxi. 6, lii. 10, civ. 5). In Ps. x. 16, xlviii. 15, it is used *adverbially* in a *nominal* sentence.

<sup>43</sup> “For ever and ever” (לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד) occurs only nine times (Ex. xv. 18, Mic. iv. 5, Ps. ix. 6, xlv. 18, cxix. 44, cxlv. 1, 2, 21, Dan. xii. 3). In all it is used *adverbially* in a *verbal* sentence (in Dan. xii. 3 the verb of the preceding sentence is to be supplied).

<sup>44</sup> Ps. lxi. 8, lxvi. 7, lxxxix. 2, 3, 38. The plural is used three times, 1 Kings viii. 13 [= 2 Chron. vi. 2], Ps. lxi. 5.

<sup>45</sup> So, too, נָצַח is used a few times instead of the more frequent לְנֶצַח (Jer. xv. 18 (?), Amos i. 11, Ps. xiii. 2, xvi. 11). Cf. the use of וְרוּר without preposition in Ps. lxxii. 5; and the use of עָקַב in Ps. cxix. 33.

which never take the preposition, is uncertain, but not unlikely. The fact of the adverbial use of "ever and ever," in whatever way we account for it will be admitted by every one. The question at issue is whether as the predicate of a noun clause a noun can be used adverbially as the equivalent of a prepositional phrase.

Hitzig and Ewald both held that "ever and ever" is, to quote the words of the former, "always a modifier of the predicate, but never the predicate itself." Partly on this account they claimed that Elohim is predicate instead of vocative, and rendered "Thy throne is God [*i.e.* (the throne) of God] for ever and ever."<sup>46</sup> Delitzsch accepted this contention regarding "ever and ever," but claimed, at the same time, that it could be regarded as an adverbial accusative. Delitzsch's words are: "As Hitzig remarks *יעד עולם* occurs frequently as an adverbial adjunct (*e.g.* in xlvi. 15, x. 16), whereas in the predicate *לעולם ועד* (*e.g.* in cvi. 1) is more common. In this passage also *עולם ועד* is thought of as accusative . . ." Let us consider the facts a moment. Since "ever and ever" occurs as we have seen only five times (not including Ps. xlv. 7) and "for ever and ever" but nine times, and since both are used adverbially, it does not seem that either Hitzig or Delitzsch could have been thinking solely of these two phrases. And as a matter of fact Delitzsch's second example (Ps. cvi. 1) does not contain the words "for ever and ever," but merely "for ever." Yet if we turn to the phrases "ever" and "for ever" we find that the former as stated above occurs only five times, which does not correspond any better with the "frequently" (*gewöhnlich*) of Delitzsch's statement than does "ever and ever." As to "for ever"

<sup>46</sup> In this connection we may remind ourselves that "ever" (*עולם*) occurs very often as a genitive after a noun (especially in the expressions "covenant of eternity" and "statute of eternity"). This suggests that if as Hitzig and Ewald maintained it were necessary to assume that the expression is elliptical, it would not necessarily follow that "Elohim" is to be regarded as a genitive. It might be possible to render the verse as follows, "Thy throne, O God, (is a throne of) ever and ever." The fact that the genitive would then consist of two nouns would be no serious objection to this interpretation.

( לעולם )<sup>47</sup> it may be remarked that it is used quite frequently (nearly seventy times) in *nominal* sentences and in a majority of these instances as sole predicate; but it is to be noted that about forty of these instances occur in the one oft-repeated phrase "(for) for ever is his mercy," which is found twenty-six times in a single Psalm (Ps. cxxxvi). Aside from this phrase examples of the nominal sentence with "for ever" as the sole predicate are rare (Ps. cxvii. 2, cxxxv. 13, Prov. xxvii. 24, 2 Chron. ii. 3). In *verbal* sentences it is used somewhat more frequently (about one hundred times) than in nominal, and with many different verbs, the verb "to be" being found about a dozen times.

