





BS514
.S394



AN
INTRODUCTION
TO
THE BOOKS
OF THE
OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

BY A. SCHUMANN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN,
BY THE AUTHOR OF
"THE PEOPLE'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE."

"The Bible lies open before the eyes of every man, in order that he may there learn and understand what relates to his highest welfare; and the more, for now many years, the Bible has been investigated, the greater light, comfort and power has it given forth. Continued inquiry will evolve new blessings. No mind, no heart, can measure the inexhaustible depth of divine love and truth existing in the Bible. Till the end of time will it remain the light which God himself has given, for it is the true light which enlightens all men that come into the world."—*See p. 14.*

LONDON:
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.,
STATIONERS' HALL COURT.

M.DCCC.XLIX.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY RICHARD KINDER,
GREEN ARBOUR COURT, OLD BAILKY.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THIS is a book of results. Its author professes to lay before his readers "the sure results" gained by theological criticism within the last half century. The report is made by one, who, though orthodox in religious belief, is a scholar of Gesenius and De Wette in theology.

As a summary of these results, the book has been chosen and translated, since it will afford the assailants of the Bible in this country, reason to think that they have assumed too jubilant a tone, and since it will supply to its friends solid grounds for the conviction that their alarm has been undue. Let those who suppose that the Bible has received fatal blows from German criticism here satisfy themselves how little impression has been thereby made on its substance.

A writer of the Rationalistic school in theology has been preferred because such an one may be believed to report all the damage that the Scriptures have suffered from criticism, while one of conservative tendencies would have been open to suspicion. To what extent the results here set forth are "sure" in their negations, is, with the Translator, a point of secondary consequence. His main purpose has been to afford to the negative criticism of Germany an opportunity of allowing English students to judge how inconsiderable is the breach which it has been able to make in the walls of Zion. Some notes are added by the Translator, which may tend to prove that its assaults are more numerous than its victories. Meanwhile, every enlightened lover of the Bible will rejoice to find himself in possession of *the book* after all the perils through which it has passed, and will not be without a feeling of triumph in the thought that the founda-

tions which the hostility of German Rationalism has in vain assailed, may well be regarded as secure.

It is one of the recommendations of this Volume for the English reader, that it contains brief but instructive notices of the apocryphal writings.

Lest a false impression as to the Author's theological views should be produced by what precedes, it may be well to sub-join his own statement: "My position is not that of blind belief in every letter of the Scripture; but I have a firm conviction that the Bible contains a Divine Revelation, and this conviction rests on systematic investigation and reasonable grounds. In the Scriptures I find the word of the living God. Their sacred authors spoke under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; but without being thereby forcibly removed from their age, their culture, their circumstances—in short, from the view of life given them by the various relations in which they stood. All these influences were rather employed by the spirit of God, in order to lead them to a clearer knowledge of divine truth. That truth, so far as under God's grace they became acquainted with it, lies in their writings, visible to every eye. Only in the words of the Saviour himself, however, do I recognise the pure, full, eternal truth, as revealed to us by the invisible Father, through his only begotten Son."—*Vorrede*, xi.

CONTENTS.

OF THE BIBLE IN GENERAL.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| SECT. 1—Names of the Bible | 1 |
| „ 2—Time of the Formation and Collection of the Biblical Books | 4 |
| „ 3—The Original Languages of the Bible | 7 |
| „ 4—The most Important Translations of the Bible | 9 |
| „ 5—Use of the Bible in the Church | 11 |
| „ 6—The Division of the Bible into Chapters and Verses | 13 |
| „ 7—Value of the Bible | 13 |

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

| | |
|--|----|
| „ 8—Canonical and Apocryphal Books | 17 |
|--|----|

A.—THE CANONICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

| | |
|---|----|
| „ 9—The Earliest Division of the Canon | 18 |
| „ 10—Later Division of the Canon | 20 |
| „ 11—Succession of the Canonical Books; according to the Time of their Origin | 21 |

I.—THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

| | |
|---|----|
| „ 12—Historical Composition among the Hebrews | 23 |
|---|----|

THE PENTATEUCH.

| | |
|--|----|
| „ 13—Contents | 26 |
| „ 14—Character and Formation of the Five Books of the Pentateuch | 28 |
| „ 15—Observations specially on the Book of Genesis | 34 |
| „ 16—Continuation | 40 |
| „ 17—Observations on Exodus | 42 |
| „ 18—Remarks on Leviticus | 46 |
| „ 19—Observations on the Book of Numbers | 48 |
| „ 20—Observations on the Book of Deuteronomy | 52 |
| „ 21—Moses and his Law | 54 |

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA

| | |
|---|----|
| „ 22—Contents, Character and Authorship of the Book | 57 |
| „ 23—Remarks on the Book of Joshua | 59 |

THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

| | |
|--|----|
| „ 24—Contents, Character and Formation of the Book | 61 |
| „ 25—Observations on the Book of Judges | 63 |

THE BOOK OF RUTH.

| | |
|--|----|
| „ 26—Contents, Character, and Author | 65 |
|--|----|

THE TWO BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

| | |
|--|----|
| „ 27—Contents, Character, and Author | 66 |
| „ 28—Observations on the Books of Samuel | 67 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| THE TWO BOOKS OF KINGS. | |
| SECT. 29—Contents, Character, and Author | 71 |
| „ 30—Observations on the Books of Kings | 73 |
| „ 31—Continuation | 78 |
| THE TWO BOOKS OF CHRONICLES. | |
| „ 32—Contents, Character, and Author | 80 |
| „ 33—Observations on the Chronicles | 83 |
| THE BOOK OF EZRA. | |
| „ 34—Contents, Character, and Author | 88 |
| „ 35—Observations on the Book of Ezra | 89 |
| THE BOOK OF NEHEMIAH. | |
| „ 36—Contents, Character, and Formation | 91 |
| „ 37—Observations on the Book of Nehemiah | 92 |
| THE BOOK OF ESTHER. | |
| „ 38—Contents, Character, Authorship | 93 |
| „ 39—Observations on Esther | 95 |
| II.—THE POETICAL BOOKS. | |
| „ 40—On the Poetry of the Hebrews in General | 96 |
| THE BOOK OF JOB. | |
| „ 41—Contents, Character, and Authorship | 99 |
| „ 42—Observations on the Book of Job | 101 |
| THE PSALMS. | |
| „ 43—Contents, Character, and Authorship | 102 |
| „ 44—Observations on the Psalms | 105 |
| THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON. | |
| „ 45—Contents, Character, and Authorship | 109 |
| „ 46—Observations on the Proverbs of Solomon | 110 |
| ECCLESIASTES. | |
| „ 47—Contents, Character, and Authorship | 112 |
| „ 48—Observations on Ecclesiastes | 113 |
| THE SONG OF SOLOMON. | |
| „ 49—Contents, Character, and Authorship | 115 |
| „ 50—Observations on the Song of Solomon | 116 |
| III.—THE PROPHETIC BOOKS. | |
| „ 51—On the Prophetic Office generally | 118 |
| „ 52—Age of the Prophets | 122 |
| „ 53—Prophecies | 124 |
| THE PROPHET ISAIAH. | |
| „ 54—Contents and Character | 128 |
| „ 55—Life of Isaiah | 130 |
| „ 56—Of the Servant of God | 132 |
| THE PROPHET JEREMIAH. | |
| „ 57—Contents and Character | 136 |
| „ 58—Life and Times of Jeremiah | 138 |
| „ 59—The Lamentations of Jeremiah | 140 |

THE PROPHET EZEKIEL.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| SEOT. 60—Contents and Character | 141 |
| „ 61—Life and Times of Ezekiel | 143 |

THE PROPHET DANIEL.

| | |
|---|-----|
| „ 62—Contents, Character, and Authorship | 144 |
| „ 63—The Circumstances of Daniel's Life, and the Historical Relations in the Book, at and after his Age | 147 |

THE TWELVE MINOR PROPHETS.

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| „ 64—The Prophet Hosea | 152 |
| „ 65— „ Joel | 154 |
| „ 66— „ Amos | 155 |
| „ 67— „ Obadiah | 156 |
| „ 68— „ Jonah | 157 |
| „ 69— „ Micah | 159 |
| „ 70— „ Nahum | 160 |
| „ 71— „ Habakkuk | 161 |
| „ 72— „ Zephaniah | 162 |
| „ 73— „ Haggai | 163 |
| „ 74— „ Zechariah | 164 |
| „ 75— „ Malachi | 166 |

B.—THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

| | |
|---|-----|
| „ 76—On the Apocrypha in General | 167 |
| „ 77—Judith | 169 |
| „ 78—The Wisdom of Solomon | 171 |
| „ 79—The Book of Tobit | 174 |
| „ 80—Ecclesiasticus | 176 |
| „ 81—Baruch, with the Epistle of Jeremiah | 178 |
| „ 82—The First Book of the Maccabees | 180 |
| „ 83—The Second Book of the Maccabees | 182 |
| „ 84—The Third and Fourth Books of the Maccabees | 183 |
| „ 85—The Jewish History in the Three Last Centuries before Christ | 184 |
| „ 86—The Rest of Esther | 191 |
| „ 87—The Additions to Daniel | 192 |
| „ 88—The Prayer of Manasses | 194 |

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

| | |
|---|-----|
| „ 89—Canonical Books | 195 |
| „ 90—Apocryphal Books | 198 |
| „ 91—Of the Original Greek and the First Manuscripts of the New Testament | 200 |
| „ 92—Division and Order of the Books of the New Testament | 202 |

I.—THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

THE FOUR GOSPELS.

| | |
|--|-----|
| „ 93—Their Mutual Relation and their Title | 204 |
| „ 94—Credibility of the Evangelical Narratives | 206 |

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

| | |
|---|-----|
| „ 95—Contents | 209 |
| „ 96—Author, Character, and Formation | 210 |

| THE GOSPEL OF MARK. | | PAGE |
|--|--|------|
| SECT. 97—Contents | | 212 |
| „ 98—Author, Character, and Formation | | 213 |
| THE GOSPEL OF LUKE. | | |
| „ 99—Contents | | 215 |
| „ 100—Author, Character, and Formation | | 215 |
| THE GOSPEL OF JOHN. | | |
| „ 101—Contents | | 218 |
| „ 102—Author, Character, and Formation | | 219 |
| THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. | | |
| „ 103—Contents | | 222 |
| „ 104—Author, Character, and Formation | | 223 |
| „ 105—The Jewish History during the Events narrated in the Evange- lists and the Acts of the Apostles | | 227 |
| „ 106—Continuation of the History | | 232 |
| „ 107—The Jewish Sects in the Time of Christ | | 238 |
| II.—THE DOCTRINAL BOOKS, OR THE TWENTY-ONE APOSTOLICAL LETTERS. | | |
| „ 108—Occasion and Character in General | | 242 |
| „ 109—Formation, Sending and Reception of the Epistles | | 246 |
| THE THIRTEEN EPISTLES OF PAUL. | | |
| „ 110—The Life of the Apostle Paul | | 248 |
| „ 111—The Same continued | | 253 |
| „ 112—The Character of Paul | | 259 |
| „ 113—Continuation | | 267 |
| „ 114—Peculiarities of the Pauline Epistles | | 272 |
| „ 115—Pauline Epistles—Order of Time | | 275 |
| THE NINE EPISTLES OF PAUL TO WHOLE COMMUNITIES. | | |
| „ 116—The Epistle to the Romans | | 277 |
| „ 117—The Two Epistles to the Corinthians | | 282 |
| „ 118—The Epistle to the Galatians | | 288 |
| „ 119—The Epistle to the Ephesians | | 291 |
| „ 120—The Epistle to the Philippians | | 295 |
| „ 121—The Epistle to the Colossians | | 298 |
| „ 122—The Two Epistles to the Thessalonians | | 301 |
| THE FOUR EPISTLES OF PAUL TO INDIVIDUALS. | | |
| „ 123—The Two Epistles to Timothy | | 305 |
| „ 124—The Epistle to Titus | | 308 |
| „ 125—The Epistle to Philemon | | 310 |
| „ 126—The Epistle to the Hebrews | | 311 |
| THE SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES. | | |
| „ 127—The Two Epistles of Peter | | 315 |
| „ 128—Continuation | | 318 |
| „ 129—The Three Epistles of John | | 322 |
| „ 130—Character and Formation of the Second and Third Epistles | | 325 |
| „ 131—The Epistle of James | | 326 |
| „ 132—The Epistle of Jude | | 330 |
| THE PROPHETIC BOOK. | | |
| „ 133—The Apocalypse | | 332 |
| „ 134—Continuation | | 336 |

AN
INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOKS
OF THE
OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

OF THE BIBLE IN GENERAL.

Section I.—NAMES OF THE BIBLE.

THE designation of the entire collection of the Old and New Testament writings is taken, partly from the description of the Old Testament in the New, inasmuch as the names of the Old Testament found in the New are transferred and applied to both parts of the Bible; partly from the contents and worth of all the biblical books; and lastly from the chief portions of the two great divisions of the Bible. Accordingly, the entire collection bears the following appellations:—

The Holy Scriptures, or the Scripture.—Thus, in particular, is the Old Testament designated (2 Tim. iii. 15; Rom. i. 2; Matt. xxii. 29; John x. 35, xix. 36). A similar denomination is found in the Old Testament (Dan. ix. 2); and at a later period the same name was used as descriptive of the New Testament. The reason of this designation lies in the opinion that the composers of the Old Testament books were specially enlightened, inspired and sanctified of God, and that their writings contained the revelation which, through them, God made to the world. The books of the Old Testament were holy, as written by holy men and as containing holy things. That which held good of the Old Testament was, in a yet higher degree, ascribed by Christians to the New Testament. Hence came the same appellation for the entire collection.

The Old and the New Testament (Covenant), or the two Testaments.—This name also is used in the New Testament (2 Cor. iii. 6, 14; Gal. iv. 24; Heb. ix. 15), whence it is derived. The original Greek term (*διαθήκη*) denotes a direction, an arrangement, and therefore a man's last will; but in the language of the Bible, a religious institution or polity, conceived as an arrangement or covenant formed between God and man. Consequently it is used for both the Mosaic and the Christian dispensations, of which the former is called *the old*, the latter *the new*, Covenant. From the religion itself, the title was transferred to the books which contain its original archives, and which present the covenanted arrangements. And as in the Old Testament *the law*, called also the five books of Moses, or the Pentateuch, was held to contain the Covenant, so are those books specially denominated the law (2 Kings xxii. 8; Rom. ix. 4; Ps. cxlvii. 19—comp. 1 Mace. i. 57); a designation which is applied to the books of the Old Testament generally (Ps. i. 2; Isa. viii. 16; Matt. xii. 5); and at a later period, for a similar reason, to the New. The Greek word was translated *Testamentum* by the Latin Fathers of the church, and as the Latin ecclesiastical version of the Scriptures, called the Vulgate, had the term *Testamentum*, that term passed thence into most other translations made in the western languages. The languages, however, of the Slavonic race use the term *law*, from the Greek, for they received Christianity from the Greek and not the Latin church.

The Bible.—This name comes from the fifth century, A.D., and was probably first used by the ecclesiastical Father Chrysostom. It signifies *the Book*, and designates the Old and the New Testaments, since they form *the book*, that is, the book of books, or the best of all books; in other terms, the most valuable, the most holy, book,—the book which is inspired by the spirit of God himself.

The Word of God.—The justification of this title is found in the contents of the Bible. The name is taken from the New Testament, where repeatedly it signifies the revelation made by God to man, especially that made through Jesus Christ (John iii. 34, viii. 47, xvii. 8; Rom. x. 17; Ephes. vi. 17; 1 Pet. i. 25; Heb. iv. 12, vi. 5; Luke v. 1, viii. 11, 21, xi. 28). Hence it is, with full propriety, applied to the whole Bible, as containing the connected revelation of God made in the Old and New Testament. Many persons, taking the expression literally, see in every word of the Bible, from beginning to end, the very word of God dictated to the writers by the Holy Spirit. This view is opposed by the Bible itself (1 Cor. vii. 12, 25, 26; 2 Cor. xi. 17); and there is no more certain and effectual means to lower and undermine the sacred worth of the Scriptures than to cling pertinaciously

to the letter, to represent every expression as God's own utterance, and to demand for it a blind veneration. Since, however, the word of God lies in the sacred writings, and every reader enlightened by God finds it there, and feels it in his own heart, and since he is also conscious that divine light, divine peace, and divine power, flow hence into his bosom—for these reasons the Bible may well be termed the Holy Scripture, and will for ever bear the name of God's word (1 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 11).

Revelation.—In the sacred writings, the word Revelation denotes that communication of unknown things, particularly religious truth, which has come immediately from God (Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 6, 26; 2 Cor. xii. 1, 7; Gal. i. 12, ii. 2; Ephes. i. 17, iii. 3). As now the writings of the Old and New Testament contain this communication from God to man, made by the mouth of holy men inspired by God, so the whole Bible is termed *Revelation*, that is, the immediate disclosure of holy and divine truth which proceeded from God (Heb. i. 1; John i. 18, iii. 11, xii. 49, 50, xiv. 10; Matt. xi. 27; 1 Thess. ii. 13).

The Law and the Gospel.—In this way the two chief portions of the Bible are briefly designated. Strictly, the word Law denotes the five books of Moses; but since the other writings of the Old Testament are grounded on the Pentateuch, and all the writers down to the days of the Messiah had the law for their foundation, the Old Testament in general received the name of *Law*. Similar is the case with the appellation *Gospel*. In its primary application, the word denotes the four Gospels, which are followed by what was termed the Apostle, that is, the collection of Epistles (Letters) found in the New Testament. The Epistles, however, contain the Gospel of Christ. Epistles and Gospels, from the substance of their common contents, came, therefore, to be called the Gospel. In spirit, the Law and the Gospel vary. Hence arises a contrast between the Law, which worked through sin to condemnation and death, and the Gospel, which leads through grace to life and blessedness.

Besides these names, which are applied to the sacred Scripture generally, the Old Testament is described in the Bible by the following designations: 1. *The Law* (see preceding paragraph; also John xii. 34, xv. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 21). 2. *The Law and the Prophets* (Matt. v. 17, xi. 13, xxii. 40), according to the chief divisions of the Canon of the Old Testament. And, still fuller, 3. *The Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms* (Luke xxiv. 44). Yet more definitely, and according to the three main portions of the Canon, 4. *The Law, the writings of the Prophets, and the other books*. Thus is the Old Testament twice described in Ecclesiasticus (see the Prologue).

At a later period the New Testament was, from its two chief parts,

named *the Gospel* and *the Epistle*; to the latter of which were reckoned the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocalypse.

In pursuance of these representations, and of the view given by the Scriptures themselves, the Bible may be considered as the collection of those sacred writings which contain the revelation made of God to men, and whose authors were under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Section II.—TIME OF THE FORMATION AND COLLECTION OF THE BIBLICAL BOOKS.

The books of the Old Testament, written in Hebrew, which constitute the Canon of the Old Testament, were formed between the age of King Saul and the age of the Maccabees, that is, between the year 1100 and the year 175 before Christ. The collection of them began after the Exile, especially at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, or about 450 years before Christ. First were brought together those books which were written before and during the Exile. The process was gradual. Since, however, the collection thus made was not considered finished, but was kept open, there were, from time to time, added books of a later origin, and Ecclesiastes, the Chronicles, and Daniel, were taken in; which books, as they were received into the collection after the other books, do not stand in the Hebrew Bible in the place which, according to their subject-matter, they would have held, but were at last subjoined to the rest. We may consider the collection to have been completed and closed, and thus what is termed the Canon to have been formed in the time of the Maccabees; for in the Prologue to the book which bears the name of "Jesus, the son of Sirach" (Ecclesiasticus), which was written a short time after the age of the Maccabees, mention is twice made of the Canon, according to its present order and division ("the law and the prophets, and other books of our fathers"). The thorough and varied investigations which have been gone into regarding the time when these books severally came into existence, have led to the following result. From Saul down to the Exile, or during the age of the Kings, were formed the following books, namely, the five books of Moses, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, most of the Psalms, Proverbs, the Canticles, the Prophets (excepting the three last, and the unauthentic portions of Isaiah), Job, and Joshua. During the Captivity were formed the two books of Kings, several Psalms, and the unauthentic portions of Isaiah. After the Captivity were formed several Psalms, the prophetic

writings of Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, the historical books, Ezra and Nehemiah, Ecclesiastes, the Chronicles, and, finally, Esther and Daniel. (For more exact statements, consult the parts relating to the separate books.)

The second part of the Old Testament, *the Apocrypha* (see Section viii.), contains two classes of writings: 1. Those which were originally written in Greek; 2. Those which are Greek translations of Hebrew works. They formed an appendix to the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible; the additions to Esther and Daniel were introduced in the proper places in the Greek translation of those books. For when, after the foundation of Alexandria in Egypt, many Jews settled in that city for commercial purposes, they, by degrees, forgot their mother tongue. They learned to speak Greek. Hence arose the necessity for a translation into Greek, of the Old Testament, which they could no longer read in Hebrew. This translation was used in the synagogues. Thus arose the Greek translation of the Old Testament, bearing the name of Septuagint (*Septuaginta*), which, beyond a doubt, is the most ancient version of the older Scriptures. To this translation were subjoined the apocryphal books, which thus gradually came into use. The time of the origin of these apocryphal works falls in the centuries that immediately preceded the advent of Christ. Some of them, however, for example, Judith, are later than the public ministry of our Lord. (More exact statements are given under the several books of the Apocrypha.)

Among *the books of the New Testament*, *the letters* of Paul take precedence in point of time. His apostolical labours and the foundation and instruction of Christian communities by him, gave him first, among all apostles, occasion for the composition of his letters. Of these we possess thirteen. The time of their origin begins about the middle of the first century of our era, that is, about from eighteen to twenty years after the Saviour's death. Reference to lost letters of Paul is made in these passages, namely, 1 Cor. v. 9, and Coloss. iv. 16. Paul was followed by Peter, James, Jude, and John, letters from whose pens have been preserved to the present time.

At a later period were *the Gospels* written; for, at first, the heralds of the Saviour proclaimed the good news only by word of mouth. This office was fulfilled in the several communities by evangelists (Acts xxi. 8; Ephes. iv. 11; 2 Tim. iv. 5), who for the purposes of their ministry travelled round from church to church. Theodoret (died about 470, A.D.) says of them, *περιούτες ἐκήρυττον, they went about proclaiming the Gospel*. When, at length, notice was taken of the unavoidable disfigurement of the simple evangelical truth, the necessity was

felt for writing down the trustworthy, purely historical deeds and speeches of the Saviour, to which duty apostles, or the scholars of apostles, applied themselves; and with what care and exactness they executed the task, may be learnt from what Luke states in the introduction to his Gospel (i. 1-4). About thirty years after the Crucifixion, written memorials began to be made, and thus the four Gospels which we now possess had their origin in the second moiety of the first century. Of these four Gospels, that of Matthew is most, that of John the least, ancient. To the Gospels was, as a continuation, subjoined the work now called *The Acts of the Apostles*. Within the apostolic age were also produced the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Revelation of St. John the Divine.

As the separate Christian communities possessed at first only copies of one or more of these works, and with these there gradually mingled unauthentic and non-apostolic writings, and as Christian doctrine was more and more unfolded, and sects arose, so was there felt a need and a desire of possessing only the genuine and uncorrupt truth, as set forth in the actual writings of the apostles; accordingly, after the middle of the second century, there gradually came into existence the collection of our New Testament books (the Canon of the New Testament). Extreme care was employed in order to test the authenticity of these works. First they collected together the letters, or epistles. The collection was termed the *Apostle (Instrumentum Apostolicum)*. Therewith were afterwards united the four Gospels, under the name of the *Evangel*, or *Evangelium (Instrumentum Evangelicum)*. Thus gradually arose the whole New Testament Canon, which, towards the middle of the third century, existed in its complete state, for it was known to Origen, who died in the year 254, A.D. Nevertheless the inquiry, whether any but authentic writings had been admitted into the collection, was not terminated, and that careful inquirer, Eusebius (died 340, A.D.), Bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, the most learned ecclesiastic of his day, and the first writer of a history of the church, makes mention of seven New Testament writings which were then, not with universal agreement, regarded as authentic and apostolical. These seven Scriptures are the Epistle of James, the Epistle of Jude, the second Epistle of Peter, the second and the third Epistles of John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as the Apocalypse. Of the two last, however, he expressly says that only a few rejected them (Eusebius iii. 3, 25), while the apostolic origin of the five others is characterised by himself as uncertain (iii. 25). More recent investigations thereon have led to partly different results. (See the observations on the several books.)

Section III.—THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES OF THE BIBLE.

The language in which the canonical books of the Old Testament are written is the *Hebrew*, a tongue which was pre-eminently fitted to be the first channel of a divine revelation, by the simplicity of its syntax, its richness in words expressive of religious ideas, and the general loftiness of its style. The Hebrew belongs to a large class of languages which were anciently spread over Western Asia, and which bear the name of Shemitic. Three branches of this common stem extended themselves over the nations of Western Asia, known to us from the remains of antiquity, and especially from the books of the Bible. The northern branch contained the Syriac in the west, and the Chaldee in the east; the middle branch contained the Phœnician and the Hebrew; the southern branch contained the Arabic. The golden age of the Hebrew tongue extended from the age of Saul to the end of the Babylonian captivity, that is, from 1100 to 536 before Christ. The best works of the Old Testament came into existence during this period (Section ii.). During the Exile, the Jews grew accustomed to the Chaldee, the mother tongue of the kingdom of Babylon, and on their return they brought the Chaldee into Palestine, where it remained the common language, while the Hebrew continued to be the language of books till the time of the Maccabees; from which era it gradually fell into total disuse. The period which extends from the Exile to the Maccabees is the silver age of the Hebrew tongue; in which, by the intermingling of Chaldaic forms and of Persian as well as Greek words, it lost its native purity. By reference to these facts we find assistance in our attempts to determine the age when any particular book was produced or brought into its present condition.

The Chaldee is found in only certain passages of the Bible (Jer. x. 11; Ezra iv. 8, vi. 18, vii. 12-26; Dan. ii. 3-vii. 28). From these passages it appears that the Jews of the time to which they refer were acquainted with the Chaldee, while in the two last, occurring in Ezra and Daniel, we find reason to hold that after the Exile the Chaldee was more common than the Hebrew: for after the author, in the two first passages of Ezra, has given two letters written in Chaldee, one to the King of Persia, the other the King of Persia's reply, he carries on his narrative in the same language, until, at vi. 19, he is reminded of the Hebrew, in which he then continues to write. The same is the case in Daniel, where Nebuchadnezzar addresses the interpreters of dreams in Chaldee, in which tongue the narrative proceeds. In the English the term "Syriac" is employed, though the Chaldee is meant. The latter

had a great resemblance to the Hebrew ; the one bearing to the other a similar relation to that which is borne by the German and the Dutch, or by the Lowland Scotch and the English. Hence we see how it might come to pass that the Hebrew remained the language of books, while the Chaldee became the language of conversation.

The Jews on their return from captivity were subjects of the Persian empire, under which they continued for 200 years. The Macedonian dominion ensued. Alexander the Great, having destroyed the Persian yoke, became master of Palestine. After his brief empire, the land of Israel, as lying between Egypt and Syria, was eagerly contended for by those two powers which rose into influence after Alexander's death. At last Palestine came into the hands of the Syrians, when, under the dominion of the Syrian King Antiochus IV., the Jews had to endure frightful persecutions, which led to the heroic age of the Maccabees. In this whole period the common tongue of Palestine was the Chaldee, mixed with many Syriac forms ; whence arose *the Syro-Chaldee*, which became the prevalent language of the Jews. The Syro-Chaldee was the tongue in which Jesus spoke and taught, as is clearly witnessed in the New Testament, which in some passages give the words of Christ in the original terms (Mark v. 41, xv. 34 ; Matt. xxvii. 46 ; John xx. 16).

At the same time, in conjunction with the old vernacular tongues of Western Asia, the Greek was much diffused from the age of Alexander the Great. This was the case in Egypt, especially in Alexandria ; also in Syria, under the dominion and influence of the Seleucidæ. As the Greek was the ordinary tongue of the court and the rulers, so was it indispensable to men of distinction and a token of superior culture. By degrees the use of the Greek, both in speaking and writing, became more prevalent. Meanwhile the people retained their hold on their native tongue. Hence two languages were at the same time employed in Palestine. The Greek, however, that was spoken by the Jews borrowed very much from the Hebrew, which was their mother tongue, not only in forms of expression, but modes of thought and general colouring, so as to give rise to a peculiar compound of Hebrew-Greek. This impure Greek was particularly employed in composition by the Jews of Alexandria. In this Greek they accordingly made their translation of the Hebrew Bible, called *the Septuagint* ; on which account the idiom bears the name of *Alexandrine Greek*. In the same tongue was the Apocrypha written, and, at a later period, the New Testament. Also the immediate scholars of the apostles, who are called the apostolic fathers, wrote in the same form of the Greek language.

Section IV.—THE MOST IMPORTANT TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE.

When, in the second century (A. C.), the Hebrew language had died out, the Jews, both in and out of Palestine, felt the need, more and more, of possessing the Old Testament in translations executed in the different popular tongues. This need became more urgent after the destruction of Jerusalem, the dispersion of the Jews, and the diffusion of Christianity. There were accordingly made several translations.

The most ancient, as already intimated, is the *Greek translation* of the Old Testament, which, from the number of the translators, has been termed *The Seventy* (*Septuaginta*), and which, for Jews and Christians alike, is the most important. The account of its origin given by traditionary history is as follows:—In the second century before our Lord, at the desire of Ptolemy Philadelphus, seventy-two Jews—six from each of the twelve tribes—were sent to Alexandria, in order to execute there a translation of the Old Testament into Greek. A later story represents that these translators were shut up in seventy cells in the island of Pharos, which lies just off Alexandria. Of these, each one prepared a translation. On being compared together, all the versions thus made were in a wonderful manner found to agree word for word. The object of this fable was obviously to enhance the value of the translation. The probability is, that the version we possess was executed by the Jewish Sanhedrim of Alexandria, which consisted of seventy-two members, and that hence originated the name *Septuaginta*. It is, however, easy to discern the hands of five or six translators. The respect felt towards this version soon became so great, that it soon caused the original to go out of use, and was employed even in Palestine. Whence it happens that writers of the New Testament, when they allege passages from the Old, cite them according to the Septuagint, nay, in some places, re-produce defects and faults found in that translation. For instance, in Ps. xl. 6, we have, in the Hebrew, words tantamount to these—

“ Mine ears hast thou opened,”

but in Heb. x. 5, where the passage is quoted, we read—

“ A body hast thou prepared me,”

words which are literally taken from the Alexandrine version.

The ecclesiastical use of this version passed from the Jews to the Christians, who employed it in reading the Scriptures in their places of worship, and at first employed it exclusively. They received and used together with it the appended apocryphal books (Section ii.), making no difference between the two. Their ignorance of Hebrew, which kept the

original closed to them, concealed the difference from their eyes. At a later period they became aware of its existence (Section viii.).

After Christianity was spread in the west, a necessity arose for translations into the Latin tongue. Such translations were made from the Septuagint. These were all superseded by the celebrated *Latin translation of Jerome*, executed by that learned Father at Bethlehem, about A.D. 400. It was made from the Hebrew Bible, and, under the name of *The Vulgate*, is acknowledged by the Catholic church as the only one of authority: the Vulgate was the first generally printed book, and it was declared to be equal in value to the original by the Council of Trent.

Among modern translations, that of Luther undoubtedly deserves the first rank; for independently of the ecclesiastical respect in which it is held among all German Protestants, its internal value is very great. Before Luther there were two translations of the Bible, one in German, the other in Dutch. These were made from the Vulgate, and were but little known.

