

any other agency to convince the world of sin; one may say it has created in man, both as person and as race, the conscience for sin. It stands not simply as the symbol of the grace that saves, but of the wickedness that dared attempt to extinguish the grace. And another thing may be added. While He had to drink the cup, it would not be quite correct to say that His prayer was not answered. For He did not pray in vain. The author of *Hebrews* says, "He was heard for His godly fear."¹ Jesus died on the cross, but not of the cross. He suffered crucifixion, but He was not crucified. The will which triumphed in the conflict broke the heart which could not bear to endure death at the hands of sinners. And this brings us to the conclusion that the death which redeems was all the work of the Redeemer; and not at all of the men who might sin against His grace but could not sin away His mercy, or deprive Him of the splendid privilege of giving Himself "a ransom for many."

A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

MOSES AT THE BATTLE OF REPHIDIM.

"Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim. And Moses said unto Joshua, Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek: to-morrow I will stand on the top of the hill with the rod of God in mine hand. So Joshua did as Moses had said to him, and fought with Amalek: and Moses, Aaron and Hur went up to the top of the hill. And it came to pass, when Moses held up his hand, that Israel prevailed: and when he let down his hand, Amalek prevailed. But Moses' hands were heavy; and they took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, the one on the one side, and the other on the other side; and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun. And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword."—Exodus xvii. 8-13.

STUDENTS have always been at considerable pains to explain the meaning and efficacy of the lifting up of the hands of Moses during the battle which Israel fought against

¹ v. 9.

Amalek at Rephidim. The opinion¹ that the lifting up of the hand, or rather hands,² is here equivalent to the exercise of military command during the fight may be dismissed without much discussion. The office of Moses was mainly that of a teacher and prophet, and not that of commander on the battlefield. He no doubt planned and personally superintended the military training and warlike preparations of his people, but at times of actual fight he appears to have been in the habit of delegating the military command to a capable and trusted officer who understood the master's plan well, and was possessed of the necessary prowess and strength. In the present case, the transference of the captaincy to Joshua is distinctly mentioned; for the words, "Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek" (v. 9), can hardly be taken to imply anything short of Joshua's appointment to the supreme military command during the action that was then imminent. It is also clear that for the guidance of a fighting host the steady uplifting of the hand would mean nothing, and that for purposes of command one should expect the directing hand to be in more or less frequent motion.

Another view that has been formulated is that Moses in lifting up his hands at the same time held aloft the rod of God which he was in the habit of carrying with him on important occasions, and which is specially mentioned in the eighth verse of the passage under consideration. It has been thought that the lifting up of the wondrous staff had the effect of bringing down heaven's help upon Israel's

¹ For the references to the various views held on the subject, see Dillmann and Keil and Delitzsch *in loco*.

² In accordance with the reading of the LXX., Onkelos and the Peshitta. It may be added, however, that יד appears to be used here for the "arm and the hand" together. The Kāmūs mentions this usage for the word in Arabic, and terms like אצילות ידך, arm-pits (Jer. xxxviii. 12), and זרעי ידיו, "the arms of his hands (?)" (Gen. xlix. 24), and ידיו משה כבדים "and Moses' hands (?) were heavy," in verse 12 of the present passage, make such a view imperative in Hebrew.

host to the discomfiture of the army of Amalek. But it is difficult to accept this rather magic explanation of the great incident which we are trying to bring as near to our understanding as possible. A mechanical act like this does not—however much wonderfulness one may attach to it—seem to harmonize with the seriousness of the deadly struggle that was being carried on at the foot of the hill on which Moses and his two companions had taken up their watchful position.

The situation appears to become more intelligible, if we agree with the more commonly accepted view according to which the lifting up of Moses' hand was the outward expression of deep and earnest prayer on behalf of the people whom, under supreme Divine command, he was leading from Egypt towards Canaan. The rod may indeed have occupied one conspicuous position or another during the incident which we are considering, but it would be much easier to imagine that the great instrument of Israel's victory was the fervent and unceasing intercession of their great leader rather than the holding up of the wonder-working staff.