Since then the use of "for ever" as predicate is, aside from the familiar refrain "for ever is his mercy," a comparatively rare one, it is not strange that we do not find "ever" used as sole predicate. But that it might be thus used adverbially as the equivalent of "for ever" seems probable. An example of such an adverbial predicate is Ps. lii. 3, "The mercy of God (endureth) continually" ( בל-היום , cf. 2 Chron. xii. 5 ). "Continually" is always used adverbially elsewhere, though never with a preposition, and sometimes stands in parallelism with "for ever." Another example is 2 Sam. ii. 32, "and they took up Asahel and buried him in the sepulchre of his father which (is in) Bethlehem." Both of these examples seem to prove that a predicate noun may be regarded as an adverbial accusative and be, at least syntactically, the equivalent of a prepositional phrase.

As we have seen, Hitzig and Ewald, though rejecting the view that "ever and ever" is predicate, do not find it necessary to alter the text, and Delitzsch construes it adverbially. But since this contention of these scholars regarding the

<sup>47</sup> The construction with ל occurs about 160 times in the Old Testament; the one with ער is not included in the above discussion. It occurs only about half as often as לעולם and while in the Historical Books it is the more frequent expression of the two, it is only rarely found (xlvi. 9, lxxxix. 5) in the Psalms, aside from the phrases "from now and for ever" (cxiii. 2, cxv. 18, cxxi. 8, cxxv. 2, cxxxi. 3) and "from everlasting to everlasting" (xc. 2, ciii. 16).

use of "ever and ever" might be regarded as at least favoring the view that the sentence was originally verbal it will be well for us to return to this question for a moment. It has been pointed out above that there are about a dozen cases in which "for ever" is used with the verb "to be." Regarding these instances it is important therefore to note that in only one of them (Eccles. iii. 14) does the verb stand *between* the subject and the predicate as is the case with the emendation we are considering. In four instances it stands *before* the subject: as indicative (2 Chron. xxxiii. 4) or jussive (Ps. lxxii. 17, lxxxi. 16, civ. 31). In six it stands *after* the prepositional phrase "for ever" (Isa. xlvi. 7, Ps. xxxvii. 18, li. 6, 8, lxxxix. 37, Job vii. 16). The infinitive construction is used four times (2 Sam. vii. 29, 1 Chron. xvii. 27, xxviii. 4, Ezek. xxxvii. 28). Obviously then there is here in the case of the predicate "ever and ever" little to favor and nothing to require the altering of the text and the introducing of a verb, not to specify the verb "to be," into the sentence.

To sum up, as it stands the sentence, "Thy throne, O God, (is for) ever and ever," is a simple nominal sentence and is properly to be regarded as descriptive, like a number of others in the same psalm. The reading "shall be" would change the character of the sentence, and for this there is no warrant in the verse itself or the context. The words "ever and ever" are most naturally to be regarded as a predicate nominative, nouns being used instead of adjectives partly because there were no adjectives to express the idea appropriately, but still more perhaps, for the purpose of phrasing as strong a statement as possible of the fact that eternity is of the very essence of Messiah's throne. That "ever and ever" is the adverbial equivalent of "for ever and ever" seems less probable; but there is some warrant, as we have seen, for such an explanation. A verb is not needed; and if a verb had been used it would probably not have been the one proposed by Bruston and Giesebrecht.

5. The Dogmatic Difficulty and its Messianic Solution.—  
With a view to commending the emendation of the text



of Psalm xlv. 7 which we have been considering, Giesebrecht introduced his brief presentation of it with the remark: “The following interpretation is perhaps on this account of general interest, because through the use made of it in Hebrews i. 8, 9 the passage belongs to the better known passages of the Old Testament.” That it is there cited as a Messianic passage, does not require proof. It is one of several Old Testament citations adduced to show the peculiar glory which properly belongs to the “Son”; and it is both the longest of them and the one in which the directly Messianic reference may be said to be most obvious. “Thy throne, O God” is the natural rendering of the Greek<sup>48</sup> as it is of the Hebrew and it accords admirably with the context in which it appears, *i.e.*, with the argument of the writer.<sup>49</sup> Weiss’ statement, “The attempts to avoid the construction as vocative (cf. Grotius and also Ewald: thy throne is God) cannot be carried out without arbitrary