The first printed Bible which contained the entire Old and New Testament appeared at Mayence in 1462. Luther began his great work in 1517, with the seven penitential psalms, which he translated from the Vulgate. In the Wartburg (1521-1522), he translated the New Testament; and in order to translate the Old Testament from the original, he applied with great diligence to the study of the Hebrew. Melanethon gave him instructions in Greek, and two of his colleagues in the University, namely, Aurogallus and Cruciger, were his teachers and advisers in his Hebrew labours. He wrought at his translation with a conscientiousness, a care, a patience, and a thoroughness, which occasioned the highest admiration, and with astonishment and veneration we read in his piece, entitled, "*Vom Dolmetschen*," how he went about his task. In the year 1534 it was completed. The first edition was printed by Hans Luft in Wittenberg. Much for the diffusion of the Lutheran translation was effected by the Baron Caustein, who, in 1718, founded at Halle an institute for the printing of low-priced Bibles. Here were Bibles first printed from stereotype plates. From the year 1804, in which (March 7th) the English Bible Society was formed in London, in order to make the Bible generally known, that book, translated into nearly all languages, has been put into the hands of many millions of persons throughout the world. The English Bible Society not acknowledging any divine revelation in the books forming the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, omits them in all its editions* (Section viii.).

* See *The People's Dictionary of the Bible*, article Bible, 2 vols. 8vo. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.; also *The Annals of the English Bible*, by C. Anderson, 2 vols. 8vo. London: Pickering.

Among the most recent German translations, that of De Wette deserves special mention. It is made after the pattern of Luther's translation, which it surpasses in skill, in exactitude, and in thoroughness, though De Wette is far behind Luther in simple elevation, resistless force, and archaic dignity. The very fact that Luther's diction is more ancient than our own by some centuries, makes it, as being more akin to the original, a better representative of that original, while it is in itself venerable and impressive, so that all modern attempts to supplant it must fail, and Luther's German in the Bible will remain so long as German hearts beat with evangelical love for the Bible. The high and inimitable excellences of the Lutheran translation cannot, however, suppress the wish which becomes the stronger the more highly the Bible is valued, that some pious and careful hand should make in that translation the proper corrections in cases where there is no doubt but that great man committed errors. Those who will make no change give reason for the opinion that they respect Luther more than they respect the sacred Scriptures. In the poetical books, especially the Prophets, many changes are requisite. Luther himself complains of the difficulties which he found in the Prophets and in Paul's Epistles, and if he has not succeeded in overcoming every difficulty, the failure is no reproach for one who has performed what in many respects is unsurpassable. Whether or not an alteration should be made in every case in which an archaism is found, is altogether another question; for though the meaning might by such changes be a gainer, yet the correspondence with the original would suffer, for in the Hebrew are found archaisms as well as terms of dubious import.

Section V.—USE OF THE BIBLE IN THE CHURCH.

The Pentateuch containing the law, as being in the eyes of Jews the most important part of the whole Bible, was used in the temple and in the synagogues, being read aloud in separate paragraphs. The five books forming the Pentateuch were divided into fifty-four portions, since with the Jews leap-year, which returned every fourth year, having a month more than ordinary years, consisted of fifty-four weeks. The divisions of the law thus formed were denominated *Parasché*, that is, Portions. At a later period, passages were taken from the Prophets for the same purpose, which were not copied in the order in which they stand in the original, but were chosen with reference to the readings

from the law. These prophetic selections were read at the close of the service in the synagogue, and were hence called *Haphtaré*, that is, Dismissals, because with these the congregation was dismissed. At the time of Christ the reading of these Haphtaré was very common (Luke iv. 16-17; Acts xiii. 15). But divisions into chapters and verses were not yet in use, and a passage was indicated by stating the chief subject of its contents, or by mentioning the name of a noticeable person or thing occurring therein. (Comp. Mark ii. 26, xii. 26.)

When the Alexandrine version came into use (Section iv.), the lessons were read from it. But since Christians also made use of this translation it was pronounced erroneous, and laid under a curse by the Jews, who chose other translations. The Christians, who borrowed their form of divine worship from the synagogue, read out of the Old Testament, making their selections chiefly from the Psalms and the Prophets, since they specially referred to Christ. Explanations accompanied the readings, for which even in the earliest centuries they used the Septuagint. They also read the letters of apostles which were sometimes sent from one church to another (Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27), and thus, as the portions of the New Testament were gradually collected, its use was introduced. In the same way arose the putting together, so as to form one whole, the Old Testament and the New, both being read in the same community. Imitating what was done in regard to the former, Christians soon made selections for reading in public from the latter. Passages, taken from the Gospels and the Epistles, were put together in the same volume, in the Western or Catholic church, as early as the fifth century, and a later period in the Eastern or Greek church. The origin of the passages of the New Testament, called Gospels and Epistles, now read in public worship, cannot be exactly given. Some find their author in Bishop Gregory the Great (590-604, A.D.), others in Aleuin, the teacher of Charles the Great (800, A.D.). The choice of these portions is for the most part very happy. The passages taken from the Gospels for holy days could scarcely be more suitable, since they bring under notice the facts on which the festival is grounded.

Section VI.—THE DIVISION OF THE BIBLE INTO CHAPTERS AND VERSES.

The original writers of the biblical books knew nothing of our divisions into chapters and verses, though the poetical works must at their origin have presented lines and stanzas, for the rhythm and the numbers of a verse unquestionably imply such divisions. Accordingly, in the oldest manuscripts, the verses of the poetical books are written separately, but the verses are not numbered. In regard to the other writings of the Old Testament, the division into verses probably arose in the period between the sixth and the eighth century, when the Jewish rabbis in Palestine devised the system of vowels and accents now found in most Hebrew Bibles. With this system is intimately connected the division into verses. Some, however, find for it an earlier origin. The division into chapters is much later. It is first found in the Old and New Testament of the Latin Bible (the Vulgate) of Hugo St. Caro (1240, A.D.), whence it was transferred both into the original text and into all translations of the Bible. The division into verses, of the New Testament, as well as the numbering of the verses in both Testaments, have for their author Robert Stephens, who first introduced them in his edition of the Latin Bible (1550). According to De Wette, this took place in the New Testament, edition 1551, and in the Old, edition 1558.

 Section VII.—VALUE OF THE BIBLE.

As containing the original documents of our religion, the Bible is of the highest value. In relation to its origin and its contents, it is termed divine. For though the idea of inspiration is diversely represented, and the early assumption of an inspiration which extended even to the words and the letters has properly been renounced, since the biblical writers represent themselves neither as unerringly acquainted with the natural sciences, nor, in the investigation of the ages before them, free from the possibility of misconception, yet will all Christians not sunk in unbelief acknowledge that the spirit of God speaks to us in the Bible, and that in it is found eternal, divine truth. The Bible is, and ever remains, not merely the divine fountain of our Christian belief (John v. 39;

Gal. i. 8 ; John xvii. 17 ; Apoc. xxii. 18 ; Deut. iv. 2), but also a divine protection against all mere human doctrines and dogmatical despotism (Gal. v. 1 ; John viii. 32, 36 ; Prov. xxx. 5), inasmuch as it offers "the sword of the spirit," which will always obtain the victory, so long as the soul of man dwells upon the earth (Ephes. vi. 17 ; Heb. iv. 12 ; Apoc. i. 16 ; Jer. xxiii. 29). Protestants have every reason for clearly ascertaining what it is they possess in the Bible, for by its guidance all the foundations of doctrine and conduct are to be investigated (Ps. xciii. 5, exix. 160 ; Rom. xii. 2 ; Ephes. v. 10 ; 1 Thess. v. 21 ; 1 John iv. 1 ; Phil. i. 9, 10) ; out of it comes all support both in life and in death (2 Tim. iii. 15, 16 ; John vi. 68 ; Rom. i. 16 ; John v. 24 ; James i. 21) ; with it every illusion and error are to be overcome (Ephes. vi. 17) ; and from it is the establishment of a divine kingdom over all the earth to be hoped for (Isa. lv. 10, 11 ; Rom. i. 16 ; x. 17). The study of the Bible is not restricted by any human authority (John v. 39 ; Gal. i. 8, 9 ; Isa. xxxiv. 16).

The Bible lies open before the eyes of every man, in order that he may there learn and understand what relates to his highest welfare ; and the more, for now many years, the Bible has been investigated, the greater light, comfort and power has it given forth. Continued inquiry will evolve new blessings. No mind, no heart, can measure the inexhaustible depth of divine love and truth existing in the Bible. Till the end of time will it remain the light which God himself has given (Ps. exix. 105, lxxxix. 90 ; Isa. xl. 8 ; 1 Pet. i. 25 ; Matt. xxiv. 35), for it is the true light which enlightens all men that come into the world (John i. 9).

On this account it is our duty to become not only acquainted but familiar with the Bible. In it a pious life has the greatest value, since the growth of the inner man, the strengthening of the immortal spirit, which hence ensues, can never be carried sufficiently high. If, however, we would possess a deeper insight into the meaning and the spirit of the Scripture, acquire a more thorough understanding of its contents and purposes ; if we desire that our minds should not be borne hither and thither on vague feelings excited by its perusal ; if we would form a clear conception of what the Bible is, and be ready to give a reasonable answer to every one that questions its worth,—then must we know well, not only the contents of the Bible, but the character, the occasion, the origin, of the sacred books individually, at least to such an extent that we may each be competent to form a well-grounded opinion on these points for ourselves, in order that we may not be shaken in our holiest convictions by every wind of doctrine and every frivolous sally of scorn, lest in the end we become the prey of habitual doubt and confirmed unbelief. For the diffusion of sound biblical knowledge all ought to

labour who know and love the Scripture, for the ignorant, like the blind, are ever in danger of a fall.

When we consider the value of the Scripture in this light, it appears self-evident to every Christian that the Old Testament cannot to him be of equal importance with the New. * It is, indeed, the ground-work of the New, and contains God's preparatory revelation. But full, clear light from on high shone first in Christ. This light we find in the New Testament, from whose luminous summits we may look on the Old, which for us Christians can have full authority only as it sets forth the light of the New Testament, and does not contradict the eternal truth which was spoken by the mouth of the Saviour. The relation of the Old to the New Testament is as the dawn to the meridian day. This imperfection of the Old Testament in comparison with the New is indicated very decidedly in the latter (Heb. viii. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Gal. iv. 3, seq.—comp. Jer. xxxi. 31, seq.).

The Bible has another claim on our respect, one not to be despised, though of less consequence than what has now been spoken of. It is a witness and memorial of a very remote antiquity. The Old Testament gives, respecting the east and respecting primæval ages, information which can be had nowhere else. A great portion of the books of the Old Testament belongs to the most ancient monuments of human language. We have in them instruction on the history, not only of the Jews, but the neighbouring nations, and so are enabled to correct, support and supplement statements found in other quarters. In the Bible we contemplate a mirror of the domestic, the public and the political life of the east in the most remote eras. Considered in an artistic view, the form of narration in the historical books is singularly simple in its kind, and the lofty diction, and the surpassing power of the sacred poetry in the poetic and prophetic books, present for ever unattainable masterpieces of writing. On its part, also, the New Testament affords us the most instructive and gratifying insight into the relations and circumstances of Judaism in the time of Christ, the primitive condition of the Christian church, the first spiritual conflicts of Christianity with Judaism and Heathenism, and finally into the development of Christian doctrine in the teachings of its first promulgators. On these accounts, the Bible, even were it not the holy book that it really is, would possess a value altogether peculiar to itself. But in comparison with other sacred books, the true worth of the Bible becomes yet more striking. The most remarkable of these sacred books connected with the east are—1. Those of the Indians, *The Vedas*, and the commentary on them, called *The Puranas*. The transformations of gods, and the transmigration of souls, found therein, suffice to show that they cannot be

compared with the simple truth of the Bible. 2. *The Zendavesta* of the Persians, with the doctrine of Zoroaster, touching the two original beings in the kingdoms of light and darkness, namely, Ormuzd and Ahriman, and the spirits of both. Wide as heaven and earth is this doctrine from the simple biblical teachings respecting one Almighty God, the Creator of the Universe. 3. *The Koran* of the Mohammedans. What a contrast between its sensuous pictures of Paradise, its principles in many respects essentially grounded on sense, and the divine earnestness and holy purity and strictness of the Gospel! 4. *The Writings of Confucius* among the Chinese. His moral precepts are without a sure foundation, and a powerful influence, for they rest on no principles of belief. The very reverse is the case with the morality of the Bible.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Section VIII.—CANONICAL AND APOCRYPHAL BOOKS.

The word Canon signifies properly a reed by which anything is measured (compare *yard*). The grammarians of Alexandria denoted thereby the collection of those old Greek writers which they recognised as models (*classics*), and which they therefore made use of as *measures* or *tests* of the grammatical and poetic forms in the Greek language. From them the use of the word Canon passed to the Christian Fathers, who employed it to indicate the collection of those sacred writings which, acknowledged by the church as authentic, served as a test of belief, and were used in the public service of God. *The Canonical Books*, then, were those books which stood in this collection; opposed to them were *The Apocryphal Books*, whose authenticity there was reason to doubt, since their authors were not known, and which were used and partly kept secret by the heretics. From this attempted secrecy arose the name of apocryphal, that is, hidden. At a later period the term was used in a milder sense, as denoting those books which, though not accounted clearly authentic, nor employed as a guide in belief, might yet be read for edification, both in the family and in the church. Hence they acquired the appellation of “Ecclesiastical Books” (*Libri Ecclesiastici*), or books for reading (*βιβλία ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα*). The designation of “Apocryphal Books” was first revived by Luther, among Protestants, for the Catholics prefer the appellation “Books of the Second Canon” (*Libri Deuterocanonici*).

Both of these kinds of books were, as alike canonical, used by the first Christians in their church lessons, since they had received in the Greek translation the Apocrypha together with the Old Testament. When, however, in the second century, many unauthentic and heretical works were in circulation, distinguished Christian teachers gained information from learned Jews on the opinion prevailing among them respecting the biblical books of the Old Testament, and thus were they led to the distinction between the canonical and the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. While, however, the Eastern or Greek church

held fast by this distinction, little importance was given to it in the Western or Latin church, where the Apocrypha, as well as the Canon, was continually used as divine writings. Luther was the first to revive the distinction, in following the ancient Greek church; while the Catholic church at the Council of Trent (1546, A. D.) declared all the books of the Bible to be canonical. Modern Catholics, who are aware of the incorrectness of this determination, make the following distinction; they call the Apocrypha the *Second Canon*, and ascribe to it an inferior degree of inspiration.

A.—THE CANONICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Section IX.—THE EARLIEST DIVISION OF THE CANON.

The earliest division of the canonical books, as we now have them in the Hebrew Bible, is the following. The entire collection was divided into three parts:—1. The Law; 2. The Prophets; 3. The Sacred Writings. Unitedly they bore the name of “The Twenty-four,” as in all they formed 24 books. We subjoin the divisions:—

| I. | II. | III. |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| THE LAW. | THE PROPHETS. | THE SACRED WRITINGS. |
| (<i>The Pentateuch.</i>) | (<i>The Octateuch.</i>) | (<i>The Hendekateuch.</i>) |
| The 5 Books of Moses (5) | 1. The First Prophets: | Psalms (1) |
| | Joshua (1) | Proverbs (2) |
| | Judges (2) | Job (3) |
| | 2 Books of Samuel (3) | Canticles (4) |
| | 2 Books of Kings (4) | Ruth (5) |
| | 2. The Second Prophets: | Lamentations (6) |
| | Isaiah (5) | Ecclesiastes (7) |
| | Jeremiah (6) | Esther (8) |
| | Ezekiel (7) | Daniel (9) |
| | The 12 Minor Prophets (8) | Ezra & Nehemiah (10) |
| | | Chronicles (11) |

The number 24 arose thus: The five books of Moses formed five separate rolls, whence the name *Pentateuch*, as each roll was preserved in a separate cover or cloth. The second part contained eight rolls, and hence bore the name of *Octateuch*, for the two books of Samuel were reckoned as one, as were the two books of Kings and the twelve Minor Prophets. The third part had eleven rolls, for Ezra and Nehemiah formed one book. The whole was termed the *Hendekateuch*.

The several rolls consisted of prepared skins, or parchment. At the two ends of broad strips of parchment were two sticks or staves, on and off which the reader rolled the manuscript according to his wishes in reading. Every "roll of a book" (Jer. xxxvi. 2) contained a multitude of columns standing separately and side by side, and extending the whole width, or from top to bottom, of the strip of parchment. Commonly only one side was written on, though in cases of necessity the back was also employed. Some of the biblical writers did not write with their own hands, but dictated the words to an amanuensis. In this way Jeremiah employed his friend Baruch (Jer. xxxvi. 1-6—comp. Rom. xvi. 22). At first a writing of the kind was communicated only to friends; afterwards it was multiplied, according as persons made copies for themselves or for others. The names of the books were often taken from the first word; for example, the Hebrew names of the five books of Moses,* of Ecclesiastes, of Lamentations. Others received their designation from the main personage of the book, as in the case of Joshua, Ruth, Ezra and Nehemiah, Esther. Others again were denominated from the predominant subject-matter, e. g. Judges and Kings.

The reason why the four rolls of the historical books were designated *The First Prophets* is to be found in the fact that prophets were their authors, for before the Exile the prophets were almost exclusively the writers of the Hebrew people. In the name was also conveyed a preference; for these books were more highly estimated by the Jews than what we term the prophetic books. The respect in which they held their Scriptures were indicated by the Jews by the division and order in which the books stood. As the most important and most sacred were, (1) the five books of Moses; then (2) followed the prophets; and (3) the last rank was held by the sacred writings (*Hagiographa*). It deserves remark, that according to the most ancient arrangement, Isaiah held the third place among the second prophets, for in the Talmud,†

* In Luther's German Bible the five books of Moses are denominated, from the order in which they stand, "the First," "the Second," &c. In our English Bibles the names are taken from the Septuagint. Thus *Genesis* (in the Hebrew *Beresith*), or Creation, because the first book opens with an account of the Creation. The second book bears the name of *Exodus* (Hebrew *V'el'le Semoth*), which in Greek signifies *outgoing*, as the book begins with the departure of the Israelites from Egypt. The third book has the name of *Leviticus* (*Leuitikon*, in Hebrew *V'aiera*), because it relates to the Levitical law. The fourth book is termed *Numbers* (Hebrew *V'aiedaber*), as in the beginning it gives God's command for numbering the people. And the fifth book has the appellation *Deuteronomy*, Second Law (in Hebrew *Elle Haddaberim*), because it presents a revised summary of the Mosaic legislation.

† After the destruction of Jerusalem, biblical studies among the Jews were prosecuted almost exclusively in the Jewish schools at Tiberias, Joppa, and

and many ancient manuscripts, such is the place of the book. Yet, and in its present condition, it is certainly more recent than the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel (see under *Isaiah*).

Section X.—LATER DIVISION OF THE CANON.

The Alexandrine Jews departed from the original division of the Canon of which we have just spoken. They made a division according to the contents of the several books, placing together those which were related to each other. Hence they formed three classes—1. The Historical books; 2. The Poetical; 3. The Prophetic. This division of the Septuagint (“The Seventy”) was followed by Jerome in the Latin (Vulgate), and by Luther. Accordingly, the biblical books stand thus:—

| I. | II. | III. |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| HISTORICAL BOOKS. | POETICAL BOOKS. | PROPHETICAL BOOKS. |
| The Pentateuch. | Job | Isaiah |
| Joshua | Psalms | Jeremiah |
| Judges | Proverbs | Lamentations |
| Ruth | Ecclesiastes | Ezekiel |
| 2 Samuel | Canticles | Daniel |
| 2 Kings | | Hosea |
| 2 Chronicles | | Joel |
| Ezra | | Amos |
| Nehemiah | | Obadiah |
| Esther | | Jonah |
| | | Micah |
| | | Nahum |
| | | Habakkuk |
| | | Zephaniah |
| | | Haggai |
| | | Zechariah |
| | | Malachi |

Lydda, in Palestine, and in Babylon. In these schools the Talmud came into existence from the third to the fifth century (A. D.). The Talmud consists of two parts: the first is called *Mishna*, that is, the Second Law, collected about A. D. 200, by Judas the Holy; the second part contains two Commentaries on this Mishna, under the name of *Gemarah*. The most ancient and shorter of these two Commentaries, *The Gemarah of Jerusalem*, dates about 250-270, A. D.; the less ancient and the fuller, *The Gemarah of Babylon*, was written in Babylon, in the fifth century (A. D.). In the Talmud are found the traditional explanations and determinations of the Pharisees respecting the Mosaic law, and therein ridiculous refinements and hair-splittings, though occasionally also excellent proverbs and parables. (See Engel's *Philosoph. für die Welt*, 2 Thl. p. 48, seq., and 3 Thl. p. 132.)—A.

In this arrangement, Ruth is placed where, in regard to time, the book belongs, for the history falls in the age of the Judges. Esther however ought, from its matter, to stand before Ezra and Nehemiah, where, in the Hebrew Canon, it is really found (Section ix.), since the history of Esther at the Persian court refers to a date prior to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah.

In the poetic books, Job stands before the Psalms, probably because it was held to be the oldest book in the Bible, or, at any rate, much older than the Psalms. The three works which bear the name of Solomon (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles) are arranged according to the value of their contents.

Among the Prophets, the four first are called the greater, since the compass of their books, compared with the rest, is much more considerable, while the latter, containing only one or a few chapters, are appropriately termed the minor. In consequence of their smallness they stand on one roll, and are reckoned as only a single book (Section ix.). The Lamentations of Jeremiah being rightly acknowledged as the work of the prophet, in which light it was regarded by the Septuagint, was placed next to the larger production of the same author. The Book of Daniel, which, as being a work of late origin, the Jews did not rank with the Prophets, since they ascribed to it no divine inspiration, and treated it with a certain degree of dis-esteem, is, however, properly added to the greater Prophets, in virtue of its subject-matter. The order of the twelve minor Prophets is the same as that which is found in the Hebrew Bible.

Section XI.—SUCCESSION OF THE CANONICAL BOOKS, ACCORDING TO THE TIME OF THEIR ORIGIN.

Since it is only in the prophetic books that we find exact data which determine the time of their production, and since in the rest we have, for giving their several dates, merely such aid as may be derived from their contents, diction, and other circumstances, so, while we can ascertain with great certainty the age when the prophetic books were produced, we are, with most others, unable to do more than make approximations to the truth. Besides, in the historical works generally, more ancient sources are drawn upon, so that we have two distinct things to learn,—1, to what age those sources belong; and 2, at what time a book came into its actual condition: opinions may, therefore, well vary respecting the time when such books originated. Nevertheless, thorough re-

searches and investigations have led to generally received results on the point, and at present it is only in a few instances that the judgment of the learned vacillates. In the ensuing summary of the canonical books in relation to the time of their origin, we have for our authority the most careful researches. The date of some books, however, remains uncertain. There are three successive periods which form the basis of the following division. These are—i. *The Period of the Kings*; ii. *The Period of the Exile*; iii. *The Period after the Exile*.

i.—*The Period of the Kings, from 1100—588, A. C.*

1. The first four books of Moses, or Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers; at least the originals of these are the most ancient Hebrew writings, and from these originals gradually arose the four books themselves.

2. Most of the Psalms, especially those bearing the name of David and Korah.

3. The Canticles, at the time of Solomon.

4. The two books of Samuel, shortly after the age of David and Solomon.

5. Judges and Ruth, both of the same age, while the family of David still held sway.

6. Joel, the most ancient prophet, under King Uzziah, about 810, A. C.

7. Amos, Hosea, Micah, and Isaiah, in the eighth century, A. C., at the time when the Assyrians were dangerous to both kingdoms, and in the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, from 811—699.

8. The Proverbs, } about the time of Hezekiah, 728—699.

9. Nahum, }

10. Zephaniah, about the time of King Josiah, 643—612.

11. Deuteronomy, } near the Exile.

12. Job, }

13. Habakkuk, Obadiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, 588, by Nebuchadnezzar.

14. Jonah, } at the time of the Exile.

15. Joshua, }

ii.—*The period of the Exile, 588—536, A. C.*

1. The two books of Kings, after the 37th year of the Captivity; see 2 Kings xxv. 27.

2. Several Psalms.

3. The second part of Isaiah, towards the end of the Captivity.

iii.—*The Period after the Exile, 536—175, A. C.*

1. Haggai and Zechariah, at the time of Darius Hystaspis, in the 16th year after the Return, that is, 520, A. C.

2. Several Psalms, especially the "Songs of Degrees," Ps. cxx.-cxxxiv.

3. Ezra, after 445, A. C., in which year Ezra returned to Jerusalem.

4. Nehemiah, after 445, A. C., when Nehemiah went to Jerusalem.

5. Malachi, a contemporary of Nehemiah.

6. Ecclesiastes, at the end of the Persian dominion, or at the beginning of the Macedonian.

7. Chronicles, in the Macedonian period.

8. Esther, } both during the Syrian dominion, when persecution had

9. Daniel, } begun, and the Maccabees came forward.

As books in regard to whose date critics hesitate, we must place these:—1. The Canticles, which some, on account of its style, place after the Exile. 2. Job, Jonah, and Joshua, which some refer to a greater or less period before the Exile, others to an unascertained time during the Exile. Diverse decisions and conjectures have been pronounced respecting other books. These opinions vary greatly from those which have now been set forth. But most of them rest on dogmatical prejudices, and can scarcely overturn the decisions we have given, for which there are clear and satisfactory grounds. We must now consider the canonical books according to their substance.

I.—*THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.*

Section XII.—*HISTORICAL COMPOSITION AMONG THE HEBREWS.*

Historical writing among the ancient easterns differs essentially in many points from what we are acquainted with in modern days and western countries. Knowing nothing of the philosophy of history, the orientals of old, following the order of time, simply ranged one fact after another as they believed them to have occurred. Many special features, descending to the minutest details, family histories, and genealogical registers, possessed a high value, and are peculiar to their manner of writing. The language was in the highest degree simple, often present-

ing pictures, and dialogues. When historical materials of greater antiquity are employed, they are for the most part adopted faithfully and word for word, or re-produced in brief extracts, but not re-cast. In the earliest history, respecting which there were no historical materials, the writer simply followed tradition as found in the mouth of the people. Of the biblical historians of the Old Testament, the following remarks will hold good. With the exception of Nehemiah, they all availed themselves of more ancient written materials, which are not always expressly cited (e. g. not in Genesis). In consequence, sometimes two or more divergent accounts of the same event stand together, e. g. as respecting the Creation (Gen. i. 2); and as to the manner in which David and Saul first become acquainted (1 Sam. xvi. 17-23, xvii. 55-58). The authors of the books are not mentioned except in the case of Ezra and Nehemiah. Before the Exile, prophets were the writers, whence the ancient histories bear the name of Prophets (Section ix.). After the Exile, the office fell into the hands of priests, as clearly appears from the spirit of the Chronicles compared with the spirit of the books of Kings. As however prophets and priests composed these works, we easily see whence came the religious spirit, the theocratic view of the world, the constant regard to divine Providence, by which they are pervaded. Writers such as these were, by the direction of their minds and their prevailing religious view of the universe, specially fitted to feel and understand the divine guidance of the people, the inspiration which God gave in the lot of individuals and of nations, and the general movement of the divine mind in the government of the world; though it cannot be denied that their own peculiar, popular and religious conceptions threw a colouring over their narratives. That in cases where the testimony of eye-witnesses was out of the question, and the history was written centuries after the event, tradition should have found acceptance, is by no means surprising, and to faithful narratives in regard to what took place before any historical composition existed, and, failing written memorials, what was kept alive in the mouth of the people, we are indebted for the fact that we have before our eyes the connected history of the Jewish nation, and so the unbroken line of providential dealing therewith, as well as historical truth generally in its fundamental characteristics. From the time of Moses down to that of Nehemiah, historical books formed one great systematic whole. In the succession, the book which follows has a reference to that which precedes, whose narratives it carries onward, so that the history proceeds in its course from the Creation to Nehemiah. Only between the history of Joseph and Moses, and therefore between Genesis and Exodus, there is a blank of 430 years: and the Chronicles repeat and supplement much of what is found in the books of Samuel and

Kings. It is also a peculiarity of the historical books of the Bible, that in them all, here and there, poems appear which are clearly distinguished from the general prose of the narratives. Examples may be found in Gen. xlix. 2; Exod. xv. 2; Numb. xxiii. xxiv.; Deut. xxxii. xxxiii.; Judg. v.; 2 Sam. i. Many of these poems are older than the history in which they stand, and are therefore taken from ancient tradition or from more ancient works. Such a poem is the Song of Deborah (Judg. v.), in which the diction is distinguished from the general language of the book by its archaic forms.

With this general character of the biblical history, nugatory has been the attempt to find an explanation, from exclusively ordinary causes, of events which depart from the usual course of nature, and, from a dislike of miracle, to credit the most incredible things, rather than to receive the simple narrative in its own native features. The greater reason is there for renouncing the notion of finding a natural explanation, since in most cases we cannot decide what in truth was done by the wisdom and omnipotence of God, contrary to the usual course of nature, and what belongs merely to the conceptions and views of the earliest reporters. In some individual events, as, for instance, in the supply of manna in the wilderness, and the passage through the Red Sea, modern investigations and a knowledge of nature and of localities have given hints and indications of the way in which God's hand at the right time makes nature serviceable to His holy purposes; but hence to draw a conclusion respecting every event narrated as a miracle, is as rash as, from the circumstance that God has given aid in this way and no other, to infer that in the same and no other way can He ever give aid. In cases where recent inquiries and an accurate acquaintance with nature really throws light on a biblical narrative, there let it receive a welcome; but to expound scriptural narratives by mere guesses and empty fancies, is to destroy the value of the sacred writings, and altogether to disown their origin and their character. In the most decided way must we here reject a conclusion which is too often made in certain quarters, and which is to this effect: if in the biblical narratives anything traditional occurs, the whole is but a collection of traditions and fables, and deserves no credence. Such a course would be as unreasonable as to treat as a falsehood a statement made by a trustworthy friend, because, without any blame to him, inaccuracies are found therein. What in ordinary life, however, no wise man would do, that in regard to holy Scripture some try to make good, without suspecting that, instead of the alleged power of their faith, they betray its very great infirmity when they show alarm if any one of the biblical narratives is not literally expounded. The divine power of the Scripture reposes in reality on firmer grounds than an

extreme servitude to the letter ; and the person who can only thereby sustain his faith, may in these days unhappily experience how in a moment his belief may sink and fall, since the basis on which it stands gives way when he least thinks of it. The credibility of the biblical history in general remains unshaken, though we explain single incidents in it in such a way as their nature requires ; yes, we hold so much the more firmly that which, after all possible scrutiny, approves itself as historical and ever-valid truth.

Note.—Ewald (*Geschichte Volks Israel*, i. 256), who will not be charged with undue conservative tendencies, thus concludes his disquisitions on the historical books of the Old Testament:—"If we survey the entire course over which we have gone, we find in their historical culture, grounds for inferring that the culture of the Hebrews in other respects must have been very rich. Here we have seen appear all the chief kinds of historical composition, with the single exception of that which is founded on philosophical investigation ;—the history of youth, with its self-deceptions ; of maturity, with its high development ; the artistic in several degenerate species ; the annalistic, with its lapidary style ; the legal, the sacerdotal, the popular ; that of simple narrative ; that which, full of prophetic ideas, rises into poetry ; and that which freely re-produces the addresses of individuals : here is history, which flows on with aimless unconsciousness, as well as that which is subservient to the most definite aim ; heavenly history, and history with a deep earthly dye. And while, under the earliest kings, Hebrew history reaches its period of bloom, and for some centuries maintains itself in this flourishing condition, its beginnings go back to even the very early age of Moses, and comprise borrowed portions which are still more ancient."

Lepsius (*Die Chronologie der Aegypter*. Berlin, 1849. p. 14), in deprecating the unwarrantable attempt to make the Bible supply the basis and the details of a universal scientific chronology, holds with Ewald, that whilst the first comprehensive drawing-up (*die erste umfassendere Redaktion*) of the Old Testament writings took place immediately after the Augustan age of Hebrew poetry under the first Kings, portions of the Pentateuch originated in the time of Moses.

THE PENTATEUCH.

Section XIII.—CONTENTS.