It cannot, however, be said that even this explanation is quite satisfactory. If the efficacy of intercessory prayer had been the main purport of the lifting up of the hand, one should have expected a mention of the act of prayer¹ in one form or another. The absence of any such expression in the narrative makes it very likely that the holding up of Moses' hands had some other great significance, although the intercessory lifting up of the prophet's soul to God must be allowed to have formed a very important part in the total energy implied in the raising aloft of his hands in the position which he occupied on the hill overlooking the battle-field below.

¹ The "spreading out" (פָּרַשׁ) of the hands is indeed in various places an accompaniment of prayer, but in all such cases the act of prayer is made clear in the context.

The truth appears to be that the lifting up of Moses' hands during the action of Rephidim signified and effectually represented the full strength and energy of the people of Israel in its deadly conflict with the opposing hosts of the Amalekites. Moses, with his hands perseveringly held up on the hill overlooking the fighting scene, is to be regarded as the full embodiment of his people's power. This explanation may at first sight appear fanciful, and it may also be thought that there is something mystical in such a view of the incident. But I think that a realisation of the whole event, together with a proper appreciation of the relation of Moses to the people he was leading from bondage to freedom, will make the case much clearer to us. The position of Moses is almost—if not entirely—unique in the history of the nations. An abjectly enslaved people owed to him the glorious re-awakening of their race and the inauguration of their national independence. He found them in dire bondage, and he made them free; he found them broken-hearted and in "anguish of spirit," and he breathed into them new hope and fresh courage; he found their great and ancient traditions almost forgotten amongst them, and he revived the glory of their past before their eyes with a view to the opening out of greater glories in the years to come; he found the original Yahveh¹ worship of their ancestors almost entirely in abeyance in the house of their bondage, and he breathed into their souls the inspiration of the true God with which he had been filled himself. Under the influence of this new strength and new freedom he succeeded in rescuing them from the hand of their oppressor, in breaking the power of the Egyptians pur-

¹ I am aware of treading here on delicate ground, as the subject still requires much clearing up; but the thesis maintained in this paper is in no way dependent on this particular statement (to which, however, I am ready to adhere).

suing them with the multitude of their chariots and their sharp-edged weapons of destruction, and in advancing them several stages in their journey towards the land of freedom and the goal of glory. At the time in which the narrative of the battle of Rephidim falls, they were marching fast towards the mountain of Sinai, where the moral and spiritual covenant between the Lord their God and themselves was to be concluded. This covenant was destined to be their great charter of true glory before the nations of the world, and in the fulfilment of the moral obligations then laid upon them they were to find their sure pledge of Divine protection and unconquerable strength. But just before the realisation of this great event, there arose against the marching tribes of Israel a warlike people which tried to cut off their new-born hope, and to destroy their as yet undeveloped strength. It was the first serious encounter after their escape from the Egyptians which the Israelites had to meet. In this great crisis Moses was naturally the person to whom the whole people, as one man, looked for support and guidance. In him, as the messenger of their God, as their deliverer from captivity, and as their great moral and spiritual hero, were all their hopes centred. Now he must either secure for them a glorious conquest, or perish with the hosts which he had undertaken to lead. On his personal power depended the destiny of the whole race. If he can support Israel with the power of the God who was inspiring him, all is well; but if not, all is not at an end, and there would be no Sinai, no ark of the covenant, no marching on to a destiny of glory, and no Divine ordinances pointing to great spiritual realities beyond. All look to Moses, and the prophet of God is not looked to in vain. There is power and great significance in the words he addresses to his faithful and trustful Joshua: "Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek: to-