<sup>48</sup> In proof of this it may be pointed out that Lünemann (cf. Meyer’s *Commentary*, in loco) adopted this rendering for Heb. i. 8, despite the fact that he preferred to translate Ps. xlv. 7 “thy throne of God,” *i.e.* “thy divine throne,” or “thy throne is (throne) of God, or divine,” which indicates clearly how strongly he felt the superiority of the rendering as vocative. And it may be added that Dwight in his “Notes” to this commentary (Funk and Wagnall Ed.), while carefully stating the objections to this interpretation admits “the greater simplicity and naturalness of the construction in the Greek, and perhaps, also, in the Hebrew, if the word is thus understood [*i.e.*, as vocative].” That grammatically the construction as vocative is the natural one has been convincingly argued by Lindsay as follows: ‘Undoubtedly  $\delta \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  is here the vocative case, applied as an address to the Messiah: ‘Thy throne, O God!’ And let it be remembered that this is the form in which the vocative of  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  appears almost invariably throughout the whole of the Septuagint and the New Testament: the other form  $\theta\epsilon\grave{\epsilon}$  only occurs about four or five times in the whole Scriptures. And it is important to remark that  $\theta\epsilon\grave{\epsilon}$  never occurs in the Psalms of the LXX, whereas  $\delta \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  as a vocative is to be found on almost every other page. In a passage, therefore, quoted from the Psalms, as the one before is, no other vocative than  $\delta \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  was at all to be expected. The true meaning, therefore, beyond all possibility of doubt is: ‘Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever’” (*Lectures on the Ep. to the Heb.* (1867) I, p. 61f.).

<sup>49</sup> “It is seldom that the sacred writers undertake to prove what they teach. The first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews is an exception to this general rule. The divinity of Christ is here formally proved.” (Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I. p. 519.)

change of meaning (*Umdeutung des Wortsinnes*) and are now generally given up," is too sweeping in view of the advocacy of the rendering "thy throne is God,"<sup>50</sup> by Bishop Westcott. But none the less it cannot be successfully denied that the interpretation of the word "God" as vocative and as an "apostrophe to the Messiah" is the one which has been generally held by Christians in every age. No less certain is it that the general acceptance of this interpretation of the verse in Hebrews has been very largely responsible for the belief on the part of Christians generally both of the past and present that the Psalm is itself to be regarded as directly Messianic, and that the King referred to in it is "King Messiah." Because of this it is significant that the same view is a very ancient one in Jewish circles also, as the Targum shows.

That there is involved in the directly Messianic interpretation of this passage a prophetic and typical conception of Old Testament history follows at once. But this constitutes no difficulty to those who accept at its face value that supernatural conception of the religion of the Bible which is its most pervasive and consistent feature. The details of interpretation may indeed occasion some difficulty; it may be hard to distinguish satisfactorily between the typical and the anti-typical,<sup>51</sup> the essential and the accessory. But that an inspired

<sup>50</sup> This rendering is comparatively old. Bleek connects it with Erasmus.

<sup>51</sup> These difficulties have impressed scholars in various ways. Thus Oehler remarks, "It is only by doing some violence to the language that the allegorical meaning can be regarded as originally intended by the author. . . . How entirely, to bring forward only one point, is the thought found in ver. 11, that Israel, to unite with Messiah, must forget its people and father's house, opposed to all the teachings of the Old Testament!" (*O. T. Theology*, p. 525.) Regarding Oehler's first point we may ask the question, If the allegorical interpretation would be forced if 'intended by the author,' is it any less forced if read into the psalm by a later collector? Yet most scholars will admit that it was as a Messianic psalm that this poem made good its right to a place in the Psalter. Should we not therefore endeavor to find an interpretation which will do equal justice to author and collector? Turning now to the "star example" which Oehler cites, can we not see in it a reference to that complete identification of herself with her husband's interests,

Psalmist, probably on the occasion of some royal marriage, should foretell the kingly glory of Messiah's reign,<sup>52</sup> is no more surprising than that an Isaiah in an evil time, a time when danger threatened, should point men to “Emmanuel,” the “Mighty God.” To those who regard this Psalm as directly Messianic the address “O God!” occasions no difficulty.