Genesis contains the primæval history of the world (i.-xi. 9), the creation (i.), the fall of man (ii., iii.), Cain's murder of Abel (iv.), the deluge (vi.-viii.), the building of the tower of Babel (xi.) ; then comes the family history of the patriarchs (xii.-xxxvi.), in which we have that

of Abraham (xii.-xxv.), of Isaac (xxvi., xxvii.), of Jacob or Israel (xxviii.-xxxvi.), and finally the history of Joseph (xxxvii.-l.).

Exodus narrates the departure of the Israelites from Egypt under the guidance of Moses after a residence there of about four hundred years (i.-xiv.), embracing the earliest history of Moses (i.-vi.), his miracles before Pharaoh (vii.-xi.), death of the firstborn among the Egyptians, and institution of the Passover (xii.), the escape (xiii.), the overthrow of Pharaoh (xiv.); then come the first events in the desert (xv.-xviii.), as Moses' triumphal song (xv.), the manna and the quails (xvi.), water from the rock (xvii.), institution of judges (xviii.); next is narrated the legislation at Sinai (xix.-xxiv.), including the Ten Commandments (xx.), and finally the formation of the tabernacle, the sacerdotal raiment, and of the sacred vessels (xxv.-xl.), with the narrative of the golden calf (xxxii.).

Leviticus sets forth the laws regarding the priests and the service of God, giving specific directions in regard to sacrifices, food, fasts, uncleanness, &c. (i.-xxvii.).

Numbers opens with the numbering of the people (i.-x.), and then speaks of the further events which took place in the wilderness, from Sinai to the Jordan (x. 21), narrating the account of the quails and the ensuing plague (xi.), the sedition of Aaron and Miriam (xii.), the spies Joshua and Caleb (xiii.), murmuring of the people, and their punishment (xiv.), the rebellion of Korah (xvi.), the flowering staff of Aaron (xvii.), water from the rock (xx.), the serpents (xxi.); at last stand the events near the Jordan (xxii.-xxxvi.), embracing the history of Balaam (xxii.-xxiv.), Joshua's being appointed the successor of Moses (xxvii.), the victory over the Midianites (xxxi.), two tribes and a half take the land on the east of the Jordan—Perea (xxxii.), appointment of the forty-eight Levitical cities and the six cities of refuge (xxxv.).

Deuteronomy offers a repetition of the law with emendatory explanations (i.-xxx.); the law of the Ten Commandments engraved on stone was to be set up on Mount Ebal, and on Gerizim were the blessings to be pronounced, and the curses on Ebal (xxvii. 4-26); at last comes Moses' withdrawal, blessing, and death (xxxiii., xxxiv.); Mount Nebo xxxiv.).

Section XIV.—CHARACTER AND FORMATION OF THE FIVE BOOKS OF
THE PENTATEUCH.

The five books forming the Pentateuch are in the condition in which they now lie before us, formed of two more ancient and easily recognised originals. In Genesis these two documents are distinguished by the name which they severally give to the Supreme being. The more ancient of these always terms the Almighty *Elohim*, in our version "God" simply; the less ancient terms him *Jehovah*, "Lord," or *Jehovah Elohim*, "Lord God." After narrating the origin and import of the name *Jehovah* (Exod. vi.), the older document also chooses the name *Jehovah*, and this external distinction ceases. But internally, in phrasology and manner, the distinction remains obvious. The older document, or "the *Elohim*-document," is more simple and lofty in its narrative, but it is also more wordy, and has greater breadth. The less ancient, called "the *Jehovah*-document," exhibits God more like men, and is shorter and more reflective. The former constitutes the substance of the narrative. The latter appears in interposed passages. Thorough investigations into the date of these two originals derive the more ancient from the time of Samuel and Saul, the less ancient from the time of Solomon or the immediately succeeding age. From these originals, especially the former, were gradually formed the four first books during the regal government. When at last these four books were brought to a close (Numb. xxxvi. 13), the fifth book was appended to them, and towards the time of the Exile the present Pentateuch was completed (2 Kings xxii. 8, 10, seq.), for from that time traces of acquaintance with Deuteronomy may be found in later biblical writers.

From the character and origin of the entire work, it is clear that it was not written by Moses in its present condition. Nevertheless, Moses must be regarded as the originator and writer of the most important part of the entire contents, namely, the law, for it is expressly recorded that at the command of God he wrote down both laws and events (Exod. xxiv. 4, 7, xxxiv. 27; Numb. xxxiii. 2; Deut. xxxi. 9); and the high education which Moses received in Egypt puts it beyond a doubt that he was fully acquainted with the art of writing. Hence comes the designation in the Old Testament, namely, "the law of Moses" (Josh. viii. 32, xxii. 5—comp. xxiv. 26; 2 Kings xiv. 6; Ezra iii. 2; Nehem. viii. 1), which in substance is found also in the New Testament (Matt. xix. 7, xxii. 24; Mark vii. 10, x. 3, xii. 26). As then the law, which is the kernel of the five books, proceeded from Moses, the inference was not unnatural that the whole Pentateuch was

the work of his hands. This conclusion was formed in ages long before criticism was studied and understood. But the biblical writers do no more than represent Moses as the originator and writer of the law, in no way ascribing to him the authorship of the five books in their actual condition. What is thus declared to us by them no critical researches will nullify.

The most important considerations against the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch as now found are these: 1. The language is the same as in the historical books of the Old Testament down to the Exile. Had Moses written them, then during the space of a thousand years a living tongue would have undergone no change. Such a thing is without a parallel, and it is contradicted by the changes which the Hebrew passed through from the era of the Exile.—2. The originals out of which the books were formed must have been older than Moses: whereby the difficulty arising from the unchanged language is augmented.—3. The service of God, as described in Judges, Samuel, and Kings, is not that which is enjoined in the Pentateuch.—4. The style of the fifth book varies essentially from that of the other four books, so that the same author cannot have written them all (Section xx.).—5. There are citations of, and allusions to, facts, which, according to the testimony of the other historical books, took place long after the time of Moses. In this remark, reference is made to, I. Names borne by cities and places given at a much later period, e. g. Hebron (Gen. xiii. 18—comp. Josh. xiv. 15); Dan (Gen. xiv. 14—comp. Josh. xix. 47; Judg. xviii. 29); Bethel (Gen. xii. 8, xxxv. 6, 7, 15—comp. Josh. xviii. 13). II. The extermination of the Canaanites as having in the time of the writer long taken place (Gen. xii. 6). III. The mention of Kings in Israel (Gen. xxxvi. 31—comp. xlix. 20). IV. The borders of the land as they were in the days of David and Solomon (Gen. xv. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 1-12). V. The characterising of Judah as having regal power (Gen. xlix. 8, 10). VI. The allusion to the Exile (Deut. xxxiii. 7).—6. The entire legislation supposes an already far more highly cultivated civil polity, and often has reference to relations and abuses which arose at a later period, especially as found in Deuteronomy, in which the dividers of the land are spoken of as “they of old time” (Deut. xix. 14).—7. The history of Moses himself is mixed with traditions.—And 8, lastly, The narrators very clearly distinguish themselves from Moses and his time: thus they say of an event, “as it is at this day” (Gen. xxii. 14, xxvi. 33, xxxv. 20), they praise Moses (Numb. xii. 3; Deut. xxxiv. 10), they name the place where Moses with the people was encamped, “that side the Jordan,” as only authors could have done who lived on this side (Numb. xxii. 1; Deut. i. 1, iii. 8, iv. 41); and, finally, the death and burial of

Moses are mentioned (Deut. xxxiv.); to regard which as an addition by a later hand is only an expedient resorted to in need, for this passage, both in diction and manner, connects itself intimately with what goes before, and appears as a necessary conclusion of the whole.

Against all these considerations, the friends of the older view, which makes Moses to have immediately written the Pentateuch, have adduced many arguments which often show much ingenuity and learning; but the dogmatic pre-judgments, out of which, more or less, all these objections have flowed, have not power to take away the force of the clear reasons which have been alleged above.

From what has now been said of the way in which the five books of Moses came into existence, two things are clear. One is to this effect: in conjunction with the memoranda made by Moses himself, tradition and popular narratives were sources of the accounts which have come down to us; by which fact the traditionary character of many separate events is explained, also many laws and directions in their present condition, proceeding not forthwith from Moses, were afterwards referred to him; whereby the more exact determinations respecting events and relations which took place at a later time, and could not in the actual detail have been provided for by Moses, find a satisfactory explanation (Deut. xvii. 14-20, xix. 14; Numb. xxxv. 9-28, xix. 1-7, 8-13, to which belongs the important passage in Jeremiah, according to which God gave no command in the desert respecting "burnt offerings or sacrifices;" Jer. vii. 21-23). The collectors and writers of the whole Pentateuch then, according to the fundamental view involved in the theocratical or divine government which they recognised, put together what came from Moses himself, and what might be ascribed to him, and so preserved among the people that which was accounted most important and most holy, namely, the law.

Note.—That the writer of the book of Genesis availed himself of written documents as well as monumental evidence and oral communications, may, in general, be regarded as a fact, and it is a fact which is of a nature to conciliate credence; but what those documents are, and how they were employed, are questions which are yet *sub judice*, as appears from the diversity of views put forth on the subject. Without entering into these, we may remark that the cause of the difference between the Elohim and the Jehovah documents has been found by some in the variation of the ideas of the subject-matter, so that while the Hebrews were careful to select in each case that name of God which in sense was most appropriate, so when they spoke of God generally, they used Elohim; but when they referred to God, considered relatively to his providence, and specially to Israel, then they employed Jehovah, since the Mosaic religion was a kind of Jehovahism.

Theologians often think and speak as if in the biblical writings they had to

do with printed books—books, that is, which at once took a definite and finished shape, to which nothing could be added, and from which nothing could be taken. Such is not the fact. The Canon was slowly formed in the course of ages by repeated additions, all in MSS. If substantive portions were appended, words and sentences might be introduced. Not impossibly the sacred books underwent a revision, so as from time to time to make them more useful in making them more adapted to the wants of the actual age. This revision, made under the sacred respect and love of truth, which guarded the Canon itself and its separate books, would be designed to improve, not corrupt, the writings, by adding necessary information in particulars, and points of connexion and transition for the whole. That the revision was made in an honourable spirit, is obvious from the absence of any attempt to remove objections and harmonise apparent discrepancies. All the facts of the case indicate a *natural* growth. Had fraud been at work, it would have left fewer difficulties for critics to deal with. As, however, the MSS. were open to additions at the hands of their conservators, so does the occurrence in a book of passages of later dates by no means prove that the book itself must be referred to the time to which any one or more of these additions may point. Every book is older than its notes. Indeed, the whole subject has been handled too much in the wholesale. The date of a single passage has been made to decide the date of a book. In printed works there is some reason for this, not in the case of manuscripts. The only proper way is to ascertain the date of each particular part, and then, when the dates vary, to consider what bearing these dates have as to the date of the whole. The date of parts and the date of the whole are, and should be, treated as two separate questions, though possibly having a common result. The questions too, of quantity and proportion, should be entertained. The critic should ask, how much belongs to the earlier, how much to a later, day? It is very possible that the bulk or nearly the whole of a book may be of great antiquity, while a few words are of a late origin. We certainly have no right to identify the date of the whole with the date of a part. Let the reader turn to Deut. ii. 1-13, and he will find an illustration of our meaning. The chapter begins with a narrative, which having for its subject *we*, is evidently the product of an eye-witness, of one who took part in the events. Similar traces are found until you come to the tenth verse, where the narrative is suddenly interrupted, and is not resumed till the 13th verse. Between the two stands a piece of historical information, whose origin is best explained by calling it an antiquarian note, which being suggested to a later hand by the mention of the Moabites in verse 9, was originally written in the margin, and afterwards taken into the text. Another instance occurs in the same chapter, 20-23. In the last are found the words, “unto this day,” whose origin are thus explained without involving the late composition of the book. In these general remarks is there in substance an answer to many of the objections taken to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, though they also suggest a caution which bids conservative theologians claim and attempt no more than facts warrant. Were the spirit of party and of conflict happily banished from theology, and were earnest minds of all communions engaged in ascertaining facts, these facts, as simple, uncoloured realities, would form the data of opinions and the ground of conclusions, until, by combined effort, a systematic view would be gained which would carry with it as much certainty as in each case the nature of things admitted. Ere, however, so happy a result can be gained, this side must cease to carry their

assumptions beyond their warrant, and that side cease to employ their ingenuity in order to lessen or destroy the grounds of men's credence in the biblical records.

That in the Pentateuch words are found which did not proceed from Moses, is beyond a question. The number of those words is a matter of debate. Our author errs on the side of superfluity.

A less unfavourable view is given by a recently deceased Catholic critic (*Herbst Einleitung*, ii. 1, 45), in these words:—"The origin of these writings may be thus conceived. During his residence of forty years in the desert, Moses wrote down the laws, and in their written condition made them known to the people for their present or future obedience. Then he deposited them in the side of the ark. With a view to warning and instruction of future generations, he also wrote down the most memorable events of his life, and put the document into sacred custody or entrusted it to the hands of his tribe (Exod. xv. 1-21; Numb. xxi.; Deut. xxxi. 19). Also many events were narrated by one generation to another, and the memory of them kept alive in domestic tradition. At a late time, a Hebrew sage brought the writings of Moses forth from their sacred custody, added the songs, and collected family traditions. Taking the Mosaic documents as he found them, he arranged the materials in the order of time, supplemented the historical part from the songs and traditions, and so delivered into the hands of the people his work, which was a history of the Mosaic legislation." In this view the substance of the Pentateuch is of Mosaic origin. Probably, however, more is ascribed to the sage than facts justify. But more and less are questions of mere degree, and consequently questions of not paramount importance. As such, they cannot be discussed in a note, nor indeed can the general question whether the Pentateuch, and, if not the whole, how much of the Pentateuch, rests on the authority of Moses, be satisfactorily decided until the subject has been investigated and set forth on the basis already indicated.

To these general views, which in effect comprise modifications of, or replies to, most of the specific arguments given in the text for the late origin of the books *in their present condition*, we add a few particulars. The argument, from style, against the Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy can have little force when we fairly take into account how changed was the position of Moses when now standing on the borders of Palestine and on the brink of the grave, he reviewed his work, and, reviewing it, modified many parts, taking, meanwhile, special care with a view to coming events in the occupation of the land by his people. No one utters a dying request in the style employed for a legal digest.

But it is said that the language of the Pentateuch in general betrays a later age than that of Moses. Invariableness, however, is one great peculiarity of the Shemitic tongues. And if the Hebrew received modifications from the time of the Captivity, it was owing to the very powerful causes brought into operation by that national calamity, which, removing all the influential part of the nation from their own soil, and mingling them with foreigners, could not fail to occasion great linguistic changes. Another argument has as little force. The writers employ a word "this (or that) side Jordan," which shows that they lived in Canaan. Here again we must complain of the logical leap made from the particular to the universal. But the fact alluded to well exemplifies the uncertainty of these verbal proofs. The word in Hebrew is עבר (*Hofer*). As its representative, Luther gave *jenseit*, "that side," the English translator, "this side" (comp. Numb. xxxii. 19). If the word means "that side," then as the side spoken of in the

original is the east of the Jordan, the writer lived on the west of that river, and so was not Moses. But if the word means "this side," then the eastern bank is denoted, where Moses was. Two things are here put in issue:— 1. The meaning of *Hober*; 2. The position of the person who uses it. Now *Hober* properly signifies "to cross," hence "across," or "over;" also "a passage," or place of crossing a river. This last signification is found in the term Bethabara, "house of passage," applied to some spot near where the Israelites passed into Palestine. At this passage they were assembled when in the plains of Moab, and the word, in the instances referred to in the text, seems to denote neither this nor that side, specifically considered; but a certain spot or place, called the "passage" (Josh. xxii. 11—comp. Abarim, Numb. xxvii. 12; Jer. xxii. 20; 2 Sam. xix. 18), or "the ferry." The Hebrews stood at "the passage," or, as it is expressed in Numb. xxxv. 1, "in the plains of Moab, by Jordan, near Jericho." Now the terms "at the passage," determine nothing as to the position of the speaker, who may, when using them, stand with equal propriety on the east or the west of the passage. The same is true also, if the term *Hober* came, as is the fact, (thus we have Πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου for *Peræa*,) to be the customary designation for the country lying along the eastern bank of the Jordan; for when once the name *Hober* came to be equivalent to *Peræa*, it would be used indifferently by speakers, whatever their position. That, however, the word *Hober* may be used of the west of the Jordan by a speaker residing on the west of that river, is evident from Isaiah ix. 1, where it is represented by the English "beyond."

A careful geographical study however of the Old Testament would, we believe, bring to light many incidental illustrations of the trustworthiness of the scriptural narratives. Some illustrations of the kind may be found in two pamphlets whose titles are given below.* We subjoin a remark or two in explanation.

In the book of Numbers (xiii. 21), the spies are said to have gone up from the wilderness of Zin unto Rehob, that is, Beth-rehob, near Dan or Laish (Judg. xviii. 28, 29). The narrative states that Moses was in the desert immediately on the south of Canaan; and it implies that the direction in which the spies proceeded was in its great bearings northward. Now, it deserves special notice that not only does the general construction of the narrative imply that the writer was himself in the desert, but the order of the words "from Zin unto Rehob" gives evidence that such was the fact. Had the words been written at a late period, they would rather have been "from Zin unto Dan;" for, after the time of the Judges, Dan was the name for the northern limit of Palestine; and had they been written by some one resident in Palestine, they probably would have stood in an inverted order, namely, from "Dan to Zin," as in the phrase "from Dan to Beersheba" (Judg. xx. 1). There thus arises a probability that the passage preceded, if not from Moses, from some one in the position in which Moses was at the time of the recorded events, and hence we are led to the belief that we have here the narrative of an eye-witness.

Near the sources of the Jordan, on the west of Paneas, Dr. Wilson came to a

* *Scripture Illustrated, from Recent Discoveries in the Geography of Palestine*, with a Map, showing the different levels of the country. 2s.

Scripture Vindicated against some Perversions of Rationalism, in an Investigation of the Miracles, "Feeding the Five Thousand," and "Walking on the Water;" with a Map of the Sea of Galilee. 2s. 6d.

hill, called Tell-el-Kadhi. The word *Kadhi*, in Arabic, signifies "Judge"—an exact accordance in etymological meaning and a curious perpetuation of a name. The identity of the place with the ancient Dan is confirmed by the fact that the stream which rises here is designated Nahr ed-Dhan, or river of Dan. The site corresponds with the information supplied by Eusebius and Jerome, who place Dan at four miles from Paneas, on the way to Tyre. Here then we have the ancient name and place revived and restored. Three times did the place change its appellation. Called at first Laish, it became Dan, and then, under the predominance of Arabian influence, Kadhi. The last is simply a translation of the word Dan. The discovery and identification are interesting. They also afford a confirmation of the reality of the scriptural record. That confirmation is the more striking and satisfactory, because, as appears from the above details, it is connected with facts in which collusion was impossible.

Section XV.—OBSERVATIONS SPECIALLY ON THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

The Greek name of the book of *Genesis* signifies "Origin;" but in Alexandrine Greek, "the origin (or creation) of the world." The name, therefore, is taken from the contents of the first chapter. The Hebrew name of the book, **בראשית**, "In the beginning," consists of the opening word of the book. Another Hebrew designation is **ספר יצירה**, that is, "Book of origin," or of formation (from **יצר**), having for its basis the same idea as the Greek appellation.

In the first part, namely, the primæval history, the following points deserve a closer consideration:

The History of the Creation.—This account contains in a representation which, from its simplicity, was no less lofty and easy to be understood by men who were in the earliest stage of civilisation, the everlasting truth respecting the creation of the world. God has here given in a shell his first revelation, which centuries have preserved and centuries will preserve till the world is no more. The everlasting truth is beyond controversy this: God, out of nothing, gradually created the universe, which is perfect in every relation, by means of his almighty word. The shell is the covering. If we adhere to this shell, word for word, we give up the kernel to doubt and scorn. As part of the covering we regard the division of the entire work of creation into six days, so that on the first, matter and light were called into being; on the second, the firmament of heaven, as a firm covering; on the third, the firm land, the sea and the plants; on the fourth, all the heavenly bodies; on the fifth, fish and birds; on the sixth, land animals coming

out of the earth, and man; when finally, on the seventh, God rested from his work. To receive the account literally is impossible, since the entire representation contains only imperfect conceptions resting on sensible appearances and optical misjudgments of the universe, and since the operation of God himself is set forth as a labour, from which, "after the manner of man," he rested when he had surveyed the whole. With those imperfect conceptions must be classed the circumstances that light existed before the sun, that evening and morning preceded that luminary, that vegetable productions were earlier than the same source of light and heat, that heaven is represented as a firmly-fixed vault, above which is a part of the general mass of water, that the sun and moon are set as lights in this firmament, and that this small earth is made the centre for whose sake all the universe is called into existence. In the same category must we place a fact which is of special importance, namely, that in the second account of the Creation, which forms a part of the Jehovah-document, there are considerable deviations and diversities from the first. According to it, the earth when created had no grass nor plants, for "Jehovah had not caused it to rain, and there was not a man to till the ground" (Gen. ii. 4, 5). The earth was first watered by a mist which arose from it. Hence trees grew out of the ground (ii. 6, 9). The animals were created after man, and man gave the animals their names (ii. 19). Afterwards the woman was created; while, in the former narrative, male and female are brought into being at the same time (ii. 20-25—comp. i. 26, 27). Attempts have been renewed to explain away these discrepancies. But they succeed neither in their immediate object, nor in conciliating respect for the Bible. Good sense and a proper regard towards the Scripture are in accordance with the idea that its writers could neither possess nor require the exact acquaintance with physical science which Providence left to be attained in later ages. Nevertheless, they were led to know and to report divine truth after their own simple manner, and far elevated above all the cosmogonies of the ancient world is the unadorned narrative of the Bible, which indeed gives us the key for explaining the distorted traditions of other nations, which, in a measure, have lost the simple truth of the biblical narrative. The deterioration will appear from the ensuing statement of the artificial views entertained as to Creation by the chief nations of antiquity.

i. *The Tradition of the Indians.*—At first, the universe, covered with water, rested in the bosom of the original being. *Brahma*, the creator of the world, swam over the water, and saw nothing but water and darkness. Then the forms of the earthly world lay undeveloped in deep sleep. Hereupon he created heaven and earth, as well as good and bad

spirits, and at last he sent forth, out of his own members, four men, who were the chiefs of the four castes; in other words, he created a Brahmin, a warrior, a husbandman, and a slave. The three last took wives, but the priest (the Brahmin) was to have remained unmarried, and only in anger did the Creator give him a wife (Kreuzer, *Symbol. und Mythol.* i. 595).

ii. *The Tradition of the Babylonians or Chaldeans.*—The world was originally framed out of darkness and water. Thereupon *Baal*, the highest god, descended, tore his wife *Omoroka* into two parts, and created from one of these parts heaven, from the other, earth.

iii. *The Tradition of the Persians.*—According to the *Zendavesta*, their sacred books, *Ormuzd*, the god of light, created the entire visible world in six periods, in commemoration of which he appointed six annual festivals. On the first day he created light between heaven and earth and the stars; on the second day, water, which at first covered the whole earth, then sank into the depths of the earth, and afterwards was in part borne by the wind into the heights, so as to form the clouds; on the third day he created the dry earth, beginning with the sacred mountain, *Al Bortsh*, whence the other hills were produced; on the fourth day he created trees and plants; on the fifth day, the beasts; and on the sixth day, the first man, *Cajomorte*. He was killed by the evil power, *Ahriman*; but out of his seed arose an intermediate being, and from this intermediate being sprang the first twelve human pairs (*Zendav.* i. 21, iii. 59).

iv. *The Tradition of the Phœnicians.*—In the beginning there was a disturbed chaos enveloped in darkness, which contained the original substance of things. This chaos was quickened by the uncreated *Kolpia*, and, united with night, it brought forth time and the first human beings. Night is named *Baau*.*

v. *The Tradition of the Egyptians.*—The Egyptians had the idea of a world-egg, out of which the universe was evolved. This idea is also found among the Indians and Greeks (Euseb., *De Præp. Evang.* iii. 11).

vi. *The Notions of the Greeks and Romans.*—We must distinguish the doctrine of the philosophers from the conceptions of the poets, as found in Hesiod and Ovid (*Metamorphoses*). Diodorus reports two views as entertained by the most respected natural philosophers and historians. According to one view, the world was uncreated and imperishable; the

* The Greek *kolpia* (κολπία) is undoubtedly the Hebrew קל פי יה, *voice of the mouth of God*. *Baau* (βααῦ) arose from כהו, which means *empty* (Gen. i. 2). This passage however, of the Phœnician *Sanconinthon*, is suspected of being unauthentic, since Platonic ideas are thought to be contained therein. It is found translated into Greek in Eusebius, *De Præp. Evang.* i. 10.—A.

human race had existed for ever. According to the other view, the world came into existence, and is perishable; the human race also arose at a certain epoch. Heaven and earth were, at the first, a mingled whole; then they separated, and the world took its present form. The moist elements, in virtue of their lightness, ascended to the heights, giving birth to the sun and stars, which were hurried away in atmospheric eddies; the earthy parts sank in consequence of their weight, occasioning a division into land and water. Out of the damp, moist soil, which the heat in many places caused to produce corruption, sprang all living creatures, of which those which had most warmth became birds, those which possessed more earthy elements were worms and land animals, and those with more watery parts became fish. When, however, the earth became more solid under the influence of the sun, it was no longer able to bring forth larger animals, which henceforth arose only by propagation (*Diod. i. 6, 7*).

In opposition to this, others spoke of a creation of the world by the Deity (*Cicero, De Nat. Deor. i. 11*). Plato and the Stoics represented God as operating in the creation by means of the Logos, that is, the divine wisdom (*comp. Prov. viii. 22*). Others, on the contrary, such as Thales, assumed, as the primary element, water, out of which all things were evolved. Others, again, e. g. Hesiod, were of opinion that the ether, or the element of light, was older than the sun and moon. Moreover, the Greeks ascribe to man a resemblance to God. We refer particularly to Pythagoras (*Cicero, De Nat. Deor. i. 32, 37*; *Ovid, Metamor. i. 83*).

The second point in the biblical account of the Creation requiring notice, is *the creation of man in the divine image* (*Gen. i. 26, 27*). This resemblance of man to his Maker consists, according to the doctrine of the Old Testament, in our dominion over the earth, and all the animal world (*Gen. i. 26, 28*). This dominion, however, presumes a mental superiority, which bears the name of reason, or wisdom. Hence in *Ps. viii. 5*, we read—

“Thou hast made him but little lower than the angels,
And hast crowned him with glory and honour.”

This image of God in man has not perished, for it is ascribed to man after the Fall (*Gen. ix. 6*; *Ps. viii. 5-9*). Differently, however, is it with innocence or holiness, which man lost through the Fall, and which, according to *Ephes. iv. 24*, he possessed before the Fall. As, however, according to our Christian views, we find this divine resemblance of man only internally (*John iv. 24*), so the question arises whether such an internal resemblance is intended in the passages above referred to.

That also an external resemblance, a resemblance in form, may be meant, appears from the use of the same word in regard to Seth, Adam's son (Gen. v. 3), also from the fact that, in Genesis, God often appears in a human form (Gen. iii. 8, 21, xviii. 1, 2, 13, 17, 21, 33, xxxii. 24-30).

The Fall.—The history of the Fall, like that of the Creation, contains, in an account child-like in its simplicity and easy of comprehension, the everlasting truth, that sin and its consequences came into the world through the guilt of the first human beings. They had proceeded from their Creator's hands pure and guiltless. By their own act, evil entered a world which God had created perfect, for they broke a distinct command of the Creator. Their disobedience arose from sense, from a propensity to do what was prohibited, from the inclination to follow the voice of temptation against their better convictions. With the loss of their innocence their happiness departed. Sin brought on them punishment from within and from without, and as all men after them sinned, and as the lust of sin was propagated to all races of man, so the punishment of sin fell on all men (Rom. v. 12), from which we find a redemption only in Christ (Rom. v. 17, 19). But the outer investment of the everlasting truth belongs altogether to the conception of the writer, and its verbal reception is in consequence no longer possible, since we there find unworthy ideas of God, as the highest of Beings, who must not be represented in a human manner; contradictions against the order of things, from the first devised and established by the Creator, which necessarily has its reasons in their nature; and, finally, features that are clearly traditional, such as the speaking serpent and the two mysterious trees. If, then, we insist on taking these accessaries literally, we expose to derision the everlasting truth contained in the passage.

The Flood.—That here also traditional elements have mixed themselves with certain historical truth, no impartial person can deny: for among other questions these remain unanswered, namely, how Noah got possession of all the species of animals which lived over the whole earth, and in very dissimilar climes; on what the carnivorous beasts subsisted in the ark; in what way Noah knew the food of each kind; how wild beasts became tame, so as to enter the ark, each with its mate; how so many sorts of animals have been found in a fossil state; how all the animal kingdom can have been fed by Noah; and how, in the period from Noah to Abraham, that is, in nine generations, the re-peopleing of the earth can have taken place, for the latter found Egypt an already flourishing empire. If we have recourse to a series of miracles, we set ourselves in opposition to the simple narrative itself, which

points to nothing of the kind. Notwithstanding these objections to the literal acceptance of the several particulars, the truth of a destructive flood, from which, by the counsel of God, Noah and his family were saved, remains indisputable. The actual condition of the face of the earth, geognostical inquiries, and the remarkable agreement of all national traditions, find their origin in such an event. In regard to the last point, it is true that the Deucalion deluge (Ovid, i. 163) may have been nothing more than an overflowing of Thessaly, for Herodotus mentions this as an historical fact (vii. 29); but this explanation does not hold good of the tradition of the Assyrians, the Indians, the Phrygians, and other ancient nations, nor of the Mexicans in America, in which it is impossible to mistake the resemblance to the deluge narrated in Genesis, and which are seen to refer to the same event, as soon as you have removed the several additions which are of later origin. This will appear obvious from the ensuing statements.

The Assyrian tradition speaks of a man, by name Sisutros, or Xisutros, to whom the gods announced a deluge of rain. In consequence, he buried in the sacred city of the sun, Sipparat, in Mesopotamia, the written memorials of the antediluvian world. He, his friends, and all animals, went on board a great ship which he built. In this he proceeded to Armenia, where, after the Deluge, he, with his wife and a daughter, made offerings to the gods. For these reasons he was taken up into heaven. The human beings that remained settled in Babylon, and the ship is still on the Armenian mountains (Euseb., *De Præp. Evang.* ix. 10-11; Joseph., *C. Ap.* i. 19).

The Indian tradition, which is found in the oldest heroic poem of the Indians, called the *Mahabaratha*, narrates, that in the sixth age the earth had become corrupt, with the exception of a pious king, named Manu, and seven righteous persons. Therefore Brahma prepared a flood. But before the punishment was inflicted, he appeared to Manu in the shape of a fish, and commanded him to build a ship, on which he was to embark with the seven righteous persons, and the original elements of plants and animals. Having obeyed the injunction, he at last landed on the highest summits of the Himmalayah mountains (*Die Sündfluth nach dem Indischen.* Berlin, 1829).

The Phrygian tradition has been preserved on coins of the city Apamea.* On these is seen a chest or boat swimming on the water, and containing a man and woman. On the cover of the chest there sits a bird, and another bird is flying with an olive branch in its mouth. Beneath, in Greck letters, is the word NO.

* See impressions in *The People's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii., p. 274.

Similar traditions are found among the Egyptians, the Mexicans, and even in the northern mythology (Buttmann, *Mythologus*, Thl. i. Abhandlg. 6).

Section XVI.—CONTINUATION.

The Second part of Genesis, containing the family history of the patriarchs (xii.-l.), brings before us, in its chief personages, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. The name *patriarch*, that is, chief of a tribe (*πατρις* in Greek, *tribus* in Latin), in its strict application, as denoting one who has unlimited power over his people or clan, applies to only the three first, since Joseph cannot be regarded in that light.

