

The other verb cited by GK, yasar, occurs only five times in the niph'al. Two of these are cited in GK: Jer. 6:8 and 31:18. The first of these reads, "Be thou instructed, O Jerusalem, lest my soul depart from thee..." The second includes the words, "Thou hast chastised me, and I was chastised, as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke." It is hard to see how either of these properly should be called niph'al tolerativum. The other three instances are similar.

Thus the instances alleged for existence for a niph'al tolerativum are highly questionable. It is only when the assumption is made that Is. 65:1 must refer to Israel at the time of the writing of the book, rather than to be a prophecy of the turning to the Gentiles, that it becomes necessary to interpret it in a way that assumes a type of form to be called niph'al tolerativum. No other of the instances alleged really establishes the existence of such a form.

Since there is no satisfactory evidence of the existence of a niph'al tolerativum, and in any case the recent translations of Is. 65:1 go beyond anything that such a form would justify, it must be concluded that there is no philological evidence for translating the verse in the way it is rendered in these modern versions.

3. The third consideration is that of context. This is often vital in determining the meaning of a statement. It should never, however, be considered first. Words, forms, and sentences should be considered by themselves, in order to determine exactly what possibilities of interpretation they involve. Almost every sentence admits some variation of possible interpretation. Yet every feature of the sentence has definite limits beyond which it may not properly be stretched. For truly scientific interpretation an objective decision as to possibilities of meanings should be made first without regard to context. Then, from the meanings that are objectively found to exist as possibilities, those meanings should be selected