The extreme opposite of the view just described (the New Testament view as we feel in this instance entitled to call it) is the one which regards this poem as a purely secular ode, an epithalamium on the marriage of some king. The tendency in critical circles is to set this psalm, which so interpreted no longer deserves that name, off by itself as a non-religious poem. From this standpoint the “exaggerated” diction of the poem is explained by some as due to poetic license, since the ascription of deity to a human king is so contrary to the spirit and teaching of the Old Testament. Thus we find that while Staerk does not hesitate to assert that “the address ‘thou divine being’ [Is this meant as a toning down of “O God”?] to a king of the ancient Orient is in the mouth of a singer, who uses the language of courtly flattery, something which is natural to every true wife, but especially necessary in a royal consort, and above all in Messiah's bride, who must find in her Lord, the chief among ten thousand, the one altogether lovely?

<sup>52</sup> While this Psalm is in many respects unique, it is to be observed that practically all the elements which enter into the picture are found elsewhere in the Old Testament:

a) The Covenant made at Sinai that Jehovah will be Israel's God and will dwell in her midst, as her King (cf. Ex. ix. 6, Judges viii. 23).

b) The Messianic Kingship of the Davidic House (2 Sam. vii, cf. the other Royal Pss.)

c) The Deity of the Messiah (cf. esp. Isa. vii-ix, Micah v. 1).

d) Israel and the nations personified as women (cf. the phrases ‘daughter of Zion,’ ‘of Babylon,’ ‘of Egypt,’ ‘of Tyre’).

e) Israel, Jehovah's bride, or wife (Isa. lxii. 4, 5, Hosea ii. 16, Ezek. xvi).

f) Messiah's kingdom universal, including all nations (cf. Isa. ii. 2, 3, and the “Blessing of Abraham”).

g) Messiah's reign to be righteous and glorious (Isa. xxxii. 1 ff, Jer. xxiii. 5, 6, Zech. ix).

h) To endure for ever (Isa. ix. 7, Zech. ix. 9 ff).

i) He shall have a numerous seed (Ps. cx. 3, Ezek. xvi. 20, cf. Gen. xv. 5).

perfectly natural," he yet points out that the expression "Yahwe thy God"<sup>53</sup> is "intended to express the special relationship in which this man stands to God." But such thorough-going comparative religionists as Gunkel<sup>54</sup> and Gressmann<sup>55</sup> boldly affirm that this poem preserves for us a clear example of the practice in Ancient Israel<sup>56</sup> of that "emperor-worship" which is the natural by-product of polytheism, and was widespread in the ancient Orient. Thus to the thorough-going evolutionist, as to the advocate of the directly Messianic interpretation, this verse occasions no difficulty. But he can explain it satisfactorily only on the basis of a theory which while rendered "probable" by his "comparative" studies is utterly opposed to the clear teachings of the Old Testament as to the uniqueness of the religion of Israel in its lofty ethical monotheism as in many other respects.

It is those scholars who are unable to accept either of the positions just referred to, who are unable to see in this King of Ps. xlv. the Messiah and who are unwilling to recognize polytheism, even under the guise of "poetic license" in the Psalmody of Israel, who find difficulty with the words "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." And it is not remarkable that they should endeavor to avoid the dilemma by means of interpretation or emendation. Several different interpretations have been proposed; but not one of them can be said to be natural.<sup>57</sup> A number of emendations have been suggested;<sup>58</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Staerk adopts of course the view that this was the original of "God, thy God" (vs. 8), *Die Schriften des Alten Testaments: Lyrik*. 2nd ed. (1920), p. 288.

<sup>54</sup> *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, p. 103 f.

<sup>55</sup> *Ursprung der Isr. jüd. Eschatologie*, p. 256.

<sup>56</sup> Such a claim is especially startling in view of the general tendency in critical circles to date the Psalms as late as possible.