The History of Abraham (xi. 10-xxv.) sets that patriarch before us as the perfect pattern of a pious God-devoted man, and though, according to Christian notions and the morals of our times, some spots appear in his character, e. g. the denial on two occasions, of Sarah, his wife, through fear of death (Gen. xii. 12, 13, 18, 19, xx. 2, 11, 13), and the driving away of Hagar with her son (xxi. 9-16), yet the excellence of his noble disposition and his piety, or the surrender of himself, in faith, to the will of God, which, indeed, is the fundamental feature of his character (Gen. xii. 1-4), and which awakened in him an unconditional trust in the divine promises (xv. 6, 18), and the most willing obedience to the divine commands even where it involved the severest sacrifice (xxii. 1-19),—these high qualities appear so clearly and so deeply in his history, as to make it obvious how Abraham was more worthy than other men to be favoured with a special revelation from God. While yet in Mesopotamia, his mother country, he knew the only living God, and, under His direction, quitted home in order to repair to Canaan (xii. 1), where he lived as a nomad chief among the people of the land (xii. 8, 9). There God formed with him a covenant, and promised him a numerous posterity and the possession of the country (xii. 2-7, xiii. 14-17, xv. 5, 17, 18-21, xvii. 1-8, xviii. 18), when circumcision was instituted as a sign of the covenant (xvii. 10-14). His eldest son, Ishmael, became the patriarch or prince of the Arabs (xxi. 18, 20, 21, xxv. 12-18, xxxv. 11, xxxvii. 25), and his second son, Isaac, was patriarch or prince of the Hebrews.

Of Isaac (xxvi., xxvii.), the history narrates fewer particulars, for this patriarch was less distinguished and prominent than his father; but the promise given to Abraham was renewed to Isaac (xxvi. 3-4, 24). The chief features of his character are placability and a love of peace (xxv. 14-17, 20-22, 27-31, xxvii. 33, 35, 37, 39, 40).

To Jacob (xxviii.-xxxvi.), also, was the promise confirmed (xxviii. 13-15, xxxv. 9-13); but a regard to historical truth forbids us to declare him free from faults. Selfishness and cunning sully his character. He gets from his brother Esau his rights as the first-born son, and the blessing of their common father (xxv. 29-34, xxvii. 1-29), in which over-reaching he is assisted by his mother, whose darling he is (xxv. 27, 28, xxvii. 6, seq., 42-46). His conduct towards Laban, his father-in-law, and towards Esau, his brother, on his return from Mesopotamia, displays a low regard to self, which is more clever than commendable in its resources. Esau, on the other hand, is a wild and passionate (xxv. 30-34, xxvii. 34, 36, 38, 41-45), yet nobler character, which forgets injuries, and gives free current to the claims of brotherly love (xxxiii. 4, 9, 15). From Esau the Edomites were derived (xxv. 30, xxxvi. 9).

The History of Joseph, the eleventh son of Jacob, sets before us a wise, prudent, and feeling man, who is led by God's hand through the school of misfortune to internal and external greatness. His life offers an exceeding abundance of instruction, warning, comfort, and elevation, and on that account, as well as by reason of its great interest and its simple attractive manner, is specially suited for communicating instruction to the young. But if Joseph is represented as in his youth, and in his father's house, a perfectly blameless example, due regard is not paid to the demands of historical truth. As his father's favourite, having been born of Rachel in his father's old age, he was the object of marked preference (xxxvii. 3), which was not without a bad effect on his character and history. He carried to his father what his brothers had said to his disparagement (xxxvii. 2), and a certain pride appeared in his demeanour so as to call forth Jacob's reproof (xxxvii. 5-10). Soon, however, a great wrong done to him by his brothers originated a succession of heavy trials. Then the noble qualities of his character began to more and more appear, and his treatment of his guilty brothers displays the nobility of his soul, which had God for its source, and the wonderful train of his own fate for its stimulus and discipline. His high position and influence in the court of Pharaoh led to the settlement of Jacob and his family in Egypt. Here that patriarch died, having a short time before his death predicted the fate of the twelve tribes in Canaan. The duration of the patriarchal history is 215 years.

Section XVII.—OBSERVATIONS ON EXODUS.

The name *Exodus* comes from the chief event recorded in the book. Exodus is a compound Greek word equivalent to *out-going* in English. The Hebrew name שְׁמוֹת, that is, *the names*, is taken from the second word of the first verse.

The event to which we have just referred is the departure of the children of Israel or Jacob (Gen. xxxii. 28) out of Egypt, after having been there 430 years (Gen. xii. 40—comp. xv. 13). The Epistle to the Galatians (iii. 17) has another reckoning, for it numbers 430 years from the time when the promise was made to Abraham to the giving of the law at Sinai. This statement, however, is inexact, for the point where the reckoning begins is not given with sufficient precision. We have here, in the history, an interval of 430 years. The occasion of this gap is to be looked for in the fact that the people, being in servitude, performed no acts worthy of commemoration.

The redeemer of the people chosen by God was Moses. This name was given to the rescued infant by Pharaoh's daughter (Exod. ii. 10). Hence it is rather to the Egyptian (Coptic) than the Hebrew that we are to look for its import. The meaning hence learnt is supported by the explanation given in the cited passages; for *mo* is the Egyptian for *water*, and *oushe* is the Egyptian for *rescue*, so that the whole word signifies "he who is rescued from the water:" accordingly, in the Seventy, the name is written more closely according to the Egyptian, *Moïuses* (Μωϊύσης). The Hebrew name is, on the contrary, the active participle, and denotes *the out-leader*, the rescuer, that is, the redeemer of the people, an appellation derived from Moses' having led the people out of Egyptian slavery. The Hebrew tongue, in connexion with the actual rescue, gave sufficient reason for this interpretation of the Hebrew name. The proper ground why he received the appellation is truly given in the Scripture. The father of Moses was called Amram, his mother Jochebed (vi. 20). He had a brother, named Aaron, and a sister, named Miriam (vi. 20, xv. 20). He took to wife Zipporah (ii. 21), the daughter of Reuel, otherwise called Jethro, a nomad chief or sheik, and a priest (ii. 18-21, iii. 1).

The time of the formation of the book may be learnt in the passage which occurs xv. 17, where we read these words: "Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, the place, O Jehovah, which thou hast made for thee to dwell in, the sanctuary, O Jehovah, which thy hands have established." Here is a clear reference to Solomon's temple, erected in Mount Moriah, after the building of which, in consequence, the book must be dated, whence the traditional

character of many events narrated in it may be understood, since the long interval between the events and the record gave opportunity to influences of an unhistorical nature. To such influences may be referred—

The representation made of *the twelve plagues* of Egypt (vii.-xi.); for while, without doubt, these plagues were employed by God for the punishment of the Egyptians and the emancipation of the Israelites, yet as the three first were imitated by the Egyptian magicians (vii. 11, 12, 22, viii. 7), and as several of the plagues are customary in the land of Egypt, e. g. locusts, frogs, lice, we find here an intimation as to the manner in which the actual events which God, according to his counsel and will, caused to take place exactly at that time, were afterwards set forth and narrated.

The *borrowing* of the “jewels of silver” and the “jewels of gold,” as if done by God’s express command (xi. 2, xii. 35, 36). Regarded in a Christian point of view, this artful borrowing is a theft, which a righteous God never can have commanded, whatever pains theological hair-splitting may take in order to justify it. If in any case, certainly in this we see how the representation must be distinguished from the fact, for the former is beyond a doubt the exclusive property of the writer, as he had borrowed it from tradition. The necessity and the enforcement of the seventh commandment, “Thou shalt not steal,” are made apparent by this single event.

The antecedence of God himself in a pillar of cloud and fire (xiii. 21, 22, xiv. 19, 20). Moses, as a token and guide to the people, in order to prevent their being dispersed in the wilderness, caused a burning mass to be carried before them, which by day appeared more as a pillar of smoke, by night as a pillar of fire. This fact, as represented by tradition, took the shape of the narratives found in the book of Exodus, the more readily because, to the ancient Hebrew, God was seen in every special event, and it was by God’s guidance that the Israelites were led through the wilderness; what is traditional in the account is simply the making of God himself appear in the form of a fire-cloud.

The narrative of *the passage of the Red Sea* (xiv. 21-30). The fact that the passage was effected is beyond all question. God’s hand conducts the Israelites through the sea, and delivers them from the Egyptians, who perish in the waters. But certain features in the story display their traditional character. That a strong wind had to do with the retreating of the water, the narrative itself declares (21). Now it is a fact, that in April the south or south-east wind often drives back for a mile the sea, which then suddenly returns. Hence arises a very

great ebb and flood (comp. Diodor. iii. 15, 39; Herod. ii. 11; Niebuhr, p. 412). Moses, from his long abode in the desert, was well acquainted with this natural phenomena, and could readily avail himself of the aid sent to him by God. But we can scarcely take literally the statement that the sea stood up on both sides as a wall. Here again we trace the influence of tradition (22, 29).

In commemoration of the deliverance from Egypt, the festival of *the passover* was instituted (xii. 42), more especially in order to preserve the memory of the sparing of the first-born of the Israelites, when the first-born of the Egyptians were destroyed (xii. 12-14, 21-27). Hence the name of *Passah*, that is, "passing-over," "sparing" (13, 23, 27). On the same ground were all the first-born of human beings and of beasts devoted to Jehovah (xiii. 2). Becoming thus the property of the sanctuary, they had to be redeemed by an oblation (xiii. 12-15; Deut. xv. 19-23).

The second part of the book of Exodus contains the earliest events in the desert (xv.-xl.—see Section xiii.).

Here also the narratives present traditional elements. In the events connected with *the manna* (xvi.—comp. Numb. xi.), this is specially clear. The manna, it is related, was rained from heaven during the night (xvi. 4). It is a proved fact, that an insect, the *Cimex mannifer*, occasions by its bite in the leaves of a tree a kind of gum, which hardens in the air, and in the morning falls down in small grains. When the sun is up, the mass melts in the sand, and is unusable. This last fact is reported by the scriptural narrative (xvi. 21). Manna is still gathered in the same way as is described in the Bible. These facts show us the basis on which what we there read is founded. The Saviour himself declared, "Moses gave you not that bread from heaven" (John vi. 32). We can scarcely, therefore, think of taking the statement verbally. Similar remarks may be made of *the quails* (xvi. 13; Numb. xi. 31); a wind, it is stated, brought them from the sea. We here find an intimation of the transition from the historical to the traditional state of the event. Having a long way to fly over the sea, the birds, driven by the wind, became so exhausted, that they fell in great numbers, so as to cover the ground, and be easily taken and put to death. While, however, the narrated facts thus receive their natural explanation, nevertheless, the providing care of God remains clearly visible. Nay, we have here an example of the manner in which tradition may give a colouring to an event, while the event itself is not only not invalidated, but receives confirmation in regard to its historical truth, from a more exact acquaintance with natural history.

The giving of the law proceeds, according to Exod. xix. 1-3, 20,

xx. 1, seq., on Mount Sinai; according to Deut. v. 2, xxix. 1, on Mount Horeb. The most likely explanation of this diversity is this, that by Horeb the mountain, by Sinai the particular summit, is intended. This view is taken by Dr. Robinson. Many reverse the spots. The event, however, was the renewal of the covenant between God and his people. Moses, in the most solemn manner, during lightning, thunder, and the sound of a trumpet, and while the whole mount smoked (xix. 16-20), receives from God himself the Ten Commandments, with other laws, which he writes in a book, and reads to the people. Afterwards, having been forty days and forty nights in the mountain (xxiv. 18, xxxiv. 28), he receives from God himself the two stone tables of the law (xxxv. 18), which are said to have been written by the finger of God himself (xxxv. 15, 16). But when these tables have been broken (xxxv. 19), Moses hewed two new stone tables on which God promises to write the commandments (xxxv. 1-4). This, however, takes place so that Moses, at God's command, writes the tables (27, 28). This incidental remark of the historian shows us how the first tables may have been written, and the artistic skill implied in the task must have greatly contributed to make the table venerable in the sight of the people, so that a divine character would be ascribed to them. Moreover, the Ten Commandments bear in their substance, evidence of their divine origin; for while at first they were and could only be addressed to a people in a low state of moral culture, yet the light cast on them by the Gospel shows that beneath the letter they have a deep divine import and spirit, which make them not only the unshaken foundation of morality, but in their true application the divine rule and test by which every Christian may guide and measure his outer and inner life.

The formation of the sanctuary (xxv., xxvi., xxxi., xxxvi., xxxvii., xl.), as narrated in the passages referred to, has occasioned suspicions in consequence of its splendour and artistic skill, on the ground that the presence in the desert, of so much gold and silver, and workmen of so great skill, is scarcely conceivable, especially since Solomon was obliged to avail himself of the skill of Phœnician artisans (1 Kings v. 6, 18, vii. 1). It is also said that the traditional character of the narrative is seen in the statement that God gave Moses the model for the work (xxv. 9, 40, xxvi. 30), as well as in the fact that a more simple description occurs (xxxiii. 7, seq.), from which it appears that the sanctuary was only a larger tent standing without the camp, and employed for the service of God. It has in consequence been assumed that the entire description in its details was borrowed from the splendid Davidical sanctuary, as set forth in 2 Sam. vi. 17. It may indeed be admitted that

traditional elements are mingled in the particulars, but the fundamental features of the narrated events had their origin in actual facts, which took place in the days of Moses, since the pattern given by that legislator would not, in later times, be replaced by another. Such a substitution would be presented by reverence for the Mosaic commands and institutions. A few improvements or adornings may have had their origin in later times, for here David's regal splendour and piety would not unnaturally find room for display. And these would the more readily be referred to Moses, since from Moses the chief directions regarding the sanctuary undoubtedly emanated.*

Section XVIII.—REMARKS ON LEVITICUS.

The book bears the name of *Leviticus* because it contains the laws relating to the priests and the service of God; in other words, the ritual. The Hebrew name **וי קרא**, and *he called*, is taken from the first words of the book.

Leviticus is to be regarded as a continuation of the law-giving at Mount Sinai; for the laws which it contains were given there (xxvi. 46, xxvii. 34), and in the course of eleven months, in the second and third years after the departure from Egypt. There prevails a certain order in which the laws are reported, though it is not strictly followed out. This will appear from the following summary. First come laws respecting diverse kinds of offerings, namely, burnt, meat, thank, sin, and trespass offerings (i.-vii.), which are followed by requirements for the priests (x. 8-15). Then we have directions respecting clean and unclean animals (xi.), to which are annexed the laws on the contracting of uncleanness generally (xii.-xv.), including those touching leprosy (xiii., xiv.). Then ensue laws of a mixed nature, namely, respecting the great day of atonement (xvi.), the prohibition to eat blood (xvii.), marriage and chastity (xviii.), sundry points of morality (xix.), capital crimes (xx.), priests, animals for sacrifice, and festivals (xxi.-xxiii.). Next we read directions in respect to the sacred lamps, the shew-bread, the law of blasphemy and other sins; and, lastly, to the sabbath and the year of jubilee (xxv.). The last chapter but one contains blessings on those who observed the laws, and curses on those who transgressed them (xxvi.). This originally formed the last chapter of the whole book (46).

* On several points put forward in this Section, illustrative remarks or answers may be found in *The People's Dictionary of the Bible*.

At a later period was added the concluding chapter touching vows (xxvii.). There is interposed something of an historical nature, which, however, refers to the priesthood (viii.-x.). This portion speaks of the consecration of Aaron and his sons, and the transgression and punishment of two of them for offering strange fire (x. 2).

Of special interest for us are the laws which treat of the *leprosy*, from which we obtain a view of this dangerous malady, which was peculiar to the Jews. The leprosy thus begins: there appear on the skin white and somewhat reddish spots (xiii. 2, 19, 24, 42), deeper than the skin (3, 20, 25, 30, 32). The hair at this spot becomes white (3, 20, 26) or yellow (30-32), and there arise quick raw flesh and sores (2, 10, 14, 43). The whole body is then covered with a white chalk-like scab (13, 30, 36—comp. Exod. iv. 6; Numb. xii. 10). If this breaks out suddenly, and the virus comes forcibly into sight, healing is possible (xiii. 30-35). The malady is very contagious; wherefore the most rigorous isolation is ordered (45, 46). The malady seizes the inner parts, and gradually destroys the organisation of the body. This of which we have spoken is the white leprosy, from which is distinguished the far more dangerous black leprosy, *the elephantiasis*. The black leprosy causes the hands and feet to swell, whence it has its name of “the elephant’s disorder.” The entire body is covered with a dark grey colour and with sore boils, from the painful and deadly effects of which relief is sought by scraping. This kind is accounted incurable, and is considered as a punishment of heinous sins (Job ii. 7, 8, 12).

It may be noticed that the white leprosy also seizes articles of furniture. On wool, linen, cloth, and leather, appear green and red spots, which look to be below the surface (xiii. 47). If within seven days the malady has spread around, all the affected part must be destroyed and then replaced (xiv. 39-42). If, nevertheless, the leprosy makes a second appearance, the whole house must be pulled down, and the rubbish must be carried out of the city. Persons who have been cured of the leprosy have not only to show themselves to the priests for investigation (2, 3), but also to make the prescribed offerings. The declaration that a person was clean, took place with much circumspection; for, after having showed himself to the priest, and been pronounced healed, he had to offer an oblation with accompanying ceremonies, remaining out of the camp seven days; at the end of which, having bathed and washed his clothes, he might return to his abode. On the eighth day he made a second offering (xiv.).

Section XIX.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE BOOK OF NUMBERS.

This name is derived from the numbering (*numeri*) of the people found at the beginning. The Hebrew name is **במדבר**, *in the wilderness*, a word which occurs in the first verse, and is not unsuitable to the contents. If we put together the numbers of the several tribes and families, the number of fighting men above twenty years of age is 600,000.

In the first part (i.-x. 10), besides the numbering of the people, there are additions to the laws given in Exodus and Leviticus. Of this class are the determinations respecting the duties of the Levites (ii. 48-54, iii. 5-10), and that they, instead of the first-born (Section xvii.), should belong to Jehovah, and should serve in the sanctuary (iii. 3-51); also directions for putting the unclean out of the camp, for restitution, for the detection and punishment of an adulteress (v.); ordinances regarding Nazarites, and the pronouncing of the divine blessing on the people (vi.). Then follow historical notices, namely, the offerings of the princes for the sanctuary (vii.), and laws as to the consecration of the Levites (viii.), the passover (ix.), and the sacred trumpets (x.).

From this review it appears that the two previous books (Exodus and Genesis) were already completed when these additions were made, which were appended in continuation of the preceding books, and belong specially to the levitical and sacerdotal code. A definitive plan in these appendages is not visible, which is also wanting in what ensues.

The second part, which narrates the further events in the wilderness (x. 11-xxi.), begins with the departure of the people from Sinai, and covers a period of thirty-seven years, that is, from the second year of the Exodus (x., xi.) to the last but one of the whole wandering. Most of the events here set forth fall however in either the first or the last year of this period, respecting the greater portion of which little or nothing is reported; and it appears that either nothing remarkable occurred, or that the record has not been preserved. In the historical narrative of events, laws are interposed in xv., xviii., and xix., which for the most part relate to offerings, priests, and purification, are more of a jurisprudential nature, and stand closely connected with the sequences of time and event.

Why Moses passed forty years in the wilderness, and spent so much time on the way from Egypt to Palestine, which at the most is distant only fourteen days, is clearly stated in the book. This delay was a punishment for the people's unbelief (xiv. 21, 22, 33, 34), which led Moses to the conviction that they were unequal to make the conquest of the country, and through their idolatry and disobedience were also unworthy

of being led thither sooner. First must the entire generation pass away (xiv. 22, 29, 32, 35), and only their children behold the promised land (31). While in the desert, however, Moses had to contend with dearth (xi., xxi. 5), enemies (x. 35, xiv. 42-45, xx. 20, 21, xxi. 1-3, 23, seq., 33, seq.), and with insurrectionary movements on the part of the people and of his own family (xii., xiv.); also of the Korahites, a family of Levites (xvi.): only, by the extraordinary aid given him by God, as well as his own wise moderation and humility (xii. 3), did Moses succeed in preventing a return to Egypt (xiv. 3, 4), and complete disorganisation and failure.

Striking is the repetition of the events connected with the manna and the quails (xi.—comp. Exod. xvi.: see Section xvii.). Whether in reality the same facts here lie at the bottom, and we have only to assume a second narrative, since the account in Numbers may be a corrupt version of the account in Exodus, or there were two similar events which took place with diverse accessories, it is not easy to determine, if the mind is kept free from pre-judgments. In the case of water from the rock also (xx. 2-13—comp. Exod. xvii. 1-7), the same event appears to be twice narrated. The name of the place, Massah and Meribah, that is, *temptation* and *strife*, as it is given in Exod. xvii. 7, and the express statement in Numbers xx. 13, "This is the water of Meribah, because the children of Israel *strove* with Jehovah," as well as the names of the places in both books, the Wilderness of Sin and the Wilderness of Zin (Exod. xvii. 1; Numb. xx. 1), speak for this view of the matter.

The Wilderness of Sin is a part of the Arabian desert in the vicinity of Sinai: here happened the first event. The Wilderness of Zin, however, lies on the south of Palestine, near Idumea: here the second event is placed. Easily might the similarity of the names of the two deserts have been the occasion why what was narrated of the first place should be repeated of the second.

The sending out of the twelve spies, one from each tribe (xiii.), took place when the Israelites had drawn near the borders of Palestine, probably at Kadesh, on the south-east of the promised land (xvi.). The event falls in the last year of the period before given. Only two spies, Caleb, of the tribe of Judah (xiii. 7), and Joshua, of the tribe of Ephraim (xiii. 9, 17), bring back encouraging intelligence, while the rest, from the description of the Canaanites, alarm the Hebrews, and make them again think of returning to Egypt (xiii. 32-xiv. 4). The death of the ten and the preservation of the two cause in the people's minds a determination to follow Moses to the promised land (xiv. 40). Caleb and Joshua are the only persons of all the congregation who, at a later period, really reach Palestine (xiv. 24, 30—comp. Sirach, xlvi. 11, 12).

The former, in reward of his services, obtained possession of Hebron (Josh. xiv. 13); the latter succeeds Moses in the supreme command, conquers the land, and receives the city Timnath-serah in Mount Ephraim (Josh. xix. 49, 50).

As specially important events in this part may be mentioned, 1. The flowering rod of Aaron (xvii.), by which Aaron was declared to be elected to the priesthood; 2. The plague from the fiery serpents (xxi. 4-9), whose bite was deadly, and against which Moses set up the serpent of brass; and 3. The first encounter of the Israelites with the tribes bordering on Palestine. In the south they were refused a passage by the Edomites (xx. 14-21), and were defeated by a king named Arad (xxi. 1-3). They, therefore, made a circuit, and approached Palestine on its east side, where they overcame Sihon, king of the Amorites, and take possession of the land between the two rivers, the Arnon and the Jabbok. Then, proceeding northward, they conquered Og, king of Bashan, whose land also they made their own (xxi. 33-35).

The third part states the events during the sojourn in the Jordan in the plains of Moab (xxii.-xxxvi.).

First comes the prophetic blessing of Balaam (xxii.-xxiv.), whom Balak, the Moabite, king of Syria, sends for from the Euphrates (xxii. 5, xxiii. 7), in order that he might curse the Israelites, whom, however, he thrice blessed, being thereunto constrained by the Spirit of God. That here traditional elements are found, the impartial will scarcely deny. The speaking ass is to be compared with the speaking serpent in Paradise; the anger of God against Balaam when he did that which God commanded him to do (xxii. 20-22) cannot be harmonised with a Christian* conception of God. The attempt to withstand Balaam by an angel (xxii. 22, 32) after he had been bidden by God to go (xxii. 20) cannot be thought of. The reference to the times of David, namely, to the conquests gained by that prince over Moab and Edom (xxiv. 17-20—comp. 2 Sam. viii. 2-14), also the victory of the Assyrians in the time of Isaiah (xxiv. 21-24; Isa. vii. 17; 2 Kings xv. 29, xvii. 3, 6: Section xviii.), point clearly to the later formation of the whole narrative, so that in the course of the centuries which passed away before the statements here given were written, it was easy for tradition to make additions to the facts which form the basis of this account.† It re-

* The *Christian* view of God must not be made a retro-active test and standard, for revelation is a gradual process, and no age is at liberty to make its conceptions absolute. If, however, an alleged event is opposed to the simplest view of right and wrong, no age ought to ascribe such an act to God.

† The remark proceeds on the assumption that the foretelling of events is not

mains, however, an undoubted fact, that during the sojourn in the plains of Moab the coming greatness and power of the Israelites by the counsel and will of God were predicted by a very ancient heathen prophet; and the antecedent intention of the prophet to pronounce a curse on the nation, needs in no way to be regarded as unhistorical. The narrative itself shows how the sight of the encamped armies of Israel seized so powerfully on Balaam that he could not do otherwise than speak of their future dominion (xxii. 41, xxiii. 9, 10, 13, xxiv. 2). At a later period, Balaam met with his death in a slaughter of the Midianites, to whom he had gone (xxx. 8—comp. xxiv. 25).

After another numbering of the people (xxv. 19-26, 65), and the naming of Joshua as the successor of Moses (xxvii. 12-22), there follow certain laws (xxviii.-xxx.) which are clearly introduced into the historical narrative without a definite plan, and without immediate reference to the history. After a victory over the Midianites, by whom Israel had been led to idolatry and licentiousness (xxv. 1-18), comes the division of the land on the east of the Jordan, among Reuben, Gad, and half the tribe of Manasseh, who, however, are laid under an obligation to pass over the river and aid their brethren in the conquest of the remaining country (xxxii.); at last ensues a list of all the stations where the Israelites encamped, from the time of their quitting Egypt (xxxiii. 1-49), as given by Moses himself (xxxiii. 2), also several laws and requirements (xxxiii. 50-xxxvi.) which have a connexion with the now approaching conquest of the land. Among these we may note injunctions respecting the levitical cities and cities of refuge (xxxv.). Six cities of refuge, three on the east, three on the west, of the Jordan, are appointed, whither such as inadvertently were man-slayers might fly. These six cities are, however, to belong to the Levites, so that, besides them, forty-two cities (xxxv. 6), or, in all, forty-eight (xxxv. 7), are assigned to the Levites in the land in part already, in part yet to be, conquered. There is a difference in the ordinances on this point, as found in Numbers and as found in Deuteronomy (xix. 2, seq.). According to the former, the cities are to be chosen after the entry into the land (Numb. xxxv. 10-14), all six at once. According to Deuteronomy, three cities are determined first, and, at a later time, three others were to be appointed, if God should enlarge the country (Deut. xix. 2, 3, 8, 9). According to the book of Joshua, six cities were at the same time chosen and set apart (Josh. xx. 1-2, 7-9). According to Deuteronomy, however, Moses himself severed the three

to be taken as a ground of scriptural exposition—an assumption indispensable to much rationalistic criticism; but for which an “impartial” student requires valid reasons.

cities on the east of the Jordan (Deut. iv. 41-43). These were the six cities, namely, on the east, Bezer in Reuben, Ramoth in Gilead, and Golan in Bashan; on the west, Kedesh in Galilee (in Naphtali), Shechem in Ephraim, and Kirjath-arba (Hebron) in Judah (Josh. xx. 7-9). In the diverse statements respecting these cities there is found a not inconsiderable evidence that Deuteronomy, which varies so essentially, had another composer, and was written at a later time (Section xx.), whilst Numbers points for its date to the age of David and Isaiah (Section iii.).

Section XX.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY.

The name *Deuteronomy*, a compound Greek term signifying *second law*, has reference to the contents of the entire book, in which the law is not merely repeated, but explained, expanded, and enlarged. The Hebrew name is **דְּבָרִים**, that is, *the words* or *addresses*, taken from the second word of the first verse. Allusion here also is made to the substance of the work. The style throughout is changed. The manner of representation is somewhat rhetorical, verbose, and not unlike the prophetic. The tone is no longer that of a narrator or a lawgiver, but of a moral preacher who expatiates in long exhortations (comp. xxxii.). Moreover, the style has some peculiar turns which appear not in the other books, but in the Prophets, especially Jeremiah. The formula for capital punishment, "that soul shall be cut off from his people" (Gen. xvii. 14; Exod. xii. 15, 19, xxx. 33, 38, xxxi. 14; Levit. vii. 20, 21, 25, xviii. 29, xx. 17, 18; Numb. ix. 13, xix. 20), here always runs, "so thou shalt put away the evil from among you" (Deut. xvii. 7, xxi. 21, xxii. 21, &c.). The blessing of Moses (xxxiii.) appears to have been strictly formed according to the blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix.). The blessings and the curses, as pronounced in Deuteronomy (xxviii.), on the observers and the transgressors of the law, depart from the same as given in Numbers (xxvi.) so strikingly, both in form and manner, that one cannot recognise the same author in both; the giving of the law on Sinai is in this book placed on Horeb (Deut. i. 6, ii. 2, xxix. i.—comp. Exod. xix. 1-3, 20, xx. 1, seq.: see Section xvii.). The ordinances regarding the cities of refuge vary considerably from those given in Numbers (see Section xix.). Finally, there are allusions to historical events which reach down to the Exile; for in xxxiii. 7, the tribe of Judah is conceived of as in captivity, and prayer is made for its return; and the tribe of Simeon is altogether wanting, having perished or been lost

in the tribe of Judah. From these facts we must infer that the author did not write the foregoing books; for though it has been alleged that the aim of Deuteronomy and the younger generation, to whom Moses spake these words, required a different kind of speech, yet the character of the style could never have been thus changed so as to be so different. One feels too sensibly the breathing of another spirit, to be able to deny the truth that another person is here speaking. We may also learn that the time of the formation of this book is much later than that of the foregoing. The concluding verse of Numbers shows clearly that the Mosaic legislation was considered as brought to a termination. Long afterwards an appendix was thought of, that should contain the additions and modifications which time had made necessary in the old law. The last period of Moses' life, however, seems the most suitable as that in which all these later ordinances were given, for, certainly, Moses really modified and enlarged many laws at a later time. They also referred later laws, which were accounted Mosaic, to the last days of Moses, or the time when he stood with the people in the plains of Moab, near the Jordan; for here is the place where the giving of the second law took place (i. 5).

There are *four divisions* in the book. *In the first* (i.-iv. 40), Moses delivers a long speech to the people, in which, for their warning and admonition, he sets before them the events which had taken place from Horeb to the Jordan, teaching them that the goodness of God ought to keep them from idolatry, and make them obedient to the divine commands.

The second part (iv. 41-xxvi. 19) is a partly historical, partly legislative, address, in which the previous laws are repeated with modifications. Here we may remark how, according to the statement, the second tables of the law, which Moses had made after the pattern of the first, that were broken, were written, as the first, by God himself (x. 2, 4), while in Exodus it is expressly said that Moses wrote the words on the tables (Exod. xxxiv. 27-28). This discrepancy shows how the later author, following an enlarged tradition, departs from the earlier documents, even in the manner of representing facts.

In the legislative portion of the division the added laws have nearly all reference to relations which arose long after Moses. For instance, the laws relating to a king (xvii. 14-30), wherein, obviously, the ordinances bear on the abuses of the reign of Solomon; for all that is forbidden then existed, namely, Solomon's relation to Egypt (1 Kings iii. 1), the number of his horses (1 Kings x. 26, 28, 29), the number of his wives (1 Kings xi. 1-3), his perversion to idolatry thereby (1 Kings xi. 4-6), his treasures, in silver and gold (1 Kings x. 14-21, 25): other abuses of kingly rule are not mentioned. Remarkable, also, is the cir-

cumstance that, in this part, great privileges are assigned to the Levites (xviii. 1-8, xxvi. 11-13, xii. 19, xiv. 27-29).

The third division (xxvii.-xxx.) contains directions to build on Mount Ebal (in Samaria) a stone altar, to cut all the laws in stone, and set them up there, and, after a solemn sacrifice, to pronounce, on Gerizim blessings on those who kept, and, on Ebal, curses on those who broke, the commands (xxvii.), on which the blessings and curses are spoken in a prolix, rhetorical manner (xxviii.), at the end of which Moses subjoins a detailed exhortation (xxix.-xxx.). The carrying of these ordinances into effect is reported in Josh. viii. 30-35, whence it appears that they in reality were given by Moses.