morrow I will stand on the top of the hill with the rod of God in mine hand." In these words is contained a clear forecast of the result of the impending battle. Girded with strength, Moses took his stand on the hill overlooking the field of action. In his uplifted hands was centred all the strength of his God-inspired soul. The fighting hosts of Israel knew this, felt this. The strength of Moses was their strength. The man who had led them out of the land of Egypt, and who had undertaken to prepare them for great destinies, is all himself. In the steadfastness of his strength was firmly rooted the people's strength. He, Yahveh's tower of energy in their midst, is true and firm; and the heart of Israel, therefore, fainteth not, but is strong with strength unconquerable. In the moments during which spasms of weakness came over the leader, a slight faintness seemed also to fall over all whose minds were fixed on him; but the frequent recurrence of such moments of relaxation was guarded against by the support of two other men who, like Joshua, were closely and intimately associated with Moses in the spiritual energy with which he was invested. With Joshua leading the tribes of Israel to battle, and with Moses supported by Aaron and Hur on the adjacent hill, Israel could only win; and the result of the day's action justified the plan adopted. "And it came to pass, when Moses held up his hand, that Israel prevailed: and when he let down his hand Amalek prevailed. But Moses' hands were heavy; and they took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, the one on the one side, and the other on the other side; and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun. And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword."

I have been trying to describe the event which we are considering in such a manner as to bring the scene and the

mental energy of the persons concerned as close to ourselves as possible; and it will no doubt be felt as a "bathos" if I now invite the reader's attention to an examination of the linguistic facts connected with the term "holding up the hand." The treatment of the subject before us, however, makes such an enquiry absolutely necessary, and this comparatively dull part of the task must, therefore, now be entered upon.

The idea expressed by the phrase, "uplifting of the hand," is analogous to the conception indicated by the "uplifting of the horn," which is best known by its usage in the Psalms, but is also found twice in the Song of Hannah (1 Sam. ii.) and once in Lamentations ii. 17. But whilst the latter is mainly used of exaltation following a successful struggle of one kind or another (see especially 1 Sam. ii. 1), the former is employed to indicate the consciousness of prevailing superior strength during the struggle itself. The "lifting up of the head" which (with the same verb: *רָם*) occurs three times in the Old Testament (Psa. iii. 4, xxvii. 6, cx. 7) would appear to have more in common with the raising up of the horn than of the hand. But, however this may be, the special force of the phrase with which we are mainly concerned in this place is perfectly clear. In Exodus xiv. 8 we have: *וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יָצְאוּ בְיַד רָמָה*, "for the children of Israel went out with a high hand," *i.e.*, with prevailing consciousness of power; and the same expression is repeated in Numbers xxxiii. 3. In Micah v. 8 we read: *תָּרַם יָדְךָ עַל-צָרֶיךָ*, "Let thine hand be lifted up above thine adversaries," and similar phrases are found in Isaiah xxvi. 11, and Deuteronomy xxxii. 27. In Psalms lxxxix. 14, 43, and cxviii. 16, the word *יְמִין*, "right hand," is used in the same connection instead of simply *יָד*, "hand"; and also in these instances is the force of the phrase clear and un-

¹ The phrase *נִשָּׂא רֹאשׁ* (see *e.g.* Jer. lii. 31; Zech. ii. 4) is used in a similar sense.

doubted (note especially Psalm cxviii. 16 : ימין יהוה רממה : "the right hand of the Lord is exalted ; the right hand of the Lord doeth valiantly.") The realisation of superior personal power may bring with it a spirit of pride and of wilfulness. Hence we find the expression, ביד רמה, used in Numbers xv. 30 to signify presumptuous and wilful action as opposed to שננה, which is sin committed "unwittingly." The idea of pride is indeed clearly contained in דינו רמה of Deuteronomy xxxii. 27, to which reference has already been made, and a similar term is זרוע רמה, "a high arm," which stands parallel to רשעים in Job xxxviii. 15.¹

When, with these linguistic facts before us, we return to the lifting up of the hands of Moses during the battle of Rephidim, we cannot but connect the phrases which we have been considering with the particular event on which our attention is mainly fixed in the present paper. But there is this difference. In the instances from the Psalms and the other parts to which reference has been made the "lifting up of the hand" is used in a metaphorical sense, whilst in Exodus xvii. 11 the natural and primary meaning of the words employed is evidently to be taken. To some it might at first sight seem that this difference constitutes a difficulty in the way of the explanation offered here of Exodus xvii. 11. In reality, however, it only supplies a fresh interest from a linguistic point of view. It is a well-known principle in the science of language that metaphorical expressions are abstract development from original concrete notions. Thus, to take one instance out of the many in Biblical Hebrew alone, the phrase, הִלָּה פָּנִים originally