<sup>57</sup> "Thy throne (of) God," "Thy throne (is a throne) of God," and "Thy throne (is) God," are one and all forced and artificial, and although each has found able advocates, no one of the three is anything like as probable as the "ordinary rendering." It has been repeatedly charged (*e.g.*, by Delitzsch) that such renderings are merely attempts to "avoid" the acceptance of the latter rendering. And while this may be asserted without the intention of reflecting in any way upon the intellectual honesty of many who have favored them, it can not be denied that it is the dog-

but no one of them can claim any support in the Hebrew MSS. or in the ancient versions, and they have all failed of obtaining anything approaching general acceptance with the critics.<sup>59</sup> Dr. Briggs has said of them: “None of the many explanations of scholars satisfy, and so new opinions are constantly emerging, equally unsatisfactory.”<sup>60</sup>

The fact that the critics have been unable with their utmost effort to find a satisfactory substitute for the ordinary rendering, “O God!”, and that this verse which so rendered speaks so clearly<sup>61</sup> of the coming Messiah and hails him as

---

matic difficulty which is responsible for their invention. On the other hand there are many whose attitude can only be adequately described by this word, “avoid.” And Lindsay did not hesitate to speak of the rendering of Heb. i. 8, by “Thy throne is God” as a “Unitarian rendering.” With regard to the attempt to take Elohim as vocative but in the sense of “ruler” or “judge” (Ex. xxi. 6) it may be said that it cannot be shown that a single *individual* is ever in this sense *addressed* as “God” in the Old Testament.

<sup>58</sup> (1) Olshausen (1853) asserted that a verb (e.g. “to establish”) was to be supplied at the beginning or end; (2) Bruston (1865)—his view, together with that of Giesebrecht (1887) we have discussed at length; (3) Lagarde (1872) changed “and ever” (וְעַד) into “has sustained” (סָעַד); (4) Bickell (1882) expanded the sentence to suit his metrical theories and supplied a verb (“Thy throne, established is its foundation; has established it God for ever and ever”); (5) Nöldeke (1888) simply deleted the word “God” as a gloss; (6) Bachmann (1890) read “Thy throne (is) as God,” arguing that a *Kaph* had been lost before “Elohim”; (7) Grimme (1902). “God has covered thy throne,” treating כִּסָּאֵךְ as an unusual way of writing (aramäisierende Schreibung) כִּסֶּךָ.

<sup>59</sup> Thus, while Wellhausen, Duhm and others accept the Bruston-Giesebrecht emendation, a number of critical scholars, Driver, Reuss, Kessler, Kittel, Staerk, do not even mention it, while Briggs and Cheyne consider it weak and König rejects it. Driver at one time adopted Lagarde's reading, but later expressed a preference for that of Bachmann which he apparently attributed to Edgehill.

<sup>60</sup> Briggs, *The Psalms*, in loco.

<sup>61</sup> In saying this it is not meant that to an Old Testament saint the full import of the language of this Psalm was as obvious as to the New Testament writer or to the Christian of today. But as stated above, the presence of the Psalm in the Old Testament Canon can only be accounted for satisfactorily on the assumption that it was regarded as Messianic. And there is no reason for supposing that a later “editor” saw in this Psalm a meaning which was not intended by the one who penned it.

God is so strongly supported both by internal and external evidence may well be the occasion for rejoicing on the part of all those who believe that the great theme of the Scriptures is the Christ who was to come, who came, and who is to come again. Throughout the Christian centuries the glorious prophecies of Holy Writ have been a great source of comfort and assurance to believing hearts.<sup>62</sup> The attitude of extreme caution, of ill-concealed hesitation to do justice to the prophetic and miraculous elements in Holy Writ, which is so widespread today is not a mark of superior scholarship so much as it is of compromise with the prevailing scepticism of this modern age. Christians of the past have gloried in Miracle and Prophecy as furnishing convincing proof that God has revealed Himself. The tendency to regard the supernatural element in the Bible as a "liability" rather than an "asset" is utterly opposed to the teachings of the Scripture. The Church of God has lost not a little of her power through her failure to proclaim boldly and to glory in the "mighty acts" of God recorded in Holy Writ, even though it be in the face of a "scientific" scepticism which has relegated the miraculous to the limbo of discarded notions.