The fourth portion (xxxi.-xxxiv.) narrates Moses' departure, death, and burial. At the age of 120, Moses solemnly transfers his office to Joshua (xxxi. 2, 7, 8, 23), and, after a lofty and very beautiful poem (xxxii.), and a blessing (xxxiii.), the writer, in the last chapter (xxxiv.), sets forth how Moses, from the top of Mount Nebo, surveyed the promised land, and then, having died in Moab, was buried by God himself, so that no one knew his tomb (i. 6). This alleged mode of burial gave occasion to the legend found in Philo and Josephus (*Arch.* iv. 8, 48), as well as among the Samaritans, that Moses did not die, but was carried to heaven.

Section XXI.—MOSES AND HIS LAW.

It appears to me not unimportant to indicate briefly what image is presented by the Scriptures, of Moses, the man of God, who first made the Israelites into a nation, raised them to be emphatically God's people, and appears as the chief person in the four last books of the Pentateuch. We have ascertained from the character of the books themselves, that not every legislative requirement found therein emanated immediately from Moses, and tradition, as well as modifications of the original laws introduced by experience, is to be recognised; nevertheless, the origin, the foundation, the spirit, the entire tendency of the legislation, incontestably belong to Moses, to whom also we must ascribe the historical information connected with it, and if we cannot receive, as fully historical, certain traditional elements, yet we find them more historically accredited than is the case with any other ancient history. Accordingly, Moses undoubtedly presents himself as an instrument whom God chose and endowed, that he might not only lead

and conduct Israel, but make the people that which according to the divine councils it was to become, so that specially it might be the channel of the divine revelation till the advent of Jesus, the redeemer of the world. Moses, born in Egypt of Hebrew parents, and, till a youth, brought up under his mother's care (Exod. ii. 9, 10), received, as the adopted son of the king's daughter, an education in the royal court, which far surpassed what was usual among his people (Acts vii. 22). At the same time he preserved the faith of his fathers, as well as his inner attachment to his people, now pining in dishonourable slavery. A feeling heart and a lively sense of right and wrong were early features in his character (Exod. ii. 11-14, 16, 17). His flight and his sojourn in the wilderness acquainted him with the changefulness of human fortune and the impotence of man in the hand of God, and created in his soul that true humility which, with a determined and steady will, feels its own weakness and fallibility, and by an unconditional surrender to God, from whose grace only all power comes, rises to that heroism which is capable of what is most difficult and most noble. Therefore when he received the divine call in the wilderness, and felt that he could confidently reckon on the divine aid, he with a firm tread and a fearless heart returned to Egypt (Exod. iii.-iv. 18). He was not dispirited by the impediments put in his way by the hesitations of the idolatrous Pharaoh (Exod. vi. 3, seq.). With God's aid he reached his object, and, under God's repeated assistance, he rose to that confidence in (Exod. xiv. 12, 14), and that constant communion with, the Creator (Numb. xii. 8 ; Deut. xxxiv. 10), that made him fit to be the herald of the divine will, and to found a theocratical government, which for forty years he maintained in weal and woe, amidst oppositions of all kinds, in conflict with nature and men, under murmurings and insurrections ; and transmitted to future generations as the divine institution under which the Son of God was born and the salvation of the whole world was accomplished. The virtues of patience and gentleness (Numb. xii. 3), of decided firmness of will (Numb. xiv. 41, 42, 44), and of sacred earnestness (Numb. xvi.), united with wise circumspection, a deep insight into actual and coming relations, a humane disposition (Exod. ii. 17, xxxii. 32) towards strangers (Exod. xii. 49 ; Levit. xxiv. 22), towards enemies (Levit. xix. 17, 18), towards slaves (Deut. xv. 12-18), towards the poor (Deut. xv. 7, 8, 11, xiv. 29), and extensive knowledge and culture also, and, before all, the deepest religiousness (Numb. xii. 13 ; Deut. xxxii., xxxiv. 10),—distinguish him, not only before all his contemporaries, but before all ancient lawgivers, so decidedly, that we feel strongly how much he must have been a man after God's own heart (Numb. xii. 7 ; Deut. xxxiv. 10). That he was

not altogether exempt from human infirmities, and that once at least even his faith wavered, is stated in the record itself (Numb. xx. 12). Nevertheless, he remains one of the greatest and most elevated characters of all ages. Of the wisdom which he had acquired in Egypt (Acts vii. 22), he made the freest and most suitable employment; for while he ordained and enjoined what was contrary to the morals and usages prevalent in Egypt, and, therefore, known to his people, since he aimed at a higher wisdom and sought the fulfilment of the divine will, yet he adopted hence that which was correspondent to the purpose that he had to execute. Thus the setting apart of a class of priests and Levites calls to mind the Egyptian sacerdotal caste; and in the vestments of the priests, especially the oracular breast-plate of the high-priest, we see a resemblance to sacerdotal ornaments worn by the Egyptian priests. The symbolical form of the cherub, composed of parts of man, the eagle, the lion, and the ox, directs our thoughts to the symbols presented in various animal combinations among the Egyptians. In the same way the ark, the sacred lights, the shew-bread, are, with modifications of form and application, taken from similar Egyptian institutions. Nor is it without significance that a rib is the Egyptian hieroglyph for a woman (Gen. ii. 21, 22).

The entire Mosaic legislation is divided into three chief portions, which are intimately blended, not to say confounded, together. These are,—1. The moral code; 2. The ritual code; 3. The civil code.

The Ten Commandments are the basis of the moral code. These commandments are the same law that God has written on every man's heart (Rom. ii. 14, 15), which however, through sin, was partly distorted, partly effaced, and which, by the divine will and aid, Moses restored to his people, and through them to the whole world, as the first and the most needful of all things. The other moral ordinances are connected with the Ten Commandments as explanations, developments, and more exact determinations, and are found scattered or in single groups in all the books except Genesis. The fundamental principle is the most entire and sacred love of God as the great all in all (Deut. vi. 5).

The second, that is the ritual or ceremonial law, prescribes the service of God, and all that is nearly or remotely connected therewith. It accordingly contains exact ordinances respecting the place (the tabernacle), the sacred utensils (the ark, the lamps, the altar of incense, the table of shew-bread, the altar of burnt-offerings, the cups, &c.), the sacred persons (priests, Levites, their rights, their cities, their bodily condition, services, &c.), the sacred acts (offerings and purifications), and the sacred times (especially the sabbath, the year of jubilee, and the three

great festivals, the passover, pentecost, feast of tabernacles, besides the great day of atonement). Most of these ordinances are based on considerations of time and place, and have not in consequence a character of general validity. Their only claim to permanence lies in their being an antetype in relation to Christianity and its sacred usages and doctrines. Consequently, under the Gospel they were, in the apostolical age, removed or transformed according to the spirit of the new religion, and so continued in a changed form and with a deeper meaning.

The third, or civil law, contains ordinances regarding domestic life (marriage and divorce), and public life (landed and personal property, debt, strangers, the Canaanites). For the time and the relations for which it was given, this civil law shows an extraordinary mildness, with the exception of the laws requiring the destruction of the Canaanites (Deut. v.). The maintenance of the true worship of God appears to demand the rigour and severity we find here. The injunctions which pertain also to this subject, having for the most part regard to temporary and local circumstances, and the peculiar moral condition of the Hebrew people, have no permanent obligation, and on the introduction of Christianity were mostly altered and abandoned, or retained only as a rule in particular cases, such as the degrees of affinity within which marriage is permitted.

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

Section XXII.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE BOOK.

The hero of the book, from whom it takes its name, is the same Joshua who, with Caleb and others, were sent by Moses to survey the land (Numb. xiii. 9, 17), and who was solemnly declared his successor (Deut. xxxi. 7, 23). He was the son of Nun, and of the tribe of Ephraim.

The book has *three parts*. *The first* (i.-xii.) narrates the conquest of the land; first in the south, then in the north. It begins with the overthrow of Jericho; war of extermination; thirty-one kingdoms overcome. *The second part* (xiii.-xxi.) describes the division of the land, even of that which was not yet conquered, as Tyre and Sidon (xix. 28, 29), including the apportionment of six cities of refuge (xx.) and forty-

eight levitical cities (xxi.). The division takes place near the tabernacle at Shilo (xviii. 1). *The third part* (xxii.-xxiv.) contains Joshua's departure and death, comprising two farewell speeches (xxiii., xxiv.).

It is generally acknowledged that the book did not originate with Joshua, nor in his age. This is proved by the phrase, "and they are there unto this day" (iv. 9, vi. 25). Here also tradition has produced its natural effect. This appears from the character of the narrative, which is closely related, even in style, to the book of Deuteronomy. The same conclusion arises from features of a specially striking and wonderful description. There are three events of the kind in which it is difficult not to recognise a traditional character. First, the passage of the Jordan, which divides before the ark, so that the people pass the river on dry ground (iii. 14-17). The painting of the whole scene betrays the influence of tradition, and calls to mind the passage of the Red Sea (Exod. xiv.). Secondly, the conquest of Jericho, whose walls suddenly fall at the sound of rams' horns, after having been gone round thirteen times in seven days (vi. 20). Thirdly, the standing still of the sun and moon on Gibeon at the command of Joshua, so that he might more effectually destroy his enemies (x. 12-15). The literal acceptance of this statement can only do injury to the Bible. The spirit of the book is manifested in a preference shown to the priests and Levites, as in the books of Chronicles; also by a more moralising tone. That a later spirit of tradition had influence in the composition of the book, may be inferred from the facts, that while here the Canaanites are totally destroyed, in the book of Judges they dwell with and among the Israelites, and that Jericho, in the latter work, still stands, and is called "the city of palm-trees" (i. 16, iii. 13). As a written source of information, mention is made of "the book of Jasher" (x. 13). Recent investigations have endeavoured to point out in Joshua also, portions of the two original documents of the Pentateuch, the Elohist and the Jehovahistic.*

The character of the book thus indicated leads us to place its formation in a much later period. Opinions vary. Some ascribe it to the days of Solomon; others bring it down after the Exile. The time of the Exile itself is the most probable, since we can thus explain its strongly Chaldaic diction, and the description of Western Palestine as "this (that) side of the Jordan," for the phrase clearly points to a writer who lived on the east of the Jordan, as also in the book of Kings and in Ezra (1 Kings iv. 24; Ezra iv. 10, 16).

* De Wette, *Einführung*, § 168; and Stähelin, in *Studien und Krit.*, 1835. 472; 1838. 270.

Note.—Without pretending to furnish a reply to each of the arguments for the late origin of the book of Joshua, which, indeed, are partly answered by anticipation in our previous strictures, we subjoin a remark or two, as illustrative of the weak grounds on which the objections rest. The phrase “unto this day,” proves, it is said, the late origin of the book. Two passages are referred to. In iv. 9, where mention is made of the commemorative stones set up by Joshua in the Jordan, there is nothing whatever to disprove that even Joshua was the author of the work. The other passage (vi. 25,) where of Rahab, the harlot, it is said, “She dwelleth in Israel even unto this day,” is of a nature to show that the book was written within the generation in which the recorded events took place. That a book must be of a late origin, and of a corrupt age, because it contains accounts of miracles, is an axiom with those only who deny miracles altogether, and even with some philosophers, narratives involving the miraculous would be accounted a token of great antiquity. That the whole book cannot be brought down below the Captivity, appears clear from xvi. 10, where the Canaanites are said “to dwell among the Ephraimites unto this day,” for then Ephraim was destroyed (comp. xiii. 13). But it must have been composed before Solomon, because Gezer existed in its time (xvi. 10), which was destroyed by Pharaoh in Solomon’s reign (1 Kings ix. 16.). The words Josh. ix. 27 were written before the temple was built, and proof is there found that the words, “even unto this day,” may not bring an event down below the age of David. In xiv. 14, is a passage which appears to have been penned before the death of Caleb, that is, within, or shortly after, the life of Joshua. The passage xv. 63 must have been written before the time of David, who completed the conquest of Jerusalem. These and other passages suffice to show that if the book underwent modifications by a later hand, it contains documents written at or near the time of the recorded events. A competent judge (Welte, Professor of Theology in Tübingen), after reviewing the arguments for and against the late origin of our book, thus concludes:—“The result of what precedes, is, that the book of Joshua was formed long before the severance of the kingdom, and that it contains nothing which is against its being composed soon after Joshua’s age.”

Section XXIII.—REMARKS ON THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

Much trouble has been taken, in order to show that the Israelites had a just right to conquer Palestine. The labour is uugatory. They were originally tolerated in the land as wandering shepherds, and, as appears from Abraham’s purchase of a sepulchre at Mamre, could not hence obtain a right to possess the entire country (Gen. xxiii. 3-20). The early promise that they received from God directed their eyes to Canaan, and they took possession of the land by the right of conquest, or the right of the strongest. The destruction of the natives was enjoined by political and religious considerations. The danger

of again falling into servitude, and of being contaminated by idolatry, appears, under the Judges, to have had only too much ground. Hence the rigorous, and what in these days would be cruel, proceeding of slaying with the sword, man, woman, and child, and everything that had life (vi. 21, viii. 22-29, x. 28-40). Meantime it appears, from the book of Judges, that many of the Canaanitish tribes were not exterminated, but lived among the Israelites, partly in servitude, partly in independence, some of whom soon increased to such a degree that they gained supremacy over the invaders. That, however, some Canaanitish tribes were wholly extirpated by Joshua, is proved by the following noticeable fact, namely, that in the beginning of the middle ages there were found on the north coast of Africa, near Tangiers, stone columns, with a Phœnician inscription, to the effect that Canaanites had settled there, "being expelled by the robber Joshua" (*Procop. de Bello Vandalico*, ii. 12).

The book of Joshua, especially the portion xiii.-xxi., is exceedingly important for the geography of Palestine, since it gives the division of the land among the twelve tribes, and a geographical description of the country. Only it must not be overlooked that the account has somewhat of the ideal, since the land is not merely considered in its whole extent, but parts are reckoned which the Israelites never possessed nor conquered, e. g., Tyre and Sidon (xix. 28-29). It is worthy of observation, that there is mention of a description of the country somewhat resembling a map or chart (xviii. 4, 6, 8, 9), made at the express command of Joshua by three men appointed for the purpose. The book, however, appears to contain a contradiction, for it states that Joshua subdued the whole country (xi. 16-23, xii. 7, seq.), and yet expressly declares that there was much of the land to be possessed (xiii. 1, seq.), adding that Jehovah would expel the remaining Canaanites, "and ye shall possess their land, as the Lord your God hath promised you" (xxiii. 5, seq.). This contradiction can be explained only on the supposition that either the different sources of information employed by the writer contained it, or that, at a later time, all the conquests were collectively ascribed to Joshua.

Joshua, as the hero of the book, appears to have been altogether specially fitted for the office of leader and general of the people by many prominent characteristics. When sent by Moses to spy out the land, he displayed courage and prudence (Exod. xiv. 6-9, 38), and his bravery was afterwards proved in a battle with the Amalekites (Exod. xvii. 9-13). Good reason, therefore, was there for his being chosen as successor to Moses. This reason is still more illustrated by what, according to the book bearing his name, he afterwards performed.

With full reliance on God, he united circumspection and foresight, as is shown by his sending out the two spies (ii.), and in many other incidents in the war (vi., viii., x.). His piety is disclosed in the conscientious care with which he executes the commands of God, given through Moses (v., xiii., xix., xx.), and promotes the faithful and constant worship of Jehovah (xxii. 1-6, xxiii., xxiv.); also in the lively sense of right with which he pardons Rahab (vi. 22, 25), and opposes the urgency of the people in wishing to destroy the Gibeonites (ix.). By his circumspection he here found the most suitable expedient, for as the Gibeonites had obtained safety and alliance by a trick, he made them into hewers of wood and drawers of water (ix. 26, 27). Decision and severity, however, could he employ, where he discovered unfaithfulness (vii.), and indeed the entire war, as a war of extermination, shows in him an iron soul regardless of suffering.

Among the Samaritans, besides the Pentateuch, there exists a chronicle, bearing the name of the Book of Joshua. It contains, in Arabic, written in Samaritan characters, a history of Joshua, partly corresponding with our book, partly altered for the purposes of the Samaritans. The last events which took place under Moses are added in the first chapters. Joshua is there called the first king of the Samaritans, and is said to have built the temple on Mount Gerizim. The history of the people is thence continued to the time of the Roman Emperor Alexander Severus, who died A.D. 235. As Joshua was of the tribe of Ephraim, whence sprung the Samaritans, they received the book which bears his name, while they rejected the other canonical books of the Jews, except the Pentateuch.

THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

Section XXIV.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER AND FORMATION OF THE BOOK.

The book of *Judges* contains the history of the people under the judges; 1. From Joshua to Samson (i.-xvi.), embracing thirteen judges, among whom are Deborah (iv.), Gideon (vi.), Jephthah (xi.), Samson (xiii.-xvi.). 2. An appendix, narrating two events (xvii. 21), namely, the expedition of the Danites (xvii., xviii.), and the extermination of the tribe of Benjamin (xix.-xxi.).

The entire history of the nation under the judges shows, in continual instances, how repeated apostacy from the service of the one true God brought, as its punishment, subjugation, either from the Canaanites, or some neighbouring power, and how, on the repentance of the Israelites, supported by their prayers, the grace of God sent some hero as a deliverer, until fresh idolatry brought punishment again. The instruments of the divine displeasure were chiefly these nations—the Ammonites and Moabites, on the east of the Jordan; the Amalekites and Midianites, in the south; and the Philistines in the west. To the last, Israel served the longest servitude, which endured for forty years. The name borne by the deliverers of the people, namely, Judges, has the associated idea of ruling, for, in the Oriental languages, judging and ruling are identical ideas. The rulers of Carthage bore the name of Suffetes, that is, judges or governors (Liv. xxx. 7, xxxiii. 46, xxxiv. 61).

The style and historical character of the book are essentially different from what we find in the book of Joshua. It is more to be compared with Genesis and the first book of Samuel, has in its descriptions much that is natural and patriarchal, and nothing whatever of the later levitical spirit. If, however, it is viewed in a Christian light, it presents many severities, such as may be expected in a people of little culture. Assassination, sanguinary cruelty, and the most shocking crimes, occur, and the perpetrators are not only not blamed, but sometimes represented as favoured by God (v. 24-31). Thus Adoni-bezek has his thumbs and great toes cut off (i. 6), which, however, appears as a retribution for that king's own cruelty (7). The king of the Moabites, Eglon, is assassinated by the judge Ehud (iii. 16-25); Jacl, in a shameful manner, slays the general Sisera, having decoyed him while in flight (iv. 17-22); Abimelech puts to death his seventy brothers (ix. 4, 5); Jephthah kills his own daughter (xi. 34-40); the Ephraimites are slaughtered at a ford in the Jordan, being detected by the pronunciation of the word Shibboleth (xii. 4-6); the inhabitants of Gibeah commit an atrocity on a concubine, and the tribe of Benjamin is, as a consequence, exterminated (xix., xx); the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead, who take no part in the vengeance, are all destroyed, save four hundred marriageable virgins (xxi. 8-14); even Samson, in order to avenge his father-in-law, sets the corn of the Philistines on fire (xv. 1-5), and has intercourse with an unchaste woman (xvi. 1-3). On the other hand, the following five passages of the book deserve special mention:—1. The song of Deborah (v.), which is full of lofty lyric force and dramatic life, and which gives to Jehovah thanksgiving for victory; and in its historical particulars not found in the narrative, and in its archaic and often rude

diction, bears evidences of its remote antiquity, and of its being composed at the time of the events which it celebrates. 2. The parable of the trees choosing a king (ix. 7-20). 3. The entire history of Samson (xiii.-xvi.), distinguished by noble simplicity, dramatic painting, attractive narratives, and important instruction in regard to time, place, and religion. 4. The expedition of the Danites (xviii.), especially interesting for picturesque description and naturalness.

The time of the formation of the book is the period of the kings. To this conclusion we are led, partly by the similarity of the style to that of Genesis, and partly by the phrase, "In those days there was no king in Israel" (xvii. 6, xviii. 1, xix. 1). Even the deportation, at least, of Israel into captivity is mentioned in the words "until the day of the captivity of the land" (xviii. 30). As, however, both these phrases occur in the appendix, we can only infer with certainty that the appendix originated in later times, while the substance of the book was written under the kings; for except in the case of the song of Deborah, it was not composed at the time of the events, as appears from the frequent form of words, "it is yet," or "unto this day" (vi. 24, x. 4, xi. 39, xv. 19).

Note.—Welte concludes a careful review of the opinions given as to the age of the book of Judges, by saying, "The time of its formation falls in the ministry of Samuel, and nothing of consequence opposes the ancient Jewish tradition that Samuel himself was its author. If not Samuel, one of Samuel's scholars may have written the work."

Section XXV.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

The chronology of the book offers special difficulties. From the death of Joshua to the death of Samson are 428 years, if the separate numbers given in the book are put together. But in the first book of Kings (vi. 1), it is expressly said that from the departure of the Israelites from Egypt to the beginning of the erection of Solomon's temple there were 480 years. Subtracting the years before and the years after the period of the judges, we have for the duration of that period only about 290 years. This contradiction may be best removed by the supposition that several of the judges, as not ruling over the whole land, were contemporaneous. The expedition of the

Danites, which is narrated at the end of the book (xvii., xviii.), ought, in regard to time, to stand at the beginning, since the occupation of their possession happened at the commencement, not the termination, of the age of the judges.

With Othniel begins a series of thirteen judges (iii.), of whom the most distinguished are, Deborah (iv., v.), Gideon (vi.-viii.), Jephthah (xi., xii.), and Samson (xiii.-xvi.). Deborah, with Barak, defeats the Canaanites under their leader Sisera, on the brook Kishon, near the borders of Galilee, for the Kishon flows by Mount Carmel into the Mediterranean Sea. Gideon, with three hundred men, routs the Midianites and pursues them beyond Jordan. He nobly refuses a crown (viii. 22, 26). Jephthah, in Peræa, at Mizpeh in Gilead, gains a victory over the Ammonites, and under a vow offers his daughter a sacrifice. As this sacrifice was contrary to the Mosaic law (Deut. xviii. 9, 10—comp. 2 Kings iii. 27; Jer. vii. 31), it has been thought that Jephthah only consecrated to Jehovah his daughter, who, in consequence, lived a life of virginity. But the statement is, that he offered her as a burnt offering (xi. 31, 39), and that the maidens of Israel every year bewailed her death (xi. 40).

We have here also an evidence of the rude state of society over which even the knowledge of God given by Moses had little influence, since we cannot deny in Jephthah the conviction that God would be pleased with a human victim. Samson, who repeatedly overcomes the Philistines, and inflicts many evils on them, is pre-eminent over others for his strength, and his tragical end, though his character is inclined to subtilty (xiv. 14, xv. 4, 5, xvi. 3), and personal vengeance (xv. 7, xvi. 28, 30), connected with fierce displays of force (xiii. 5, 6, xv. 15, xvi. 3).

The representation that Samson's strength lay in his hair, has for its origin the fact, that he, as a Nazarite, or one devoted to God, was under a vow to let his hair grow unshorn (xiii. 5). The loss of his hair was therefore the breaking of his vow. With this breach his moral strength, and, by the will of God, his physical force also, was broken and destroyed. Once, as the end of his history teaches, the power of his frame was restored (xvi. 28-30). The slaying of a lion has a parallel in the history of David, who also kills a lion and a bear (1 Sam. xvii. 34-36). And in the Crusades there were many instances of men possessing strength far surpassing the ordinary measure.

THE BOOK OF RUTH.

Section XXVI.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AND AUTHOR.

The book contains a family picture of the age of the judges, which appears to have taken its name from the chief character, Ruth. Ruth, a Moabitess, having lost her husband by death, proceeds with her mother-in-law to Bethlehem, where she lives unblameably, though in great need, and, in consequence, married by a relation named Boaz, she becomes the progenitrix of David.

The narrative, in a thoroughly simple, lovely and almost idyllic tone, shows us an attractive picture of domestic life, in which Ruth appears as the pattern of womanly virtues. She leaves her native country on the east of the Jordan (Moab), in order not to quit her aged mother-in-law, and supports herself in Bethlehem, on the narrowest means, but in the most honourable manner. Her domestic and pious disposition, and her spotless character, induce Boaz to purchase back the mortgaged property of her family, and to marry her therewith, after the nearest male relation of her deceased husband had relinquished his right to her hand. The diction altogether resembles that which we find in Genesis and in Judges, and the time of the formation of the book, in consequence, belongs to the regal period. To the same conclusion we are led by the object of the composition, since the writer aims to show how the maternal ancestress of David was a pattern of domestic excellence, so that the reproach of her being a Moabitess (Deut. xxiii. 3; Ezra ix. 2; Nehem. xiii. 1, 23-27) is removed by her piety and virtue. The lesson, that unobtrusive worth of character finds its reward, comes forth in the clearest light. That the narrative was composed long after the event, is shown by the circumstance that the manner of renouncing the rights of the Levirat required formal explanation for the reader (Ruth iv. 7), whence it follows that the age when it was customary, and by implication the age of Ruth, must long since have been past.

The passage which is found in Deuteronomy xxv. 5-10, respecting the duties of the Levirat, or next of kin, serves for the explanation of the book. According to the law in the case, when, in a family having more than one brother, a married brother died, leaving no children, the next unmarried brother was to have the option of marrying the widow, and the first-born male child took the name of the deceased. If, however, he refused to perform the office, the widow had the right

of taking his sandal from off his foot, and of spitting in his face, as a token of disgrace to one who had failed in a domestic duty, and who, in future, bore the name of *Barefoot*. If no brother was alive, the duty passed to the next male relative. To this custom refers the passage found in iv. 7-10, where the next of kin takes off his shoe before the proper tribunal, and hands it to Boaz, whereby he signifies that he resigns his right to him.

THE TWO BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

Section XXVII.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AND AUTHOR.

The first book of Samuel consists of three parts, namely,—1. The history of Eli and Samuel, the two last judges (i.-vii); 2. The history of Saul, to the time of his disagreement with Samuel (viii.-xvi.); 3. The history of David, previously to his ascending the throne (xvii.-xxxi.). In particular, we here meet with Goliath (xvii.), Jonathan (xix., xx.), Saul in the hands of David, in the cave (xxiv.), in the camp (xxvi.), the witch of Endor (xxviii.), the death of Saul and Jonathan (xxxi.).

The second book contains the history of the reign of David (i.-xxiv.), comprising his taking possession of the throne (i.-v.), the conquest of Jerusalem (v.), David's undertakings for the public worship of God (vi., vii.), the tabernacle is brought to Jerusalem (vi.), David's foreign wars (viii.-xii.), his adultery with Bathsheba (xi.), his civil wars (xiii.-xx.), Amnon's crime (xiii., xiv.), insurrection of Absalom (xv.-xviii.). The book also contains some psalms, a catalogue of valiant men, a numbering of the people, and a plague (xxi.-xxiv.).

Both books originally were one, as they are now in the Hebrew. The division into two was effected by the Septuagint. The name is taken from Samuel, not as the author, but as the first chief person that comes forward. The chief person of the whole book is David; on which account it would more appropriately be styled "The Book of David." The time which both books occupy is 152 years. The diction is very like that found in the book of Judges, but is distinguished by bold strokes, striking biographical representations and portraits of the principal characters, natural connexion of the events; in short, a purely historical tone. One feels that the time in which the events took place, and the time in which they were recorded, did not stand far distant from

each other. The historical truth of the narrative forces itself on every impartial reader. If, therefore, the composer made use of written sources of information, as may easily be proved, these sources must have been contemporaneous with the facts; and if he availed himself of oral testimony, as is likely, that testimony must have been pure and unperverted. The more full of meaning is the fact, which shines out from almost every chapter, that the Mosaic worship, according to the requirements of the Pentateuch, was at this time not yet in existence.

That two written sources lie at the basis of the whole, is clear from the diversity which is found in the double account respecting the first appearance of David and the death of Saul. According to 1 Sam. xvi. 14-23, David makes his public appearance as a player on the harp in the court of Saul, who thus becomes acquainted with him; according to 1 Sam. xvii. 55-58, he first becomes known to Saul after his conflict with Goliath. According to 1 Sam. xxxi. 4-6, Saul slays himself after losing the battle on Mount Gilboa; according to 2 Sam. i. 7-10, he is slain by another person after that event. These diversities arise, doubtless, from diversities in the original documents; for that the books, as they lie before us, were formed at a later period, is shown by the explanation given of ancient customs and proverbs (1 Sam. v. 5, ix. 9, x. 12, xxvii. 6, xxx. 25); also by the anachronism, that the head of Goliath was carried by David to Jerusalem (1 Sam. xvii. 54), for he did not conquer Jerusalem until he himself was king (2 Sam. v. 6-9). However, the tone of the narrative is quite free from that levitical spirit which is prominent in the Pentateuch and Joshua. Consequently, the age of the composition must be earlier than that of those works. It may be placed under the kings, not long after the reign of Solomon.

Section XXVIII.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

The three most important characters in the books are Samuel, Saul, and David. Without doubt we possess an entirely faithful picture of them.

Samuel ("obtained of God"—1 Sam. i. 20), or, according to the analogy of the formation of other proper names, "name of God," is, after Moses, the most distinguished and most influential man of his nation; whence the two appear together as the most eminent and pious among the people (Jer. xv. 1). From childhood was Samuel, like Samson, con-

separated to God, that is, he was a Nazarite (1 Sam. i. 22, 28), and waited on the high-priest Eli, under whom he was a servant in the sanctuary. Receiving a call from God (iii. 4, vi. 10), he at a later period, as a prophet of Jehovah (iii. 20), being honoured by the trust of the whole people, was the soul of all undertakings in both spiritual and secular things. Not as high-priest, but as prophet and judge, he stood at the head of the nation, and breathed a new life into the dead or rapidly dying form of the Mosaic law. His chief institution was the school of the prophets (1 Sam. xix. 20). Presided over by Samuel, this institution exerted great and lasting influence on the Israelites. For it was the prophets who, from this time, maintained the spirit of true piety, the faithful worship of Jehovah, the moral force of the law, and the feeling of nationality. By the prophets, also, God conducted the people, and revealed himself to them. Under Eli, the office of judge had suffered a change, for Eli did not command the people in war, but governed them as high-priest. Samuel held not that sacred office, but as a prophet called of God and acknowledged by the nation, he ruled them by his personal influence, without any outward form. With what justice he discharged the duties of his office, appears from the good conscience with which he appears before the people and lays down his office (1 Sam. xii. 3). He remains, however, the influential, powerful prophet, working on the people by his doctrine and example (xii. 23), and by no means, as his conduct under Saul's government shows, indifferent to the fate of the people and the behaviour of their king. His death accordingly threw the whole nation into the deepest mourning (xxv. 1). He may have had the intention of making his sons judges after his death; at least, he appointed them to offices of the kind (viii. 1, 2). But the corruption and urgency of the people, who, wearied of changes and anarchy, wished for a king, induced him, though unwillingly, to yield. Having warned the people in vain (viii. 11, 19), he chose Saul for their monarch.