¹ The lifting up of the hand in making an oath (see *e.g.* Gen. xiv. 22) is, of course, an entirely different kind of phrase ; and רוּם יָדָהּ נִשְׂאָה in Habakkuk iii. 10 is apparently meant to signify consternation and surprise. Should, by the way, this phrase not be rendered "the high (parallel to תְּהוֹם, "deep") lifted up his hands," instead of "And lifted up his hands on high," adopted both in the A.V. and R.V. ?

meant "to stroke, or to smooth a person's face." From this notion comes the idea of caressing, soothing, and flattering; and when the phrase is finally used in the sense of "imploring a person's favour," the original concrete notion of "stroking the face" is, in practical speech, lost sight of altogether, and the only idea actually present is that of that "entreating and petitioning" for the favour desired. Instances might be multiplied to any extent, both from the Old Testament Hebrew and from any language under the sun; and we need, therefore, now only apply it to the term in which we are at present interested. The "lifting up of the hand," like the "lifting up of the horn" and the "lifting up of the head," acquired in the course of time the more or less purely metaphorical sense of "conscious valour and supremacy of power"; but originally it meant the actual raising aloft of the hand, or hands, as the natural expression of conquering physical strength. The subdued and conquered antagonist is bowed down and crushed, but the victor raises aloft the hand to strike the foe, or to threaten further punishment, if the opponent should not give in and submit himself to the conqueror's good pleasure. In all the other instances in which the term occurs the notion of conscious fortitude is so prevalent that the actual "lifting up of the hand" is hardly required to form a part of the idea conveyed; but in Exodus xvii. 11 we intercept, as it were, the phrase at an early stage of its linguistic development. Moses, as the representative and guiding spirit of Israel's hosts, actually raises aloft his hands as an effectual sign of strength and supremacy over the Amalekite foe. The phrase has already passed beyond its primary sense, for here it is not the actual combatants who lift up their hands, but a person who with intense interest watches the fight from the outside. But to the purely metaphorical notion in which the actual raising up of the hand is no more required it has not reached as yet. The concrete part of it

is indeed of such importance and reality in the present case that in order to ensure its unflinching continuance two other men are engaged in supporting the great leader, who, on behalf of a whole people, is raising aloft his hands in sure token of conquering strength.

It is clear, therefore, that the linguistic evidence makes entirely for the view of Exodus xvii. 11, which is here advocated, and if the undoubted failure of all the other proposed explanations be added to this and the other arguments brought forward in this paper, it will, I hope, be admitted that a sufficient case has been made out for the new theory formulated in this place, and I, at any rate, trust that my explanation may not be found unworthy of further investigation on the part of scholars.

G. MARGOLIOUTH.

THE THREEFOLD CORD.

ὁ φιλόσοφος καὶ ὁ μουσικὸς καὶ ὁ ἐρωτικὸς ἀνακτεῖ (Plotinus, *Enn.*, 1. 3. 1.¹)

THE human mind, when in a healthy state, sets before itself three objects of desire—the good, the beautiful, and the true. The love of the good is religion; the imitation of the beautiful is art; the pursuit of the true is science or philosophy. These three objects are all *right*, that is to say, they are objects for the healthy mind; and they are all ends in themselves—they refuse to be followed as means to any end above them, or as means to each other. And yet, in spite of their independence—their claim to stand each in its own right, these three ideals are so closely interrelated,

¹ A sentence in the "letter of Plotinus to Flaccus," quoted by Prof. Max Müller (*Psychological Religion*, p. 433), would have supplied a better text. But I have not been able to discover the Greek original of this document, which appears to be a cento of Plotinian phrases thrown into the form of a letter to an imaginary correspondent by Vaughan (*Hours with the Mystics*, vol. i. p. 78).