It will be recalled that this article was given the sub-title, "A Study in Higher Critical Method." Dealing as it does with one of the great Messianic passages of the Old Testament it has a claim upon the interest of the reader. But it is perhaps in this second aspect that it should be most illuminating. It has been pointed out that the rendering "Thy throne shall be for ever and ever" is only one of several "conjectural" emendations which have been proposed in the course of a hundred years of "critical" study of the Old Testament and that all of these emendations are opposed by evidence in support of the present text which is unusually

---

<sup>62</sup> Of Cocceius and Grotius, two of the great theologians of the seventeenth century, it was said that Cocceius "found Christ everywhere in the Old Testament and Hugo Grotius found him nowhere." In the light of Luke xxiv. 27 it should not be difficult to decide which *attitude* toward the Old Testament Scriptures is in accord with the teaching and example of Our Lord.

strong, far too strong to be ignored. We have seen that despite the initial probability in favor of this emendation due to the close similarity which obviously exists between the words Jehovah and “shall be” in Hebrew, there is almost no evidence in favor of the alleged confusion and that “zeal” on the part of an Elohist redactor does not account for it. We have seen that the proposed emendation cannot be justified on the ground of any incompleteness or stylistic weakness in the verse which may be regarded as a particularly strong statement of the thought intended, and that this emendation would not merely change the meaning of the verse in a way for which there is no warrant either in the verse itself or in the context, but would decidedly weaken it. We have seen that although this emendation has been known for more than half a century, it has been rejected by some of the scholars most influential in critical circles. Yet we find that in a widely advertised popular commentary which in the words of its own introduction claims to be “a careful and candid attempt to set forth the present results of intensive modern Biblical study,” it is asserted regarding this passage: “For ‘thy throne, O God,’ the original text must have had ‘thy throne, O Yahweh,’ ‘God’ being due to the editor of the Elohist Psalter. But ‘Yahweh’ was itself a mistake of the scribe for ‘will be’ (yih<sup>e</sup>yeh being changed into ‘Yahweh’). Read therefore, ‘Thy throne will exist for ever and ever.’” Notice the steps in the argument, if argument it can be called: “. . . must have been . . . was itself a mistake. . . . Read, therefore, . . .” We might almost imagine that the critic had seen the original MS with his own eyes and watched the “editor” and the “scribe” at their work. Professor Addis cannot have been ignorant of the fact that the emendation which he stated with such finality was only one of a number of such conjectural changes. He must have been aware that this particular emendation was opposed by some of the ablest critics, men whose scholarship he would not have thought of questioning. He must have known some at least of the weighty objections which bear against the acceptance of this con-

jecture.<sup>63</sup> Yet like Professor Baton and Professor McFadyen he did not hesitate to present it to a "popular audience" as an "assured result" of criticism established beyond dispute.

The dicta of the critics which we have been investigating illustrate two things very clearly: the remarkable readiness of the critics to accept almost any explanation of Biblical data however uncertain or even improbable which rejects the Supernatural, and the singular inability which they often show to distinguish between Possibility, Probability, and Proof. The one tendency is so manifest in most "critical" works dealing with the Bible that it has to be discounted in advance by all who would form a correct judgment as to the value of the conclusions arrived at. The other tendency is usually held somewhat in check by the obligation under which the critic feels himself to show that he is familiar with the literature of the subject with which he deals. Consequently in "scholarly" works intended for the expert, the various opinions held by scholars (at least by "critical" scholars) are usually stated and discussed with more or less fulness and the view of the writer is also adequately defended. In "popular" text-books a thorough treatment is in the nature of the case impossible; the average reader has neither the time nor the technical training to follow an elaborate discussion. This fact would seem to obligate the writer of such a popular work to confine himself as closely to generally accepted facts as possible and to avoid the advancing of doubtful theories as if they were facts. Yet there seems to be a growing tendency on the part of the critics to use just such books as these as a channel for asserting theories of this nature with a positiveness which they would hesitate to use in their scholarly treatises. But they can do this only at the risk of their scholarly reputations.

*Princeton.*

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

---

<sup>63</sup> Professor Addis died before the publication of Peake's *Commentary* and to criticize him thus severely may seem to be in bad taste. But Peake's *Commentary* is very much alive and it is being very widely advertised as the most scholarly and up-to-date one-volume commentary on the Bible in the English language.