Saul, that is, "the asked for," was of humble birth, the son of Kish, and of the tribe of Benjamin. His size and beauty, though they made him distinguished, did not suffice, after his nomination to the kingly office, to cause him to be universally received at a national meeting held at Mizpeh (1 Sam. x. 17-24); all impediments, however, were removed by the bravery he displayed in a victory over the Ammonites (xi. 12-15). Very diverse judgments have been formed of the relations he afterwards bore to Samuel. Some consider him to have been an object of Samuel's jealousy and revenge, because he would not be a willing tool in the prophet's hands. But such a view is opposed to all historical truth, and inflicts the most crying injustice on the truly noble character of

Samuel. On the contrary, an unprejudiced consideration of Saul's history finds in him the image of a mean and cruel despot, so that Samuel did well in judging him unworthy of being the founder of a dynasty. As grounds for the division which took place between Samuel and Saul, the history supplies the two following facts: Saul offered a sacrifice contrary to the express prohibition of Samuel (xiii. 8-14). The pressure of circumstances would appear to have excused Saul, for he waited till the end of the prescribed seven days. But from this intrusion into sacerdotal functions, Samuel inferred that Saul would make his own will superior to the will of Jehovah. Another error committed by Saul lay in sparing the Amalekites, after having been directed to destroy them (1 Sam. xv. 1-9). Humanity may have kept him from the bloody task, for he was not insensible to noble feeling, as appears from his conduct towards those who were hostile to his election, and whom he would not put to death when the people demanded their execution (xi. 12, 13). We see the same good feeling called forth by the high-mindedness of David, when that hero twice spared the life of the king when in his power (xxiv. 17-23, xxvi. 21-25). But the history shows how transient such emotions were with him, and how he followed only his despotic caprice against the innocent and noble David, and aimed to take away his life. From the two facts just narrated, it is obvious that self stood with him higher than the command of Jehovah. But that piety in general had no deep root in his heart, is shown by the superstition which shortly before his death led him to the witch of Endor (xxviii. 6-8), on which occasion the appearance and the words of Samuel made such an impression on him as to lead to the conclusion that, besides cowardice, Saul felt an internal reproach for his conduct towards Samuel. The gloom of Saul (xvi. 14, seq.) finds a sufficient explanation in the unhappy state of things between him and Samuel, and in the conviction that the crown sat insecurely on his head; for Samuel had made to him very distinct statements on the point (xiii. 13, 14, xv. 23, 26, 28, 35), and information of David's anointing may have secretly reached his ear. The power of music over such a state of mind was not unknown in ancient times, and this was the first occasion which brought David to Saul.

David ("beloved"), of the tribe of Judah, the youngest son of a shepherd named Jesse, of Bethlehem, was pre-eminent for personal beauty (1 Sam. xvi. 12), courage, for he early destroyed a lion and a bear (xvii. 34-36), mental ability, as displays of which witness his performances on the lyre, and in poetry (xvi. 18-23). His bravery and daring are conspicuous in the victory he gained over Goliath. He appeared at court as a luteist (xvi. 19-22), became the armour-bearer of

Saul, whose jealousy he excited by the favour that he gained by martial exploits (xviii. 5-9). From the persecutions which he had in consequence to undergo on the part of Saul, he was rescued, partly by his wife Michal, that monarch's daughter (xix. 11-17), partly by the noble friendship of Jonathan (xix. 1-7, xx.), partly again by his own circumspection and presence of mind: for Saul took measures against his life, not only by his own hand, but also by exposing him to the greatest perils in battle (xviii. 17, 25). Flying from Saul, David wandered in the mountains of Judah, southward of Jerusalem, with 600 partisans (xxvii. 2), twice spared the life of Saul, and at last dwelt at Ziklag, among the Philistines, whence he made incursions on the tribes in the south (xxvii. 6-12). After Saul's death, he was first recognised as King at Hebron, by the two tribes Judah and Benjamin; nor was it till the end of seven years and a half, on the death of Ishbosheth, Saul's son, whom the remaining ten tribes had chosen as king, that David became monarch of all Palestine (2 Sam. v. 1-5). He took Jerusalem from the Jebusites (v. 6-10), and extended his conquests on every side (2 Sam. viii.). He carried his sceptre to the Euphrates (viii. 3-6), and from the Edomites he took the whole country, together with the important harbour of Elath on the Red Sea (viii. 14—comp. 1 Kings xi. 15, 16; 2 Kings xiv. 22). He was, however, unhappy in his own family. Amnon, for his crime with Tamar, was punished with death by her brother Absalom. On which account Absalom, banished by his father, and on returning, after an absence of two years, driven from his father's presence, became embittered in his feelings towards David, against whom he strove to raise the people by all the arts of popularity. The rebellion of the son compelled the father to flee from Jerusalem, and though Joab avenged the wrong by victory, yet had David to lament the death of his son (2 Sam. xiii., xviii.). Shortly before his death, David was troubled with a second insurrection, undertaken by his son Adonijah (1 Kings i. 5, seq.), which had for its object the exclusion of his son Solomon from the throne. The attempt failed, ending with the execution of Adonijah (1 Kings ii. 24, 25). David's character is distinguished for valour and warlike ability. He also possessed qualities of mind which raise him above all the monarchs of his nation; nay, make him a very great man, the man after God's own heart (1 Sam. xiii. 14). His discretion in regard to Saul (1 Sam. xviii. 18, 25), his feeling for true friendship, such as existed between him and Jonathan (xviii. 3, 4, xix. 1-7, xx. 12, seq.), the depth of which, on the part of David, is seen in the lamentation that he poured forth on Jonathan's death (2 Sam. i. 26), his magnanimity in regard to Saul, whom he twice had in his power (1 Sam. xxiv. 4, seq.,

xxvi. 1-12), his placability in relation to injuries and desertion (2 Sam. xix. 19), his gratitude towards Jonathan, which he nobly transferred to Jonathan's son, whom he protected and honoured (ix. 1-13), his sympathy with the grief even of strangers (x. 1, 2), the rigorous justice with which he punished the murderer of his enemy (iv. 19), his fatherly love even towards his faithless son (xviii. 32, 33), before all, his deep religious feeling, which, so thoroughly pervading his masterly Psalms, finds utterance, now in celebrating the divine majesty, now in deep tones of human woe, now in accents of contrition, imploring God's mercy; and which, variously displaying itself in action, led him to take steps for bringing the ark from Gibeah to Jerusalem, for solemnising the divine worship in a becoming manner, and even with a view of erecting a temple to the glory of God (vii., xii. 13, seq.; Ps. xxxii., li.),—all these things laying open his inmost soul make him a permanent example for the remotest ages. For though much rigour and cruelty appear in his reign, the fault is imputable to the spirit of his age rather than himself. Nevertheless, the reproach of sensuality which led him to the greatest transgressions of his life—the adultery with Bathsheba, and the murder of Uriah—remains as a dark spot on his character, which exhibits him to us in his human weakness (2 Sam. xi. 2, seq.). Around his throne he collected prophets and poets, and through their influence and his own example he promoted the culture of his people. Thus the prophet Gad (1 Sam. xxii. 6; 2 Sam. xxiv. 11, 18), and the prophet Nathan (2 Sam. vii. 2, xii. 1), to the latter of whom he entrusted the education of his son Solomon (2 Sam. xii. 25—comp. 1 Kings i. 11-12), are expressly named. By means, also, of the lyric bards, Asaph (1 Chron. xvii. 4, 5, xxvi. 1), Heman (1 Chron. vii. 33, xxvi. 1), Ethan (1 Kings iv. 31; 1 Chron. ii. 6, 8, vii. 42, 44), Jeduthun (1 Chron. xvii. 38, 41, xxvi. 1), and the sons of Korah (1 Chron. x. 19—comp. Ps. xlii., xlv.-xlix.), he took effectual measures for the public service of God, especially in sacred song, for which he himself composed the most beautiful hymns. The age of David is, therefore, the golden age of the Hebrew history.

THE TWO BOOKS OF KINGS.

Section XXIX.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AND AUTHOR.

The first book of Kings contains,—1. The death of David and the government of Solomon (i.-xii.), including the wise judgment respecting

the claim of the two mothers (iii.), Solomon's splendour and wisdom (iv.), the building of the temple (vi.), navigation (ix., x.), the queen of Sheba (x.), Solomon's idolatry (xi.), and the division of the kingdom (xii.); 2. Then comes the history of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel, especially of the latter, till the death of Ahab (xiii.-xxii.), speaking of the idolatry of Israel, the prophet Elijah (xvii.-xix.), Naboth's vineyard, and Jezebel's crime (xxi.)

The second book narrates,—1. The history of the two kingdoms, especially of Israel, down to the fall of the latter (i.-xvii.), directing attention to Elijah (i., ii.), the deeds of Elisha (iii.-viii.), queen Athaliah (xi.), Elisha's death (xiii.), Hoshea's deportation by Shalmaneser (xvii.); 2. The history of Judah alone, till the destruction of Jerusalem and the thirty-seventh year of the Captivity (xviii.-xxv.), including the invasion of the Assyrians under Sennacherib (xviii., xix.), Hezekiah's sickness (xx.), the discovery of the Book of the Law, under Josiah (xxii.), the first deportation under Jehoiakim (xxiv.), the destruction of Jerusalem, and the second deportation under Nebuchadnezzar (xxv.).

These two books also were originally one. The Septuagint separated them, and, as a continuation of the books of Samuel, named them the third and fourth book of the kingdom (*τῶν βασιλειῶν*, in Hebrew *Malachim*), whence arose the title of Kings, which points to their contents. The language and style depart essentially from what we find in the books of Samuel. Here we have Chaldaisms, of which there is no trace in the books of Samuel, and a kind of chronicles, giving brief extracts. The three sources on which the author draws, and which he quotes by name, appear to have been abridged. The oral tradition, which was clearly made use of, shows the character that it acquired in its transmission during a long time, and the entire spirit of the narrative, according to which the freedom of the national worship is already disallowed, the entire Pentateuch is known, the dates are exactly given, and earlier prophecies repeatedly referred to: the aim of the whole, namely, to present the history of the fallen country as an instructive example, full of warning, and to continue it down to the time of the writer, speaks loudly for the view that the books of Samuel and the books of Kings cannot have had the same author or been written at the same time.

The time of the formation of the books is clearly indicated by the mention of the thirty-seventh year of the Captivity, when the Jewish king Jehoiachin was let out of prison (2 Kings xxv. 27-30). The books accordingly must have arisen after this date. But they contain no trace posterior to the Captivity. The three sources whence the writer drew his materials are,—1. A biography of Solomon (1 Kings xi. 41); 2. Annals of the kingdom of Judah (1 Kings xiv. 29, xv.

7, 23); 3. Annals of the kingdom of Israel (1 Kings xiv. 19, xvi. 14). From the employment of these sources of information, which were written while the two kingdoms were yet standing, it is explained how it is that there occur passages which imply the actual existence of the kingdom of Judah (1 Kings viii. 8; 2 Kings viii. 22). In a free and independent spirit the writer handled his materials, for he repeatedly and bitterly reproves Israel and its kings, speaking in a tone which would scarcely have been found in the annals of Israel; and there appears throughout a unity in style, turns of expression, and views.

Section XXX.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE BOOKS OF KINGS.

Solomon ("the peaccable") reaped the fruit of David's labours. In his peaceful reign, the monarch and the people grew rich through commerce and navigation; for from Elath and Ezion-geber on the Red Sea, he, in union with the Phœnicians, sent ships to Ophir (1 Kings ix. 26-28), a locality in southern Arabia, or in India, whence were imported gold, silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks (x. 22). Solomon introduced the arts of peace and a love of beauty and display; for he built the costly temple which bore his name (1 Kings vi.), as well as splendid palaces in Jerusalem and Lebanon (1 Kings vii. 1-12, ix. 19), materials for which, such as cedar and cypress wood, and gold, were supplied by the Phœnician king, Hiram (1 Kings v. 12-18, ix. 11), who also furnished builders (1 Kings v. 6, 18, vii. 13, 14), in exchange for which Solomon sent to Hiram the best products of his land, namely, wheat and oil (1 Kings v. 11), and gave him twenty cities in Galilee (1 Kings ix. 11). In the Syrian desert, also, east of Lebanon, Solomon erected the city Tadmor, afterwards called Palmyra. Indeed, in all the countries that were subjected to him he raised new cities, and the most beautiful buildings (1 Kings ix. 17-19). The temple which he built on Mount Moriah, a hill in Jerusalem, near Mount Zion, had the following form: it was sixty cubits long, thirty high, and twenty broad, and had on the east a portico, which was twenty cubits high, and above which, probably, windows admitted light to the interior. In front were two pillars. The inside was divided, after the manner of the tabernacle, into the holy and the most holy place. The inner walls were wainscotted with cedar, gilded, and adorned with carvings. On both sides and behind, it had a second wall, parallel with the first, giving rise to ninety side chambers, in three stories, one above another, having no connexion with

the interior of the temple. The roof was flat. The entire structure was surrounded by two courts, of which the outer inclosed the inner. The former was termed "the great court" (2 Chron. iv. 9), the latter "the court of the priests" (1 Kings vi.). The vessels of the temple were the same as those in the tabernacle, only more numerous and more splendid (1 Kings vii.). This beautiful building, which stood midway between the Phœnician and the Egyptian style, sank into ruins through Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxv. 9). The splendour of Solomon's government was prejudicial to the kingdom, for the Edomites and the Damascenes revolted (1 Kings xi. 14, seq., 23, seq.), and the pressure of taxation alienated the people, especially the ten tribes (1 Kings xi. 26, seq., xii. 4, 14).

The prominent features in Solomon's character were love of display and luxury. Both rested on a predominant sensuousness, which sought gratifications, on the one side, for the eyes, and, on the other, for lower propensities. The wish to shine was therewith connected, since it was a source of sensuous pleasure. Hence arose an expenditure of huge resources, in order that he might minister to his luxury and parade. His general culture of mind united to these inferior qualities, taste and a love of art. His father's reign, which had made the empire so powerful and flourishing, supplied means for satisfying his passions. At the same time, Solomon himself doubled those resources by his practical skill, his commerce, and his wise regulations. This practical skill and prudence were disclosed at the beginning of his reign. He caused his brother Adonijah, the old general Joab, and Shimei, to be put to death (1 Kings ii. 12-25, 28-35, 36-46), which severity was enjoined solely by regard to prudence, in order to secure his reign against any possible danger from insurrection. His knowledge of human nature and his good sense were seen in the judgment he pronounced on the claim made to an infant by two mothers (1 Kings iii. 16), in the arrangements he made for procuring supplies of provisions for the court (1 Kings iv. 7, 22, 23, 27, 28), in his appointment of officers, and maintenance of order (1 Kings ix. 22, 23), in his establishment of magazines (1 Kings ix. 19), and in the distribution of his forces in garrisons (1 Kings x. 26). This wisdom, given him of God (1 Kings iii. 5-15), connected with the religious culture which he received from his father and from Nathan the prophet, saved him from that cruelty and despotism into which Oriental rulers, who are so much given to sense, very easily fall. For although he had a thousand women for the gratification of his lust (1 Kings xi. 1-3), there is in his life no trace of injustice, still less of cruelty. He was, however, led away into idolatry by his harem, though not till late in life (1 Kings xi. 4-8),—a proof how, when the heart, quitting its hold on God, turns to the lower passions,

the greatest religious folly may be connected with ability and prudence. As David gained renown by the lyre, so Solomon was distinguished for didactic (gnomic) poetry, in which he gave utterance to the most varied precepts of virtue, piety, and wisdom. Even if it should be questioned that he spake 3,000 proverbs and 1,005 songs, and had a most minute and extensive acquaintance with natural history, yet the beautiful proverbs of his which are in our possession, give a speaking testimony to his skill in didactic poetry. The visit of the queen of Sheba and other foreign princes, in order to hear his wisdom (1 Kings iv. 34, x. 1-13), show how generally his fame for learning was diffused and acknowledged.

The two kingdoms of Judah and Israel, which, after Solomon's death, arose through the imprudent and repulsive reply of Rehoboam (1 Kings xii. 14), offer, in their interwoven history, which extends from the twelfth chapter of the first book, the picture of rapidly sinking, and at last wholly overthrown, states. Israel, the larger kingdom, with first Shechem (1 Kings xii. 25), and then Samaria (xvi. 24), for its capital, had nineteen⁷ rulers; Judah, the less, consisting only of Judah and Benjamin, with Jerusalem as its capital, had twenty rulers, who reigned 134 years longer than the kings of Israel. We subjoin a comparative view of the two lines of kings.

| ISRAEL. | JUDAH. |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| i. Jeroboam I. 975—954, A. C. | i. Rehoboam 975—958, A. C. |
| ii. Nadab 954—952 | ii. Abiam 958—955 |
| iii. Baasha 952—930 | iii. Asa 955—914 |
| iv. Elah 930—929 | iv. Jehoshaphat 914 |
| v. Zimri 929—925 | v. Jehoram |
| vi. Omri 925—918 | vi. Ahaziah |
| vii. Ahab 918—897 | vii. Athaliah 884—877 |
| viii. Ahaziah 897—896 | viii. Joash 877—838 |
| ix. Joram 896—884 | ix. Amaziah 838—811 |
| x. Jehu 884—856 | x. Uzziah 811—759 |
| xi. Jehoahaz 856—840 | xi. Jotham 759—743 |
| xii. Jehoash 840—825 | xii. Ahaz 743—728 |
| xiii. Jeroboam II. 825—784 | xiii. Hezekiah 728—699 |
| Interregnum of 12 years. | xiv. Manasseh 699—644 |
| xiv. Zachariah | xv. Amos 644—643 |
| xv. Shallom | xvi. Josiah 643—612 |
| xvi. Menahem | xvii. Jehoahaz 611 |
| xvii. Pekaiiah 761 | xviii. Jehoiakim 611—600 |
| xviii. Pekah 759 | xix. Jehoiaehin 600 |
| xix. Hoshea 731—722 | xx. Zedekiah 599—588 * |

* Compare the List in *The People's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 155, 6.

The Kingdom of Israel.—The condition of this kingdom is, from the first, lamentable. It became more lamentable the longer it lasted. The causes of this constant and thorough downfall are these: 1. Before all, idolatry, with the abominations and moral degradation that it engendered. The first monarch purposely introduced idolatry, in order that the people might not resort to Jerusalem (1 Kings xii. 26, seq.). The other kings followed this example, and were the more driven to it by their marriages with heathen women. It was especially the Phœnician divinities, Baal and Astarte, that were invoked and honoured with immoral rites. The Phœnician princess, Jezebel of Sidon, whom king Ahab took to wife, brought with her the worship of Baal (1 Kings xvi. 31, seq.). 2. The horrible civil wars and assassinations, in consequence of which the rulers quickly followed each other, and generals made themselves a way to the throne, until they, in turn, were overcome and slain. This continual change of rulers and dynasties inflicted endless evil on the state. 3. The constant jealousy towards Judah, which rendered every approach to amity, though the two kingdoms were so intimately related by origin, religion, and geographical position—nay, which repeatedly led to open hostilities, in which aid was sought in foreign alliances. Lastly, 4. The wavering and faithless policy toward external powers, which were far superior in magnitude and resources. Now Israel allied itself to Syria, now to Assyria. The consequence was, that the state which was renounced took sanguinary revenge. Thus it came to pass that Tiglath-pileser of Assyria conquered a great part of Israel, and carried its inhabitants away into his dominions (2 Kings xv. 29), and Hoshea, who had refused tribute to the Assyrian king Shalmanezzer, and allied himself with Egypt, was, after the destruction of Samaria (722, A. C.) carried away captive by that sovereign, with the best part of the nation, into Media, Mesopotamia, and southern Assyria (2 Kings xvii. 3-6). Among the nineteen kings we may mention, Jeroboam I. (1 Kings xii.-xiv.), an Ephraimite, and the first monarch; Ahab (1 Kings xvii.-xxii.), whom his wife Jezebel led to the crime against Naboth, whose vineyard he coveted (1 Kings xxi.), and under whom chiefly the prophet Elijah laboured; and, lastly, Jeroboam II., who, for a little time, postponed the fall of the kingdom, in restoring its old limits and conquering Damascus. Under him lived the prophet Jonas (2 Kings xiv. 25-27).

The Kingdom of Judah.—Here monotheism maintained itself in a less corrupt state than in Israel, for these reasons: 1. Judah was the proper home of the prophets, who, with holy zeal, fought against idolatry and moral corruption, and often, from their position in Judah, operated beneficially on Israel; we specify Hosea and Amos. 2. Judah

had a better government. Several princes of the house of David, distinguished for warlike renown and peaceful meliorations, in succession occupied the throne, and frequently efforts were made by the kings for the destruction of idolatry, which pressed into their realm from Israel, and for the restoration of the pure worship of Jehovah. Only the worship in high-places, in which it was customary to burn incense and offer victims on elevated spots, was not removed (2 Kings xv. 4). In other respects, the internal relations were not felicitous. Priests and prophets were mutually hostile, and both sought to gain influence over the monarch and his government; political parties prevailed, and there was wanton scorn at everything holy, as well as injustice, falsehood, deceit, luxury, and licentiousness, among high and low, as we see from the words of the prophets, especially those of Isaiah. In foreign policy there was the same wavering and the same maxims as in Israel; in consequence, the kingdom thus longer sustained by pious monarchs, endured at last a similar fate. The Egyptian king Nechoh, when on an expedition against Assyria, defeated the Hebrew king Josiah, and placing on the throne Jehoiakim, made him a vassal of his own dominions (2 Kings xxiii. 34). The latter, however, was soon subjected to Nebuchadnezzar, and when that prince, relying on aid from Egypt, broke his yoke, the Babylonians came into his land to take vengeance, and as Jehoiakim was dead, they transported to Babylon his son, Jehoiachin, with 10,000 of his subjects (2 Kings xxiv. 1-16). This is the first deportation. The uncle of the exiled sovereign, Zedekiah, was made king by Nebuchadnezzar. As he also rose against Assyria, its monarch laid siege to Jerusalem, which, after a year and a half, he captured. Its monarch fled; but being overtaken near Jericho by his assailants, he was carried in chains to Babylon, after having seen his sons slain before his eyes, which were then barbarously torn out (2 Kings xxv.). Thus ended the kingdom of Judah with the second deportation into captivity in Babylonia. Among the kings of Judah we may specify these—namely, Jehoshaphat, who distinguished himself by piety, the restoration of order, and a victory over the Ammonites and Moabites (2 Chron. xvii. 1, 7, xix. 5, 7, xx. 1, 6, 24; 2 Kings iii. 7, seq.); Athaliah, the mother of king Ahaziah, who, after that monarch's death, slew all his sons, and ruled as a cruel and idolatrous despot, until the young Jehoash, who had been hidden in the temple, was placed on the throne by a popular rising (2 Kings xi.); Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, under whom Isaiah laboured, and of whom the last was a specially pious king, on which account he was freed from the Assyrians under Sennacherib, and from a disorder which had befallen him (2 Kings xviii., xix.); and, lastly, Josiah, under whom the high-priest Hilkiah found in the temple the Book of the Law, accord-

ing to which the worship of Jehovah was reformed, all traces of idolatry were put an end to, and, for the first time since the age of the judges, the passover was celebrated* (2 Kings xxii. 8-xxiii. 25).

The custom of carrying away into captivity whole nations was anciently a frequent political expedient in the east. The enslaved were more easily kept under the yoke when they were sundered from their native land and from each other. Special care was taken to remove eminent persons, as well as warriors, smiths, and artisans (2 Kings xxiv. 14), in order to deprive the subjected people of the means of insurrection. Assyrian colonists were transplanted into the depopulated land of Israel, and settled especially at Samaria. From a mixture of these colonists with the remaining native population, the Samaritans had their origin (see Section xxxvii.).

Section XXXI.—CONTINUATION.

The Prophets Elijah and Elisha.—The history of these two men of God is written with special fulness. Both laboured chiefly in the kingdom of Israel; Elijah under Ahab and Jezebel, and Elisha under Jehoram, Jehu, Jehoahaz, and Jehoash. With fiery zeal they assailed the worship of Baal, and to their influence chiefly is it to be ascribed that the service of the only true God was not utterly destroyed by idolatry: their deeds have a great resemblance to each other, and, when viewed in a Christian light, many appear severe and cruel, which must however be regarded in relation to the extreme degradation of the people. Neither of the prophets has left anything in writing. Their history, as we now have it, was not composed till centuries after their day. Tradition in consequence may easily have exerted an influence on it. Both prophets were important historical personages whose extraordinary lives and deeds were not only preserved in the mouths of the people, but must have been spoken of in the annals before mentioned. In the facts narrated respecting them, we have therefore not mere popular legends, but actual realities, which could only have received their more defi-

* This statement is not warranted by the Scripture, which merely declares that *such* a celebration—one so exactly conformed to the law and so worthy of the occasion—had not taken place from the time of the judges. Consult on the subject, as well as on the discovery of the Book of the Law under Josiah, an article in *The British Quarterly Review*, No. XV. p. 48, seq.

nite and developed character from exaggerating tradition. The deeds ascribed to Elijah are these: His native place was Thisbe in Galilee (1 Kings xvii. 1). He makes his appearance by announcing to Ahab a drought, and then flies to hide himself by the brook Cherith, on the east of the Jordan. There he is fed by ravens (1 Kings xvii. 1-6). Hence he proceeds to Phœnicia, where he dwells at Zarephath, in the house of a widow, whose sole remaining food in the dearth foretold by the prophet does not grow less, and whose son he raises from the dead (1 Kings xvii. 7-24); on Mount Carmel, and before an assembly of the people, his offering is consumed by fire from heaven, while Baal's priests in vain implore their divinity for a similar token, whereupon Elijah slays them to the number of 450 near the stream Kishon (1 Kings xviii. 1-40); at his announcement the long-desired rain comes (1 Kings xviii. 41-46); persecuted by Jezebel, he flies through Beer-sheba into the wilderness, where he is fed by an angel (1 Kings xix. 1-7); he thence goes to Horeb, where God reveals himself to him in a gentle breeze, and converses with him (1 Kings xix. 8-18); on returning, he, as bidden of God, takes Elisha to be his companion and successor (1 Kings xix. 19-21); when Ahaziah, king of Israel, wished to bring Elijah from Carmel, and for that purpose sent two troops, each of fifty men, they were destroyed by fire, which at the prophet's word fell from heaven (2 Kings i. 1-12); the third troop of fifty was spared, and Elijah, being divinely assured of safety, went to the king, who died agreeably to Elijah's announcement (2 Kings i. 13-17); with Elisha he then went from Jericho to the Jordan, whose waters he divided with a mantle, when he was taken up alive into heaven in a chariot of fire drawn by horses of fire (2 Kings ii. 1-12).

Many consider that this narrative has derived its extraordinary features from the accretions made by tradition to a substratum of fact. Others think that Elijah was invested by God with special powers in order that, in a season of great peril to true religion, he might perform the important task imposed on him, and contend successfully against the gross idolatry of the nation. It deserves notice, however, and seems to indicate a traditional influence, that in the latter part of his reign, and therefore after Elijah's ascension, Jehoram receives from Elijah a letter, in which he is reproved by the prophet for his idolatry in Judah.*

Elisha, of Abel-meholah, lying to the south of Shechem (1 Kings xix. 16), succeeded Elijah in the prophetic office, and performed the fol-

* The succession of events is not here so exactly known as, within the few years involved in the case, to give force to this chronological argument. Besides, the letter might have been written before Elijah's removal.

lowing miracles. With the mantle of his master he also divided the Jordan (2 Kings ii. 14); made bad water sweet with salt (2 Kings ii. 19-22); destroyed with bears two-and-forty children who mocked him (2 Kings ii. 23, 24); successfully announced water and victory to the two allied kings of Judah and Israel when on an expedition against Moab (2 Kings iii. 9-25); multiplied a poor widow's oil (2 Kings iv. 1-7); foretold to a distinguished woman of Shunem, in whose house he often found a home, the birth of a son, whom afterwards he brought back to life (2 Kings iv. 8-37); healed, at Gilgal, poisonous herbs (2 Kings iv. 38, 41); satisfied one hundred men with twenty loaves (2 Kings iv. 42-44); healed the Syrian general Naaman of the leprosy, by sending him to bathe in the Jordan, whereupon Gehazi, Elisha's servant, treacherously procuring from the Syrian the gifts which his master had refused, was, as a punishment, smitten with leprosy (2 Kings v.); caused iron to swim in the Jordan (2 Kings vi. 1-7); defeated the king of Syria's plans, striking his troops with blindness (2 Kings vi. 8-23); proclaimed, during a siege of Samaria, when a dreadful famine raged there, a time of cheapness, which took place the next day in the sudden flight of the Syrians (2 Kings vi. 24-vii.); forewarned the Shunamite of a seven years' famine (2 Kings viii. 1-6); announced in Damascus death to the sick king and the ascent of Hazael to the throne (2 Kings viii. 7-15); and prophesied to Joash three victories over the Syrians (2 Kings xiii. 14-19); on which he died; when his bones restored a dead person to life (2 Kings xiii. 20, 21).

We here see how considerable a person God called forth in Elisha, and with what great powers he invested him. Working in the same manner and for the same objects as Elijah, he also was supported of God by extraordinary aids, though in his history too the traditional colouring is not to be denied.

THE TWO BOOKS OF CHRONICLES.

Section XXXII.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AND AUTHOR.

The first book contains,—1. Genealogies (i.-x.); and 2. The history of Saul down to David's death (xi.-xxx.); accordingly, the entire history of David's reign parallel with the second book of Samuel.

The second book gives more fully a narrative from Solomon to the

return of the Jews from exile, through the favour of Cyrus; speaking, however, mainly of Judah, and only occasionally of Israel. The history runs parallel with the first and second book of Kings.

The name of these books, *Chronicles*, had its origin with Jerome, from whom it was taken by Luther. The Seventy and the Vulgate call them supplements (*παραλειπόμενα*). By an Arabic translation they are termed "The Book of Adam," since Adam is the first word. In Hebrew the two books form one, and are called **דברי הימים** (*Dibre Haiamim*), "Words of the Days," that is, journals or annals, from the fact, that in narrating events they follow the order of time. As the second book of Samuel and the two books of Kings run in a line with the Chronicles, that is, narrate the same history, a question arises as to what relation exists between the two accounts. There are many portions in both with more or less deviation, others are found in the Chronicles only. Thorough investigations show that the Chronicles are a later work, and in part only a re-production of the books before mentioned. This opinion is supported by the following grounds—1. The Chronicles follow the later Hebrew orthography and grammar, and accordingly correct words found in the older works. 2. They substitute words easily understood, and more commonly in use, for Hebrew expressions less usual and insufficiently clear.* 3. They sometimes misunderstand expressions in the former books, and make changes accordingly. For instance, they make ships of Tarshish in the time of Solomon go from the Red Sea to Spain, while they explain the phrase, "navy of Tarshish," that is, merchant vessels, which Solomon sent from the Red Sea to Ophir, by "the king's ships went to Tarshish." Tarshish is Spain (1 Kings ix. 26, x. 22, xxii. 48; 2 Chron. ix. 21). 4. They alter for the sake of propriety, and omit matters of offence; thus they say nothing of the private life of David, his adultery, and the crime of Amnon; also the idolatry of Solomon. 5. They manifest a decided preference for Judah and for the priests and Levites; accordingly, they take only occasional notice of Israel, or none at all, pass by the entire history of Elijah and Elias, and represent the worship in Judah as having for a long time been highly splendid and perfect. Thus, according to them, Samuel was a Levite (1 Chron. vi. 16, 28), whilst in 1 Sam. i. 1, he is an Ephraimite; the two sons of David who are priests† (2 Sam. viii. 18), are, according to them, mere secular officers (1 Chron. xviii. 17), since they did not belong to the house of Levi: under the godless queen Athaliah, everything in the conspiracy of Joash takes place,

* See Gesenius, *Geschichte der Heb. Sprache*; and De Wette, *Einleit.*, § 190, a & b.

† So in the Hebrew and the Vulgate—comp. Sept.

according to them, through the Levites (2 Chron. xxiii.); but, according to the books of Kings, by means of the soldiers (2 Kings xi. 9, seq.): according to them, the ships of the Jewish king Jehoshaphat are broken in pieces at Ezion-geber, because he was allied with the Israelite king Ahaziah (2 Chron. xx. 35-37); but according to the Kings, this misfortune took place previously, and Jehoshaphat refused to connect himself with Ahaziah (1 Kings xxii. 49, 50). 6. They introduce the later Jewish theology into the history; for, according to the older information, Jehovah moves David to a prejudicial determination (2 Sam. xxiv. 1); but according to the Chronicles it is the work of Satan (1 Chron. xxi. 1), in agreement with which the idols appear as evil spirits or demons, for it is said that "they smote Ahaz, and were the ruin of him and of all Israel" (2 Chron. xxviii. 23).

From these facts it has been inferred that the Chronicles present a kind of review of the previous history, having for its aim to promote edification at a later period, and especially to exhibit in sacerdotal splendour the times of David and Solomon. Hence the omission of every occasion of stumbling, and the description of the earlier worship as an ideal of theocratic grandeur, in which the priests and Levites are made prominent in the important duties of their office. Nearly all the omissions, additions and enlargements have this for their object; which makes itself felt spontaneously if you read the book without prejudice. But as the author profited also by many other sources, which he cites by name, so does he bring forward much new information of a valuable kind respecting the earlier ages, which in no way appears suspicious, or is to be rejected in consequence of the aim to which reference has been made. These books indeed often bear evidence of their truth visibly on their front, and without reason have doubts respecting their credibility been uttered.

The formation of both books falls at the end of the Persian era; they were composed by a priest. This appears from—1. The sacerdotal, levitical spirit in which the whole is executed. 2. The clear indications in the books themselves of a later period; for example, the treasure of David is estimated by Darics ("drams"), a Persian coin, so called from Darius (1 Chron. xxix. 7); also the line of David is brought down to the seventh generation after Cyrus (1 Chron. iii. 19-24). Now this points to the time of Alexander the Great, to whose age the seventh generation after Cyrus reached; for Ezra, e. g., lived in the third generation after Cyrus. 3. The language itself, which closely approaches the Chaldee, and explains or misunderstands old and difficult words; and finally, the position of the work in the Canon, in which it holds the last place, as if the remaining books had been already collected.

The sources of information employed by the chronicler, besides the second book of Samuel and the two books of Kings, are the following: 1. the Chronicles of King David, written by the prophets Samuel, Nathan, and Gad (1 Chron. xxix. 29); 2. the acts of Solomon, written by the prophets Nathan, Ahijah, and Iddo (2 Chron. ix. 29); 3. a history of King Rehoboam, written by the prophets Shemaiah and Iddo (2 Chron. xii. 15); 4. a history of the kings Jehoshaphat and Jehu (2 Chron. xx. 34); and 5. a chronicle of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah (2 Chron. xxvii. 7, xxviii. 26, xxxii. 32). The last has been taken for our two books of Kings; but according to the express statement of the chronicler, there were in the book many things which are not found in our present history, and therefore it must have been a separate work.

Section XXXIII.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE CHRONICLES.

The genealogical lists in the beginning of the first book are put together, partly from Genesis (v., x., xi., xxv., xxvi.), partly from later genealogical data. Short historical statements are interwoven (1 Chron. iv. 9, 10, 39-43, v. 18-22, 26, &c.). It is striking, that the tribe Dan is not mentioned, perhaps because it had died out. On the other hand, the genealogies of Judah and Levi are given in the fullest manner; a fact which looks towards the object of the writer.

It is peculiar in the author, that he specially marks out in the history how the service of the one true God had always brought prosperity and conquest to the kings and the people, while from idolatry ensued defeat and other, for the most part political, misfortunes. He sets the two in constant connexion, and brings them forward as cause and effect. Thus Abijah overcomes Jeroboam, king of Israel, because he had remained faithful to the worship of Jehovah (2 Chron. xiii.), and here it is striking, that nothing is said of the idolatry of Abijah (1 Kings xv. 3). Asa having destroyed all traces of idolatry in Judah, in consequence overcomes the Ethiopians (2 Chron. xiv.-xvi.). Jehoshaphat, a pious king, falls into misfortune for his connexion with the Israelite king Ahab, and afterwards with Ahaziah. Jehoram, who marries Ahab's daughter, the idolatrous and cruel Athaliah, and becomes idolatrous himself, loses his dominion over the Edomites, lets Jerusalem be plundered by the Philistines and Arabians, and dies of a frightful disease

(2 Chron. xxi.). The divine punishments for apostacy, vice and idolatry are wrought into the substance of the narrative, and are everywhere prominent. Idolatry also, with its abominations and immoralities, destroys the internal power of the nation, and like a cancer devours every sound part.

Where the statements of the chronicler contradict those given in Samuel and the Kings, historical truth is to be looked for on the side of the latter, since the clearly-defined object of the former and the later period of his composition are decisive points. That, however, not unimportant contradictions are here found, is proved above (Section xxxii.), as well as by the following instances. According to the chronicler, king Hezekiah invites persons in Judah and Israel to the passover, and in fact, from the latter, many go to Jerusalem; the passover was celebrated in solemn splendour for eight days (2 Chron. xxx. 1, seq.). On the contrary, the second book of Kings states, that not till the time of Josiah was the passover observed down from the days of the judges (2 Kings xxiii. 21-23).* According to the chronicler, king Jehoiakim was put into chains by Nebuchadnezzar, in order to carry him to Babylon; also vessels of the house of Jehovah were taken to that city, and put into the temple there (2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, 7; Dan. i. 1, 2); according to Kings, however, Jehoiakim is not carried to Babylon, but dies peaceably at Jerusalem,† and it is on his son Jehoiachin that the misfortune of deportation falls (2 Kings xxiv. 1-16). In the Chronicles, Zedekiah is called a brother of Jehoiachin (2 Chron. xxxvi. 10); according to the second book of Kings, however, he is not his brother but his uncle (2 Kings xxiv. 17).

Note.—The Chronicles have been the special object of rationalistic hostility within the last fifty years. Extreme views on the subject have found an English representative in a recent *History of the Hebrew Monarchy*,‡ which presents the opinions of the worst school of German theology in their worst form. It may be desirable to subjoin the statement of a practical theologian (Lisco, *Die Bibel*, i. 619, seq.), who is familiar with all that has been said and done on every side in theological learning, and who is both too learned and too wise to be a partisan of any school.

“That history is an exhibition of God’s providence in the government of the

* See the note, p. 78.

† Let the reader consult the passage, where he will find much less than is stated in the text.

‡ See *The British Quarterly Review*, No. XV.

world, is a position which finds its full evidence and complete illustration nowhere except in the historical narratives of the Bible. The history of the Hebrew people presents the course of Divine Providence in regard to the world at large, but chiefly in its moral and spiritual bearings and relations with the descendants of Abraham. This character of Divine Providence finds its appropriate name and best exemplification in the theocracy or *government of God*, which was established by Moses, and developed and confirmed by various events down to the time of Christ. To present to the Hebrews this conception of the relation of society to God, was the chief purpose of the writer of the Chronicles, who wished to hold up history as a mirror, in order to encourage pious Hebrews to trust in their fathers' God, and to warn the sinful to flee from the wrath to come. Besides this general object, he had one of a special kind—he intended to communicate to the Israelites, now returning from captivity, such views taken from the history of their nation as might give them aid for bringing into due order their social and domestic affairs, so disturbed by conquest and expatriation, and specially might direct them in restoring the worship of God and the observances of religion according to the divinely-ordained model. What did not conduce to his purpose he naturally omitted, and no direct advantage could he derive from the history of Saul, who did nothing for the ceremonial of public worship, nor from the family history of David and Solomon, nor from the history of the kingdom of Israel, in which the legal worship was abolished; on the contrary, he found great use in genealogies, by which persons could learn from what families they sprang, what possessions their fathers held before the Exile, who was a priest, who a Levite, who a genuine Israelite, who of foreign or mixed extraction. Equally important must detailed and particular information respecting worship have been, for they contributed to form the type in accordance with which the new ceremonial was to be established; in the registers of priests and Levites they learnt what families had performed certain services in the sanctuary, and who accordingly had a right to fulfil them now. The writer, however, was not at liberty to forget the general history. He, therefore, sketched an historical picture of the reigns of David and Solomon, and the Jewish rulers generally, in which he constantly sought to ascertain and set forth what influence each had had in the development of the theocracy, and showed from the history how only those kings who were faithful to Jehovah enjoyed prosperity, while apostates and idolators did not escape the judgment of God. Hence his contemporaries might learn how they should shape their conduct and direct their lives. Thus the chronicler supplied a supplement which was essential to a complete view of the theocracy. For, as we should have a very different view of the Mosaic religion did we not possess the Psalms, which show how that religion occupied men's hearts, and produced fruit there, so without the Chronicles we could not form a right conception of the services of the temple. These writings prove that amid all the breaches of the law and the prevailing idolatry, nevertheless, the worship of Jehovah, if neglected for a short time, was in general observed according to the forms required in the Pentateuch. The Chronicles, therefore, form a necessary part of the Canon, which, without them, would be incomplete.

“The writer of the Chronicles has often been reproached with a certain Levitism, by which is meant a partiality for the tribe of Levi, which led him into many inaccuracies; but the last is not the case, though it may be admitted that the author ascribes to the tribe of Levi the exclusive right of conducting

the public worship, as a system ordered in all things by the Mosaic law, and existing from the time of Moses himself. Accordingly, to that law he makes frequent reference. By this means the chronicler offers a convincing proof of the divinity of the law given to Israel through Moses. That a levitical or priestly spirit prevails in the Chronicles, is undeniable. The explanation lies partly in this—that the writer was himself a Levite, if from the character of a book we may infer its author; and partly also, and specially, in the levitical spirit of the times to which he belonged. Since the re-building of the temple, and since the restoration of the Mosaic ceremonial, the long-neglected doctrines of the fathers recovered their authority, and drew on themselves the attention of the whole people, who had just gained breath, after suffering a severe punishment for their religious transgressions. What could be more important for the author or for his readers than information regarding ecclesiastical ordinances, usages, and worship? and is it surprising that he should have given special attention to this part of his country's history, exhibited, with a love for his work, events which had reference to this matter, or if, in a word, his historical point of view was the temple? That in his time the people, enlightened by affliction, were given up to the service of Jehovah and the Mosaic law, was a reason for saying little respecting the ancient idolatry, of which so much is told in the books of the Kings, since such statements would have had little application for the times of the author.

“As it is a fact that the Canon of the Old Testament writings was closed in the age of Ezra and Nehemiah, we thus gain an important inference as to the time when the Chronicles were written. Had they not then been in existence, they could not have been taken into the Canon. After the Canon was closed, no book could be taken into it. For as with Malachi the gift of prophecy ceased, and the age that immediately followed felt itself so entirely abandoned by the Divine Spirit that they did not even venture to give an opinion as to what should be done with the stones of a dilapidated altar, but laid them carefully by until a prophet should appear and give the needful instructions (1 Macc. iv. 45, 46), so they would be much more indisposed to receive into the Canon a writing of such extent as the Chronicles. This could take place so much the less, since, according to the general opinion, the Scriptures produced since the discontinuance of the line of prophets were not accounted so credible as those found in the Canon. If then a new work was offered, it would not be allowed to make part of the Canon, unless guaranteed by a prophet. After the closing of the Canon, arbitrary changes and additions in its contents were prevented by the fact, which we learn from Josephus, that the Canon was carefully kept in the temple. The taking into the Canon, of the Chronicles, forms an invincible argument against the view recently put forth, to the effect that the origin of the book is very late. In the portions which the chronicler has in common with Samuel and Kings, are found many deviations in the orthography, as well as diversities of language, according to the grammar and the usages of a later age, in comparison with the sources of the information, which belong to an earlier period, and are conformed to the usages of the time when they originated. The most numerous and the best founded opinions agree in this, that the Chronicles belong to the younger productions of Hebrew literature, and were written long after the return from captivity, yet before the book of Ezra. Others, who, though without sufficient reason, deny that Ezra wrote the book which bears his name, fix the date of their composition about 400, A. C. By the lateness of his age the chronicler

came to bear a very different relation to the history of his country from that borne by the writers of the books of Samuel and Kings. To him, as to all writers who are separated by a long interval from the narrated events, the early ages of his nation appeared an object of reverence and wonder, and that the more since the men of his day possessed little else than the memory of the past. The later historians then, as was inevitable, handled their historical materials in the spirit of their own times; and, therefore, they naturally made prominent what was good and beautiful in their history, rather than the bad and the dark, which as naturally they would endeavour to mitigate. We need not wonder if we find these the qualities of later historians, in the works of Jewish writers, who may well have taken an apologetic tone. What the present had in a less degree than the past, appeared to the author of the Chronicles in the most attractive light, and with special pleasure he described the wonderful care of Jehovah in the guidance of pious individuals, his protection of the whole nation, and his provision for the past freedom and greatness of his people.

“Although, in relation to language, style, and historical materials, the Chronicles are inferior to the books of Samuel and the Kings, yet are they of inestimable value for the Hebrew history, of which, in the later periods of the regal government, we should, but for them, possess short and often imperfect notices; while they supply many particulars regarding ecclesiastical antiquities and institutions of which we learn little or nothing from the other historical books, which are almost exclusively occupied with political events.”

On the Chronicles, Ewald makes these general observations:—“After this investigation into the sources of the work, it requires no further proof to show what a rich treasure of the most important information, respecting the less and the more ancient times, it contains within itself, and how erroneous, how unjust verdicts recent German writers have pronounced upon its contents. It is true that the way in which the author makes use of his authorities may easily lead to misunderstandings; and it is at once obvious that a work which departs so much from the older history, and can describe it only by means of secondary sources, is, for historical purposes, to be applied with caution. But if attention is given to what in thought and word is peculiar to its author, and what he must have taken from his authorities, and if, from a careful acquaintance with it, its fundamental divisions are distinguished, it may safely and very advantageously be used for the more ancient periods, and a multitude of authentic and important facts may be gleaned, which are elsewhere sought in vain; nay, you may discover in it surprising remains of the most ancient historical works.”—*Geschichte Volks Israel*, i. 251.)

THE BOOK OF EZRA.

Section XXXIV.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AND AUTHOR.

This book narrates,—1. The history of the first return from the Babylonish captivity under Zerubbabel and Jeshua in the year 536 (i.-vi.), including the commencement of the temple (iii.), hindrances from the Samaritans (iv.), continuation and termination of the building, and its dedication (v., vi.); and 2. The history of the second return, under the priest Ezra, in the year 458 (vii.-x.), with the putting away of the heathen wives (ix., x.).

The Hebrew and Greek Jews regarded Ezra and Nehemiah as one book, and even when the books were separated they called them “The Two Books of Ezra.” They, however, were originally two separate books. The style in Ezra is very simple and natural, and the contents a true and in every respect credible narrative of the return of the two colonies to Jerusalem. Against the Samaritans there is in this book a certain tone of bitterness, which is sufficiently explained by their conduct against the restored exiles. But we find not in the work that implacable hatred of a later day against the Samaritans. From iv. 8-x. 18, instead of the Hebrew we have the Chaldee, on occasion of a letter to the Persian king, who was led to forbid the continuation of the building of the temple (Section iii.). Also the letter of Artaxerxes, which at a later time gave Ezra full power, is in Chaldee (vii. 12-26).

The second part of the book, the history of Ezra, was, without doubt, written by himself; and Ezra, for the most part, speaks in the first person. To the second part, the first has the greatest resemblance, and only the extravagance of criticism endeavours to deny the fact. Very probably, therefore, was the history of the first return written by Ezra, as he had heard it from the old colonists in Jerusalem, or their children. A later compiler brought the commencement of the whole and the conclusion of the Chronicles into complete agreement, so that Ezra appears as a continuation of the Chronicles (2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23; Ezra i. 1-3), whence, however, many have wished to infer that the author of the Chronicles was also the author of the book of Ezra; but in opposition to this opinion stands the much later origin of the Chronicles, and the obvious purpose betrayed in the end of the latter and the beginning of the former. The same compiler may also have spoken in the third person of Ezra’s origin, and even have spoken in his praise (Ezra vii. 6), and yet have given Ezra’s own narrative, without having

any claim to be considered as the original author.* The view we have given is recommended by the manner in which, among the ancient Hebrews, written documents were drawn on and handled, and which we clearly see in the Chronicles, where the books of Samuel and the Kings are put under contribution.

Section XXXV.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE BOOK OF EZRA.

The First Colony.—By the permission of Cyrus, 50,000 of the exiles set themselves on the road, and proceeded to Jerusalem, under the chief Zerubbabel, a descendant of David, and the high-priest Jeshua (536, A. C.). That a greater number did not return, has its cause in the fact, that Jews, who by commerce had acquired riches and comfort in Babylon, found no attraction in the hardships and perils of the journey, and in the labour and trouble involved in a residence in the ruined capital of their country. Having dwelt for two-and-fifty years in Babylon, and having formed connexions with its inhabitants, they no longer had any vivid feeling of patriotism, or any eager desire for the re-building of the temple. In consequence, none returned save the pious worshippers of Jehovah, and persons of little property, and the entire fate of the new colony remained much behind the expectations and inspired hopes of the ancient prophets, especially Isaiah (lx., lxvi. 17, seq.). As now the Samaritans, wishing to assist in restoring the temple, received a repulse, they laid a complaint against the restored Jews before Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, † and as it would appear without result (Ezra iv. 6). A second accusation laid before the Persian monarch, known as the Pseudo-Smerdis, which imputed the most rebellious disposition to the Jews, produced an order from the court, putting a stop to the work (Ezra iv. 7, seq.). Not before the second year of Darius Hystaspis was the building resumed, appeal having been made to the original decree of Cyrus, which Darius renewed, giving at the same time aid in the construction, so that the temple, in the sixteenth

* These remarks, if they have pertinency or force to the books before us, apply to some of the objections stated by our author against the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. See p. 30.

† In the Bible, this monarch is called Ahasuerus (*noble, excellent*). This is a title and a surname which was given to several Median and Persian kings; as here to Cambyses, so in Dan. ix. 1 to Astyages, and in Esther i. 1 to Xerxes.—A.

year of Darius (515, A. C.), was finished and dedicated, and the first passover was observed within its courts (Ezra v., vi.). That Ezra, in his youth, formed one in the first colony, as some have inferred from Nehem. xii. 1, 13, is unlikely, because, between the first and the second colony which Ezra conducted, 78 years intervened, so that the Ezra mentioned in the passage was most probably a different person.

The Second Colony.—The priests and the scribe Ezra, living in Babylon, received in the second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (458, A. C.), the royal permission to proceed to Jerusalem with a second colony. The melancholy condition of the first colony made this assistance necessary, and the king, as well as the rich Jews in Babylon, gave to Ezra, in his efforts, all the support in their power. Yet only 6,000 gathered around and returned with him. The poor condition of the colony kept back many, the more readily because some had seen its actual state in Palestine (Ezra vii., viii.). Though the king had given an exemption from taxes to the priests, Levites, singers, porters, and Nethinims (Ezra vii. 24), yet not more than two sacerdotal families attached themselves to the returning caravan (viii. 2). The chief aim of Ezra was now directed to the putting away of heathenish wives in Jerusalem, and to prevent Israelites from marrying any such in future. The aim was accomplished, though not without opposition (ix., x.). Ezra, also, appointed judges (vii. 25, 26), and made other arrangements such as the times required (vii. 10).

The Third Book of Ezra.—In the Septuagint, before our canonical book of Ezra, there stands an apocryphal work of the same name, which, in the Vulgate, is called "The Third Book of Ezra," because it is placed after Nehemiah, which is there accounted the Second Book of Ezra. This "Third Book of Ezra" (Esdras) contains a very free Greek translation of our book, which in many parts has additions taken from the Chronicles and Nehemiah, besides an appendix from an unknown source, in which the author speaks of a banquet at the Persian court, at which the Jewish prince Zerubbabel, who conducted the first caravan, obtained a brilliant victory in a contest of intellectual skill. Luther did not translate this work, because its contents for the most part are taken from the canonical books.

THE BOOK OF NEHEMIAH.

Section XXXVI.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AND FORMATION.

The book contains the history of Nehemiah, who was sent (445, A.C.) as governor to Jerusalem, and revived the poor colony (i.-xiii.), presenting to the reader the royal permission to travel to Jerusalem (ii.), the repairing of the walls of that city (iii.), the hostility of the Samaritans (iv.), laws against usurers (v.), craft of the Samaritan governor against Nehemiah (vi.), several suitable regulations (xiii.), and an interposed passage belonging to the time of Ezra (vii. 5-xi. 3).

With the exception of the interposed passage, the whole is an autobiography of Nehemiah, who therein, not without lively feeling, speaks of the service he rendered for the revival of the colony. Hence the repeatedly occurring prayer, "Think upon me, my God, for good, according to all that I have done for this people" (Nehem. v. 19, xiii. 14, 22, 31), and in opposition thereunto the wish called forth by the attacks of his enemies, "Think on them, my God, according to their works" (vi. 14, xiii. 29). According to his own statement, Nehemiah introduced (vii. 6) a genealogical register, which is already found in Ezra (ii.), and contains a list of those who formed the first colony under Zerubbabel. Thereupon follows (vii. 5-xi. 3) an interposed passage which contains the celebration of the feast of tabernacles, of a solemn fast under Ezra, and which cannot have emanated from Nehemiah, since the style is quite diverse, and Nehemiah himself is mentioned in the third person, whilst he always, in other parts, speaks of himself in the first. Consequently, this portion is, in the apocryphal Ezra, introduced in its right place.

The authorship of the greater part of the book is to be ascribed to Nehemiah himself; but a compiler of a later day has taken a passage out of Ezra, and put it in an improper place. This might the more easily be done, because at first both books were accounted one, and Ezra and Nehemiah were held to have been contemporaries. The last opinion is, in respect to time, not impossible, and Nehemiah, on his coming to Jerusalem, may have found Ezra there; but, according to Josephus, Ezra was dead when Nehemiah arrived, and the Greek translation both times leaves out the name of Nehemiah, where he is mentioned in the part introduced from Ezra's time (Nehem. viii. 9, x. 1).

Section XXXVII.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE BOOK OF NEHEMIAH.

Nehemiah.—As cup-bearer of the Persian king, Artaxerxes Longimanus (ii. 1), Nehemiah receives melancholy intelligence of the bad condition of the colonists in Jerusalem (i.), and as the king, noticing his sadness, asks its cause, obtains permission to travel to Jerusalem, and receives a letter to the keeper of the king's forest, directing him to furnish Nehemiah with wood for building. Coming to Jerusalem thirteen years after Ezra, Nehemiah is chiefly concerned to repair and re-build the walls. His efforts are opposed in every way by Sanballat, the governor of Samaria. The enmity of the Samaritans and of their leader has now reached such a height that they have resolved to fall on the Jews while engaged in their work; on which account Nehemiah arms the workmen, and sets watches day and night (iv.). As the intention is discovered, it is abandoned. Sanballat employs evil measures against Nehemiah (vi.). In spite of all these hostilities, the building of the walls is completed (vi. 15) and dedicated (xii. 17, seq.). The character of Nehemiah presents disinterestedness and liberality, for during his twelve years of office he gave up its emoluments, and kept a free table for many persons (v. 14-18). He is also distinguished by many benign arrangements; he compels usurers to restore what they had gotten (v. 1-14), promotes population in Jerusalem (xi. 1, 2—comp. vii. 4, 5), makes regulations for the temple service (xii. 44, seq.), separates men of impure blood from Israel (xiii. 1-3), reforms abuses, restoring their rights to the Levites, and the due observance of the sabbath (xiii. 10, seq.). With such as are married to idolatrous women he is strict and even severe in his measures (xiii. 23-25). He drives from Jerusalem one of the sons of the high-priest, who has become son-in-law to Sanballat (xiii. 28). The rigour employed in these things arose from his conviction that, by foreign marriages, the language, the morals and the religion of the country were gradually destroyed.

The Samaritans.—The Jews who in consequence of mixed alliances had been driven from Jerusalem, went to Samaria, and placed themselves under Sanballat, to whom they were very welcome, especially the priest Manasseh, who was followed by other sacerdotal families. By them a temple was built on Mount Gerizim, where the Samaritan idolatry had its rites observed; for as those who had been banished could no longer go to the temple at Jerusalem, they thus sought to make up for their loss. Thus arose the Samaritan sect; and now hatred, from diversity of religious opinions, was added to the unfriendly feeling which already existed between Jews and Samaritans,

and which the separation made irremediable. Josephus makes the going-out of those priestly families to take place under Alexander the Great; so that in his age the religious hatred had its origin; but he here, without doubt, commits a chronological error, in confounding Darius Nothus with Darius Codomannus, who it was that Alexander vanquished. The Samaritans were, at a later time, distinguished from the Jews in the following manner. They received, as the only source of revelation, the Pentateuch, which varies from our copy in 2,000 readings, whose origin, for the most part, has reference to the peculiar dogmatic views of the Samaritans. They have besides a book of Joshua (Section xxxiii.), some Psalms and Prayers in the Samaritan tongue, and, lastly, dogmatical writings in Arabic. Their opinions vary very much from those of the Pharisees; they had very spiritual views of God, and endured no anthropomorphisms; the angels who, in their creed, were not created, but emanations from God, they called Heavenly Powers. Moses they held to be the sole prophet; in him prophecy, which arose at the Creation, had united all its lights, and he was taken alive up into heaven. The salvation of man depended on the strict observance of the law, and especially the solemnising of the sabbath, and circumcision. At the end of all things will be a resurrection. The Messiah is to be of the tribe of Ephraim. He will restore the temple on Gerizim, for only on that mountain can acceptable offerings be made to God. They therefore call the Messiah **השֹׁהַב** (*Hashob*), *restorer*. Under the emperor Justinian they were cruelly persecuted, and, like the Jews, they, in the middle ages, emigrated to Alexandria, Damascus, and other commercial cities, where they employed themselves chiefly with trade and medicine. There now remain only a few families in Shechem.

THE BOOK OF ESTHER.

Section XXXVIII.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AUTHORSHIP.

It contains the history of a Jewish maiden, by name *Esther*, who becomes the wife of the Persian king Ahasuerus. This word seems to signify “Lion King” (comp. *Cœur de Lion*), and is the same as the more common appellation Xerxes; for the Persian word for Xerxes, as it appears on inscriptions, is Kh. sh. w. e. r. sh. e. Hence the Greek $\Xi\rho\xi\eta\varsigma$,

and in Hebrew אֶחָשְׁרֶזֶשׁ, in Neo Persian, Sirchah, *Kosresh*. The known character of Xerxes is in accordance with the tenor of our narrative.

Esther's foster-father* Mordecai was, with the Jews in general, in danger of perishing under the devices of the wicked vizier Haman. Esther, however, obtains from the king, permission to oppose him, and he, with all the foes of the Jews, come to ruin. In commemoration of the deliverance the feast of Purim was appointed, that is, the feast of *lots*, so called because Haman had fixed the day of the Jews' perdition (9th March) by casting lots (Esther iii. 7).

The spirit of the book is not free from bloodthirsty revenge and a love of persecution, for Esther, not content with one avenging blow, obtains from the king, power to inflict a second (ix. 13). At least 75,000 Persians are put to death (16). The implacable national pride of the Jews and the sanguinary hatred of all who were not of their blood, offer a melancholy picture of the national character of the Israelites as developed at a later time, outlines of which may be traced in this book. Scarcely is there in it a vestige of the religious spirit, as it is found in the other biblical writings. Even the name of God does not once occur in the whole work. On the other hand, an extraordinary value is attached to fasting (iv. 16) and to forms (iii. 2). The language of the book points decidedly to a late period, for it resembles what is found in the Chronicles and in Daniel. The book is never mentioned in the New Testament.

The formation of the book is probably to be dated in the time of the religious persecutions endured by the Jews under the Syrian and Egyptian kings; for to such a period we are directed by the tendency of the work as well as the language. The writing is designed to show how those who were faithful to the laws of their fathers, especially the ceremonial law, might, even in the greatest need, reckon on the aid of God (iv. 15, seq.). As Persian customs are explained, it cannot have been written in Persia (i. 13, viii. 8). Josephus accounted it the most recent book in the Canon. If then it stands in the Hebrew Canon before Ezra and Nehemiah, the time of which the history speaks gave occasion to its position; for on the supposition that Ahasuerus is Xerxes, the event belongs to a period prior to the days of Ezra and Nehemiah. An historical fact lies at the bottom of the whole; for if some details belong to tradition, yet the entire narrative corresponds with what we know of the manners and customs of the Persian court and of Oriental cruelty,

* Mordecai is generally considered the uncle of Esther. They were in reality cousins, as is shown under the word "Uncle," in *The People's Dictionary of the Bible*.

while the origin of the festival of Purim shows very clearly that the occasion thereunto must have been given in the Jewish history.

Section XXXIX.—OBSERVATIONS ON ESTHER.

The name *Esther* is Persian, and signifies “a star,” especially the evening-star, Venus. Her earlier name was *Hadassah*, that is, *myrtle*. The former wife of the king, who was set aside because she refused to appear before the carousing court, was called Vashti, or *beautiful*. Esther is described as exceedingly handsome (ii. 7, 9, 17), prudent and subtle (ii. 10, 15, 20, iv. 11, v. 1, 4, 8, vii. 2, 3, 6, viii. 1, 4, 5), as well as faithfully attached to her religion and people (iv. 16, vii. 4, viii. 3, 6). Yet given to revenge and blood (ix. 13), she held the weak king entirely in her hands. Esther’s character cannot therefore be unconditionally approved. The way, however, in which God often brings to nought the attempts of the wicked, and changes misfortune into joy, may here find a striking instance.

The facts adduced in the work have not the slightest improbability; for that the royal commands were irrevocable (viii. 8) appears from Daniel (Dan. vi. 13, 16), where the monarch himself is grieved that, agreeably to his previous decree, Daniel must be cast into the lion’s den. The refusal of the homage of prostration customary in Persia, of which Mordecai makes himself guilty (Esther iii. 2, v. 9), is spoken of in connexion with the Grecian general Conon (*Corn. Nepos in Con. iii.*). The practice is very common in the east at the present day. Nor need we feel any surprise at the bloody slaughter committed on the enemies of the Jews (ix. 5, 15, 16). Even in later times, and more civilised lands, such shocking scenes present themselves. Mithridates slew 80,000 Romans in his kingdom; the French in the Sicilian vespers were hewn down by hundreds; and thousands of Protestants on St. Bartholomew’s day perished in Paris. Indeed, persecutions connected with religion have been specially destructive of human life.

Respecting certain additions to Esther, see our remarks on the Apocrypha.

II.—*THE POETICAL BOOKS.*

Section XL.—ON THE POETRY OF THE HEBREWS IN GENERAL.

The Hebrew poetry is distinguished from the Hebrew prose, partly by a poetical diction and poetical forms, partly by a fixed rhythm, that is, by a regularly returning harmonious measure, of the sentences in the continued development of the thought. The Hebrews were, however, unacquainted with a division of the syllables into long and short, an arrangement of such syllables into fixed feet, and the formation of these feet into determinate lines or verses (*metre*), such as we find among the ancient Greeks and Romans, as well as the Germans. Nor did they employ rhyme at the end of the line, as did the *Minnesingers* of the Middle Ages. They had an entirely free poetic form of speech, and the division of the separate numbers of a verse was determined rather by the thought than the outer form.

The poetry of the ancient Hebrews, as with all primitive peoples, was the handmaid of song, and therefore it stands in the most intimate union with song and music. At first it was specially the Hebrew women who loved dancing, music, and song, and celebrated in their poetry great events, heroes, and their achievements. Thus lyric poetry continued to live on the lips of the people. Accordingly, Miriam, the sister of Moses, and with her the Hebrew women, sang the praises of Jehovah, when in a wonderful manner he had redeemed the nation in the passage of the Red Sea (*Exod. xv. 20, seq.*); Deborah, the female judge of Israel, celebrated her victory over Sisera (*Judg. v.*); Jephthah's daughter met her victorious father with song, timbrels, and dance (*Judg. xi. 34*); the damsels commemorated her devotement every year (*Judg. xi. 40*); the daughters of Shiloh kept up an annual festival in honour of Jehovah (*Judg. xxi. 19, 21*); and, finally, women of all the cities of Israel received with singing and dancing, David, when he was returning from his victory over Goliath, and celebrated the praises of king Saul for his victories over the Philistines (*1 Sam. xviii. 6, 7*). This lyric poetry, which took a religious tone and direction from the religious character of the people, was carried to perfection by David. That monarch, as well as the poets and singers at his court, composed sacred songs for use in the solemnities of worship (*Section xxviii.*); and before all others, David breathed forth his deep religious feeling, his thoroughly pious soul, in the lyric echoes of his sacred poetry. The deepest devotion, the loftiest inspiration, the most solemn majesty, form the essential character

of these songs, and no nation on earth has anything worthy of being placed by the side of them. The spirit of God himself breathes in these holy lyrics, and lifts the soul to its Creator as on eagles' wings. After the time of David, didactic poetry made its appearance; and intelligence, practical wisdom and mental dexterity were stamped in the words of sages. Solomon presents himself as a master in this kind of poetry (1 Kings iv. 29-34), and his court was the arena for those who took pleasure in uttering proverbs. This species of poetry also was specially religious, and thus obtained its peculiar beauty. Another kind of didactic poetry is offered to our notice in the book of Job; it has for its object the justification of God in his government of the world, and accordingly bears a genuine religious stamp. As a separate kind is the prophetic poetry to be regarded, which, having more of a rhetorical character, appears in a very peculiar form. It constitutes the special sacred oratory of the Hebrews; for the prophetic speeches, for the most part, address the people with exhortation, warning, menace, and consolation; and with great force, overpowering feeling, and deeply-cutting severity, deal with the vices and transgressions of the nation, the political and religious relations of the times, the fears and hopes of the future, and the promises and threatenings which the prophets, led by the spirit of God, announce in the way of predictions. The form of these addresses is rhythmical, the diction poetical; lyric and didactic poetry are united, and often alternately, often unitedly, give their colours to the fiery language of the prophet. Lyric poetry, after the Exile, maintained itself in youthful strength, since, less dependent on public life, it was at home on religious ground, and therefore, after the Captivity, put forth its creative power in many beautiful psalms; but alienation from religious belief and growing scepticism brought ruin on didactic poetry. The contents as well as the form found in Ecclesiastes, which is prosaic, give evidence to the fact; yet, at a later time, it produced in Sirach a fair and strong offspring. Prophetic poetry sank more and more after the Exile, and died when it no longer found nutriment in the life of the people, and religious inspiration failed. Malachi, in consequence, is properly termed the seal of the prophets.

If, then, we wish to arrange all the poetical books of the Canon, according to the species of poetry to which they belong, we have as follows:—1. Lyric poetry, comprising the greater part of the Psalms, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and the Canticles; the last but one belong to elegiac and the last to erotic poetry: for that, in the Augustan age of the Hebrew people, love and wine were celebrated in song, and, in banquets, song enhanced joyous festivity, appears from the following passages, namely, Isa. v. 12, xxiv. 8-11; Amos vi. 5. 2. Didactic

poetry, of which species are Job, some Psalms, the Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes. And, lastly, 3. Prophetic poetry, in which class stand the sixteen prophets, who, however, have many prosaic parts containing mere narrations.

The peculiarity of the Hebrew poetry before mentioned, consisting in the measure of the parts or members of a verse, bears the name of *Parallelism*, or *Parallelism of members*, because the separate parts correspond to each other, go forward in substance and form side by side, and are divided from each other only by a cæsura or dropping of the voice. Each verse consists at least of two such parts or members. The thought expressed in the first member is either repeated in the second in different words, in order to express it more pointedly and definitely, or it is illustrated and made more impressive by a contrast. Critics have enumerated the following kinds of parallelisms—1. the synonymous, which gives in different words the same thought in both members (Ps. viii. 5, civ. 33; Gen. iv. 23; Job vi. 5, vii. 1); 2. the antithetic, in which the second member contains an opposition or contrast to the thought uttered in the first (Prov. xiv. 11, xv. 1, 2, 8, 13, 19); 3. the synthetic, which contains a new thought in the second member, yet so that in form and construction it corresponds to the first member (Ps. xviii. 40, xix. 8); 4. the merely rhythmical parallelism, which has no correspondence in the thought, but allows the sense to go forward, so that the verse is merely in form divided into two halves (Ps. iii. 3; Lament. i. 6, 10, 13, 17). Besides these simple kinds of parallelism, there are compound kinds, especially in the Prophets, in which the discourse becomes less regular, e. g., 1, when one member is too short as compared with the other (Hos. iv. 17; Ps. civ. 35, lxviii. 31); 2, when the verse has three members, two of which stand in contrast with the third (Ps. xxxvi. 7, xxxvii. 34, xl. x.); 3, when the verse has four members, of which the first corresponds to the third and the second to the fourth (Ps. xxxi. 11, xxxv. 26, xxxvii. 14; Amos i. 2, 3, iv. 4); and 4, when the verse has three members, all of which are parallel (Ps. i. 1, xxxvi. 5). Other compound kinds will be readily found by the attentive reader, for the species of parallelism variously modify themselves, and in living speech new forms ever arise, yet in such a way that the essential type is never lost. In the original tongue the separate members are denoted by accents, that is, by punctuation; the chief members are divided by a greater, the inferior by a less, point.

The delivery of the Hebrew songs was a sort of recitative, resembling the chant employed in the liturgical services of our churches and cathedrals. The singing was interrupted by music on the harp. The word *Selah* probably marks the place at which the singers were to

stop, in order that the instruments might come in; on which account the Seventy translated it by a word which signifies an intervening song, *διψαλμα*.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

Section XLI.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AND AUTHORSHIP.

It contains the history of Job, a rich and pious patriarch of the land of Uz, between Palestine and the Euphrates, in Arabia, who loses all his property, and is seized by an incurable disorder, the black leprosy, or elephantiasis; but, in the midst of his afflictions, remains faithful to God (i., ii.). Thereon follows the kernel of the book, namely, the conversation of Job with his three friends, Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar (iii.-xxxv.), who are at last joined by a fourth, Elihu (xxxvii.-xxxviii.). The subject of the discourses which ensue is the fate of Job. In the end, Job receives from the Almighty double of what he has lost (xxxviii.-xli.). The aim of the whole is to show that we often do not understand the divine appointments, but ought to submit ourselves calmly to them, and not waver in our trust in God.

The commencement (i., ii.) and the end (xli. 7-17) are in prose, the rest is didactic poetry. The contents and the plan of the whole exhibit a narrative wrought up into a noble didactic poem. The prevailing conviction, that only the sinful and the godless are unhappy, while the virtuous and pious are always the reverse, has been often contradicted by experience. Often have the innocent and the pious had to suffer, and the wicked and the base been prosperous until their end. Hence arises the question, how the divine justice stands in regard to this fact. Our author gives an answer. Job is a thoroughly guiltless sufferer. He begins with a curse on the day of his birth, and complains that God punishes innocence in him. His three friends represent the common view, namely, that a just man never can be unfortunate, and that, in consequence, since Job suffers, he must have sinned. They add, that he can regain peace only by repentance and a new life. Job, on the other hand, asserts and defends his innocence in the most touching manner, paints his sufferings, charges his friends with want of regard, and, hurried on by their opposition, declares at last that he perishes unjustly; that while the godless is always prosperous, the pious man is

oppressed. He remains the conqueror. The form of the dialogue thus far is the following: Each of the three friends, excepting the last, speaks three times, in this order,—first Eliphaz, then Bildad, and lastly Zophar. Zophar speaks only twice. To each Job gives a reply. When Job has gained the victory, a fourth speaker, namely, Elihu, appears. He, receiving no reply from Job, discourses uninterruptedly, endeavouring to confute, now Job, now his friends, and bringing forward many excellent things which had been passed over. He says, for example, that suffering is often sent by God for man's trial and improvement; and that we may contract sin unawares. After him, God himself appears in a storm, and by a number of questions respecting the universe, nature, and the government of the world, which Job cannot answer, he brings him to acknowledge his rashness in imputing blame to divine providence. Job promises to believe and to suffer in patience. Thereupon God reproves the three friends, and rewards Job for his innocent endurance by restoring to him twofold what he had lost. Here we find an entirely new solution of the great problem respecting the allotment of good and ill.

The style, lofty in itself, is connected with what is most beautiful in the bloom of Hebrew literature, and has a special resemblance to the Proverbs of Solomon. Nevertheless, several Chaldaic forms present themselves; the idea of Satan appears here for the first time. The writer is acquainted with Arabia, where he places the scene of his work; with Egypt, whence he takes pictures and natural descriptions; as well as with Palestine and the entire Hebrew mode of thought. In consequence, the most various views and judgments have been spoken respecting the place where, the time when, and the person by whom, the work was composed.

The entire character of the book is best explained by ascribing it to an Israelite dwelling in Palestine, who lived on the borders of the golden and the silver age of the Hebrew language, that is, about the time of the Captivity. Such a one may most easily have been acquainted with Egypt, Arabia, Palestine, and even the Persian doctrine on which rests the representation given of Satan (i. 6, seq., ii. 1, seq.), and of angels (iv. 18, v. 1, xxxiii. 23). The description of Egyptian natural wonders (xl. 10, seq., 20, seq.), shows that the writer did not know them from his own inspection. Moreover, the author was not a priest, a Levite, or a prophet, since there is no trace in the book of either the priestly or the theocratic spirit. The writer follows his own free, divinely-given conviction, and sets himself in opposition to the sacerdotal doctrine of equal retribution. As Ezekiel was acquainted with Job (xiv. 14, 20), and places him in union with Noah and Daniel,

the prophet must have known our book, or the history from which it was composed. Job is also mentioned in Tobit (ii. 12, 14), and James (v. 11). Hence has arisen a sharp controversy as to whether or not Job was an historical person. No doubt, his didactic is our author's main object; but there is no tenable ground for denying that he employed for the purpose the real history of a pious person who was much afflicted.

Section XLII.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE BOOK OF JOB.

Various attacks have been made on the prologue and epilogue, which, as we have stated, are written in prose. It has been maintained that they are additions by a later hand, chiefly because in the former we find Satan, who here appears in a different character from what he generally has in the Bible, inasmuch as he is a servant of God, from whom he receives a commission. But without the prologue the whole could not be understood, and the epilogue is necessary in order to give a satisfactory conclusion to the poem. Now Satan appears in the book in the light which was occasioned by the doctrine of Zoroaster as found in the *Zendavesta*. He is a wicked angel, whose abode is among the good angels near God. His name signifies an adversary, since from him come accusations and calumnies against the pious, misfortune, and evil, which cannot be ascribed to God himself, who is holy and good. The later development of the doctrine concerning Satan represents him as the opponent of God, as cast out of the kingdom of good spirits, and as consigned to everlasting punishment: but what we may hold as Christian truth in the matter, according to the words of the Saviour, must not in full be looked for in the Old Testament, and least of all in that part of it where the doctrine makes its first appearance.

The object of the entire book is clearly to supply a view for the justification of the ways of God to man, different from that which is commonly received (Section xli.), and is often set forth in the Psalms (xxxvii., xlix., lxxiii.). The new doctrine is, that it is presumptuous on the part of man to permit himself to pronounce a decided opinion respecting the ways of Providence, the designs of the Almighty in the world, and specially the causes of good and bad fortune. All refinements of inquiry and all doubts must sink in humility before the thought of an Omniscient and Omnipotent Governor of the World. Acquiescence in his wise counsels and will, is man's sole duty. If to this view we add

the Christian idea of the fatherly love of God and of future recompence after death, we possess the most perfect means for tranquillity in every doubt regarding the often dark ways of God, especially in cases of undeserved misfortune. But without this Christian doctrine the last ground for trust and peace fails, for the thought of a resistless power and wisdom only beats down our doubts, without removing them.

The speeches of Elihu (xxxii.-xxxvii.) were very probably added by a later writer; for—1. The language of these speeches is essentially different from the language of the other parts of the book; the style is diffuse and tame, and the poetry much inferior. 2. Job replies to none of Elihu's speeches; a fact which is opposed to the plan of the whole, since Job is intended to prove victorious over human opponents. 3. In these speeches many things are anticipated which belong to the discourse of the Almighty, and are found there (xxxiii. 12, 13, xxxvii. 14, seq.—comp. xxxviii. 12, seq.). 4. These speeches interrupt the natural connexion, namely, Job's request that God should appear (xxxi. 35), and the actual appearance of God (xxxviii. 1). 5. Neither in the introduction nor at the close is mention made of Elihu. If, however, a later poet has interposed this passage, it certainly contains many excellent thoughts bearing on the question at issue.

THE PSALMS.

Section XLIII.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AND AUTHORSHIP.

They form a collection of 150 religious lyric poems, divided into five books: the first from Psalm i. to xli.; the second from xlii. to lxxii.; the third from lxxiii. to lxxxix.; the fourth from xc. to evi.; the fifth from cvii. to cl.—mostly composed by David: and as to their substance, they are,—1. Strictly songs of praise to God, as the creator and governor (viii., civ., cxlv.), as deliverer (xviii., xxx., xlvi., xlvii.), as the eternal (xc.), as omnipresent and omniscient (cxxxix.); 2. Moral and religious odes, expressive of trust in God (xxiii., lxii., exxv.), resignation (xvi.), longing for the temple worship (xlii., xliii., lxiii.), forgiveness (xxxii., li.), happiness of the pious (i., xxxiv., cxxviii.); 3. Lamentation, on the part of individuals (vii., xvii., xxii., lii. lvi.), on the unhappy condition of the nation (xliv., lxxiv., lxxix., lxxx., cxxxvii.), re-

specting the wicked (x., xii., xiv., xxxvi.), and connected therewith, the justification of God (xxxvii., xlix., lxxiii.); 4. Temple odes (xxiv., cxxii., cxxxii.); 5. Poems addressed to monarchs (xxi., xlv., cx.); and 6. Historical songs (lxxviii., cv., cvi., cxiv.). Under the odes of lamentation, and those addressed to monarchs, are the messianic psalms.

The Hebrew name for the whole collection is תהלים (*Tehillim*), that is, *Songs of Praise*, so called from the chief contents. The ode considered separately is called מזמור (*Mizmor*), or *Song for the Harp*; hence the Greek ψαλμός, from ψάλλειν; and the Greek name for the collection, ψαλτήριον, *psalter*, or *harp*, used figuratively, as in modern times the word *lyre*, denoting a collection of poems intended to be accompanied by music. The term *psalm* accordingly signifies properly a poem to be sung to the lyre or harp.

Among Christians the Psalms have always been accounted the most important book of the Old Testament, for they contain the loftiest and holiest ideas respecting God and his government, speak to our deepest feelings of devotion and resignation, awaken and sustain the most unshaken trust in God, fill the soul with a sacred hatred of sin, and lead to contrition and true conversion of soul. The greatest religious poets, for instance Klopstock, have learnt from them and written after their model. They are the flower of the Hebrew poetry, and the religious sentiment has in them its most worthy and most elevated expression. The diction is perfectly correspondent to the matter, full of lofty beauty, holy power, rapt inspiration, overflowing fulness, and often in the most excellent and impressive images utters holy truth directly to the heart. If anywhere, certainly here breathes the spirit of God in sacred and sanctifying power.

David takes the first position as an author of the Psalms. His life, so full of movement and experience, gave him the most varied occasions for composing poems of the kind. He is the master and the model in this species of writing. In the headings, seventy-four psalms are ascribed to David. These headings are indeed of later origin than the odes themselves; but they were in existence before the Septuagint, and critics have certainly gone too far when they denied to David the authorship of Psalms for which they found no occasion in the historical information preserved to us respecting that poet. It is easy to believe that, in such a life as his, many events occurred of which no historical record has come down to these remote days. In order, however, the better to understand David's psalms, his life has been divided into three periods,—1. His residence in the court of Saul, where a hostile set of courtiers envied, hated, and opposed him as an upstart—one of these enemies is named “Cush, the Benjamite” (vii. 1—comp. xiii. 3, 5); psalms which

belong to this period are iv., v., xi., xii., xvii., xxxv., xli., lv., lxiv., &c. 2. His persecution by Saul, when he was in continual danger of his life (comp. 1 Sam. xix.-xxxv.); at this time were written vi., xxii., xxx., xxxi., xl., lxvi., &c.: they all have more of an elegiac character, and belong to the psalms of lamentation. 3. The period of his royal dignity (li., iii., xviii., also viii., xix., xx.). We can with certainty deny him the authorship of those psalms only which contain clear references to the Captivity, e. g. xiv., lxix. 36). Later collectors clearly put their conjectures as headings to several psalms, and thus anonymous psalms were attributed to David, since he was the most productive and the most celebrated lyric poet. When then, in Acts iv. 25, and Heb. iv. 7, such psalms, still found in our collection, are ascribed to David, this arose from the writers following the general use in language, whereby all psalms were cited under the name of David, or were considered as having been written by him.

The following writers of psalms were contemporary with David,—
 1. Asaph, a poet and prophet, by birth a Levite (1 Chron. xvi. 4, 5; 2 Chron. xxix., xxx.). He wrote twelve psalms, namely, l. and lxxiii.-lxxxiii. He was distinguished as a didactic poet (l.). 2. The sons of Korah, a levitical family of songsters (1 Chron. vi. 33, ix. 19, xxvi. 1). Their psalms are among the finest, being characterised for feeling and beautiful original figures. They produced xlii.-xlix. and lxxxiv., lxxxv., lxxxvii. 3. Heman (lxxxviii.) and Ethan (lxxxix.). Both were sages, and by their wisdom they acquired repute for their proverbs (1 Chron. xv. 19; 1 Kings iv. 31). Besides these we may mention Solomon, to whom psalms lxxii. and cxxvii. are ascribed. The former, however, seems to have been attributed to him because he is the subject of it. Moses wrote psalm xc. Of forty-two psalms, no author is given.

As to the time when the Psalms were composed, the oldest, with the exception of that which is ascribed to Moses, are those which David wrote; many belong to the period of the Kings and the Prophets, still more to the era of the Captivity, when the Jews were celebrated for sacred song among their captors (cxxxvii.); others, lastly, must be referred to the time immediately following the Exile. Against the notion that some were written still later, for instance, in the age of the Maccabees, stands the purity of the language, the position of the Psalter in the Canon, and the circumstance that many of such psalms are ascribed to David,—a fact which, at so late a time, was no longer possible, since the Septuagint has these headings. Nor is the reference of such psalms to the times of persecution under Antiochus of Syria necessary; on the contrary, it is often more natural and certain to refer them to the destruction of the Temple under Nebuchadnezzar (xliv., lxxiv., lxxix.).

The collection of the Psalms was gradually formed, and arose out of several smaller collections. This is evidenced by the circumstance that one psalm occurs twice (xiv. and liii.), another is a part of a longer composition (lxx.—comp. xl. 13, seq.). The first collection took place about the time of the Exile, when scarcely any but David's were taken. Hence the first book (i.-xli.). To this was added the second collection as the second book (to lxxii.). These two formed the original collection, which ended with the words, "the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended" (lxxii. 20). Afterwards there were added the three ensuing collections, as a third, fourth, and fifth book (to lxxxix., to cvi., and to cl.). The division into five books may have been imitated from the Pentateuch. Each book was closed with a doxology. A generally pervading plan is, with such a manner of formation, not possible; for if, at first, they put together psalms that emanated from one poet, yet, afterwards, others were subjoined, written by the same hand, which, without disturbing the original arrangement, were taken into later books, or were added to such psalms as were already set in order. In consequence, there stand together first those composed by David, excepting a few that are anonymous (i.-xli.); then come those of the sons of Korah (xlii.-xlix.), then, again, some by David (li.-lxxii.), then Asaph's (lxxiii.-lxxxiii.), and so forth.

Section XLIV.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE PSALMS.

The headings of the Psalms give not only the poet, but also the species of poetry, the occasion or the melody (the tune), and the purpose of the ode. These headings were in part not understood by the Seventy; consequently their translation is commonly unsuitable. Luther, in this, is often not to be understood.

The kind of poetry is indicated by the words,—1. Psalm, *Mismor*, that is, "a song"—this is the common appellation (iii., iv., v., vi., viii.); 2. *Maschil*, properly "a poem" (xxxii., xlii., li., liii.); 3. *Tephillah*, "a prayer" (xvii., lxxxvi., xc.); 4. *Shir*, "an ode" (lxv., lxxvii., lxxviii., lxxxiii., lxxxvii., lxxxviii., cviii.); 5. *Mismor Lethodah*, "a thanksgiving" (ci.); 6. *Tehillah*, "a thanksgiving" (cxlv.); 7. *Shir Hemoluth*, "a song of the higher court," that is, "a song of degrees" (cxx., seq.); 8. "*Shiggaion* of David," which Luther translated "David's innocence," but which probably means "an elegy of David" (vii.); and,

9. *Michtam*, denoting probably a mere writing by David (xvi., lvi., lvii., lxxxviii., lix.). These descriptions were, doubtless, characteristic originally, but we no longer have a clear conception of their differences.

The occasions of the writing of the Psalms which are given, are mainly of an historical character. Thus, psalms iii., vii., xviii., xxxiv., li., liv., lvi., lix., lxiii., cxlii. Another occasion was the solemnisation of the sabbath (xcii.); again, another is a season of affliction (cii.).

The melody and musical purpose which is often indicated in the heading has occasioned the greatest misunderstanding. In psalm xxii. we have *To the chief Musician upon Aijeleth Shahar*: the last words should be rendered "according to the hind of the dawn," by which is intended the melody indicated by the initial words of another ode, the tune of which was to be employed. The "hind of the dawn" is the sun, which, in Arabie, is poetically designated "a gazelle." At the head of psalms xlv., lx., lxix., and lxxx., we find the word *Shushan*, and in the plural *Shoshannim*. *Shushan* signifies "a lily," and is supposed here to denote a musical instrument which may have derived its name from its shape. In lvi. we have *Jonath-clem-rechokim*, that is, "the dove of the distant Terebinths," denoting the melody to be used by giving the first words of another ode. At the head of psalms lvii., lviii., lix., we find *Al-tuschith*, "destroy not," whereby is signified the tune of a poem which began with the words *Al-tuschith*. Over psalm ix. are the words *Muth-labben*, that is, "the manner of maidens," which again assigns the tune to which the ode was to be sung. Sometimes the musical instrument is intended, as in v., *upon Nehiloth*, that is, "the flute;" in liii., *upon Mahalath*, that is, "a lute;" in lxxxviii., *upon Mahalath Leannoth*, which Luther rendered "the weakness of the wretched," and which may signify "the sickness of the harassed," referring to the subject-matter—comp. liii.; in vi., *Neginoth Sheminith*, "on the harp with eight strings," or "on the octave-harp," that is, "the base." *Neginoth* often occurs (iv., vi., liv., lv., lxi.), and signifies either, in general, "a stringed instrument," or, specifically, "a harp;" *Gittith* (viii., lxxxi., lxxxiv.) denotes a musical instrument, perhaps one invented or specially used in Gath. *Jeduthan* (xxxix.) is the name of a music-master, and *Selah* signified "a pause" in the vocal music, so as to give opportunity for the instruments to come in (ix. 17, xcii. 4).

The psalms of degrees (cxi.-cxxxiv.) are distinguished by a rhythmical peculiarity. The ideas proceed after the manner of steps. The following verse repeats the last words of the preceding. This is most observable in cxi., cxxiv., and cxxix. The name of these fifteen psalms has its reason in this peculiarity, which thus takes up and carries on the thought or expression of the previous verse, inasmuch as each

successive idea gives the reader a lift as by a step (or degree) on to another.

The penitential psalms are these: vi., xxxii., xxxviii., li., cii., cxxx., cxliii. This selection was made in the ancient Christian church for the purposes of its penitential discipline. Contrite persons, who were desirous of being received back into the bosom of the church, and, in consequence, submitted themselves to ecclesiastical punishment, were required to repeat these seven psalms on seven consecutive days.

The Messianic psalms.—Several psalms contain obvious allusions to the sufferings and the glory of the Saviour; on which account the Jews referred them to the Messiah, and the New Testament applies them to Christ. They have been divided into these two classes: 1. Such as announced the sufferings and death of the Saviour (xvi., xxii., xl.—comp. Acts ii. 25, and xiii. 34, seq.; Matt. xxvii. 46; John xix. 24; Heb. x. 5-7); and 2. Such as describe his power and majesty (ii., xlv., lxxii., cx.—comp. Acts iv. 25, 33; Heb. i. 5, 8, 9; Matt. xxii. 41; Heb. v. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Acts ii. 34). A distinction has here been made between the original meaning, that meaning, that is, which the writer himself connected with the words, and the meaning which besides lies in the words through the mysterious working of the holy spirit, by which reference is made to Christ. To assume that the author himself had in his mind the Messiah or Christ, and consciously spoke of him, is to renounce all the laws of grammatical interpretation, and to open the door to arbitrariness. In the first class of Messianic psalms, the poet speaks in the first person, and is David. His hearers, in consequence, could not have thought of another person when he bewails his own sufferings and misfortune, and that the less because he does not give the least intimation that he meant any one but himself. Besides, the idea of the Messiah was not in existence in the time of David, but in the divine counsels it was evolved out of a retrospective comparison of the glorious days of David with the sad and hopeless present; in such a way, however, that the Jews had no idea of a restoration of the golden age under David, by means of a suffering and dying Messiah, sprung from the loins of David. Therefore, the cross of Christ was ever to them a stumbling-block and a rock of offence (1 Cor. i. 23). The original meaning of these psalms shows not the least intimation of a Messiah. On the other hand, every impartial student must find it wonderful that the descriptions often correspond altogether with the Saviour's fate, and we cannot here deny the operation of the divine spirit who puts into David's mouth, words and phrases whose obvious reference to Christ is recognised in later ages. Similar is the case with the second class of Messianic psalms. They, in their primary application, refer to

kings, the three first apparently to Solomon (ii., xlv., lxxii.), the last to David (cx.). Taken literally, they make no allusion to Christ, since worldly grandeur, corporeal qualities, prowess and conquest, and, in xlv., marriage with a foreign princess, are set forth; and mention is made of the king's wife and sons. If, looking at these things from a Christian point of view, we see images and allusions to Christ, this signification was not intended by the authors, but the New Testament directs us to what we, as Christians, are there to find, namely, the operation of the divine spirit, who, by these pictures, figuratively described the greatness and majesty of Christ. Moreover, the New Testament writers, in their references and citations, follow the Septuagint (Section iv.), and the method of interpretation which was prevalent in their times.

The doctrine of the Psalms, in their moral and religious elevation and divine truth, has been previously set forth (Section xliii.), but we must here make special reference to two points, in order to show how the revelation made in Christ is altogether different and superior: 1. The ill-wishes and curses found in some psalms are in decided opposition to the command of the Saviour (Matt. v. 44), as well as to his lofty example (Luke xxiii. 34; 1 Pet. ii. 23); and the frequently adduced apology, that the poet's enemies were the enemies of God, in no way justifies this implacable spirit before the tribunal of the Gospel (xxxi. 18, xxxv. 3-6, 8, 26, liv. 9, lix. 6, 7, lxix. 23-29, cix. 6-15, 17-20, cxxxvii. 7, cxl. 10, 11). Such expressions can never be agreeable to the divine will, and can be explained only by reference to the semi-barbarous spirit of antiquity, when revenge was not morally condemned.

The other point (2) to which we direct attention, is the doctrine respecting the under-world, whither all the dead go, and where, mere shades, destitute of feeling and recollection, they can no longer praise God, being excluded from his presence, and shut up in a land of forgetfulness (vi. 5, xxxix. 13, xlix. 19, lxiii. 9, lxxxviii., xciv. 17, cxv. 17). On this point the Gospel clearly gives very different instruction, and we feel deeply how totally unlike the Christian view respecting the world to come was that which was held by the poets who wrote the Psalms. In consequence, the references and declarations of the Psalms made in regard to these two particulars can contain no divine revelation for us.

THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON.

Section XLV.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AND AUTHORSHIP.

The book, in short weighty words, contains sayings and teachings of virtue, wisdom, and piety. The whole consists of four parts, namely, 1. A connected course of instruction given by a father to his son (i.-ix.), comprising figurative representation of the divine wisdom as a person (viii.)—wisdom and folly described as two women (ix.); 2. The first collection of Solomon's proverbs (x.-xxiv.), on the most diverse relations of life; 3. A second collection of Solomon's proverbs, put together by king Hezekiah (xxv.-xxix.), specially respecting the king (xxv., xxix.); and 4. Three appendices—that is, speeches of the wise Agur; of king Lemuel; and the eulogy of a virtuous woman (xxx., xxxi.).

The name "*Proverbs of Solomon*,"—in Hebrew *Meshalim*, from *Mashal*, "resemblance," in Greek *Παροιμίαι* ("comparisons," so in Vulg. *Parabolæ*), in Latin *Proverbia*, whence our "Proverbs,"—is taken from the commencing words, denoting "thoughtful sayings," so that the word "sentiments" rather than "proverbs" would describe the contents. The whole, excepting the connected speeches (i.-ix., xxii. 17-xxiv. 22, and xxxi. 10-31), contains mainly short, pithy, unconnected, and sometimes sharply contrasted, sayings on different relations in life, such as may ensue from deep thought and varied experience. The sphere in which they move is for the most part the middle condition of life. Warnings are given against vice as folly, and virtue and piety are recommended as wisdom. The motive is supplied by the retributory doctrine, according to which vice leads to misfortune and early death, virtue to earthly good and a long life. The theoeratical view is never seen in the book, for there is therein no trace of the law, the priesthood, and the worship. When then the morals taught in the book appear for the greater part only as the teachings of prudence, it is always in the higher and nobler sense, and the most excellent views of life, the most practical instructions, the richest experiences, are set forth. The Hebrew of the book is thoroughly pure and classical, most like that of Job, only free from Chaldaic forms, thus indicating the great antiquity of the work.

Solomon is repeatedly mentioned as the author (i. 1, x. 1, xxv. 1), and there is not the slightest ground for doubting that Solomon, who was so celebrated for his proverbial wisdom, and made so many proverbs (1 Kings iv. 32), composed the greater part of the work. At a later

time, when the proverbs of our book were collected, others that had not Solomon for their author were added, and ascribed to him as the great model in this species of writing; but this can have taken place in only a few instances; and merely the part (xxii. 17-xxiv. 22), in which prevails a closer connexion, and the short appendix (xxiv. 23-31), which in the heading (comp. xxii. 17, xxiv. 23-34) adverts to the sages as to several authors, may have been from a different source, while the following appendices (xxx., xxxi.) expressly name two new writers, Agur and Lemuel. That however the collection, as it lies before us, was gradually formed, appears from the fact that the same proverb occurs twice and sometimes thrice (comp. xiv. 31 and xvii. 5, xiv. 12 and xvi. 25, xxi. 2, xxii. 3 and xxvii. 12, xxviii. 14 and xxix. 1); also from the express declaration that king Hezekiah caused the new collection from xxv. to be formed (xxv. 1). Accordingly, the whole book, as now before us, arose by degrees and in the times of the kings. The original collection was i.-xxii. 16; thereto were added xxii. 17-xxiv. 31. Then followed Hezekiah's collection, and at last the three appendices in xxx. and xxxi., which with the introduction (i. 1-6) were latest in their origin.

Section XLVI.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON.

Agur, the son of Jakeh, who is mentioned in xxx. 1, was a sage, of whom nothing more is said in Scripture. His proverbs have in them much that is enigmatical. The name signifies *collector*; on which account many think that he gave himself this name, because he collected proverbs; but the addition which names his father seems to indicate that Agur was his personal appellation. It is peculiar to him that he mentions together three or four things that are haughty, wise, inconceivable, &c. (comp. xxx. 18, seq.). King Lemuel, also, is not again mentioned in Scripture. His name signifies *given of God*, or *devoted to God*, and many have held it to be a favourite or pet name of Solomon, given to him by his mother Bathsheba. Such an assumption is, however, arbitrary. Much more probable is it that he was a foreigner, perhaps an Arabian or an Idumean, monarch.

All proverbs have a rhythmical clothing, and consist of two parallel members, which are, now of the synonymous (xi. 7, xv. 3, 10-12, xvi. 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23), and now of the antithetic kind (x. 1, seq.). The

Easterns attached a special value to such sayings in which was uttered a practical wisdom that every one would understand. Thus still with us the wisdom of common life takes utterance in proverbs, or short pithy sentences. Most Oriental nations, in consequence, possess collections of such sayings, and the form is generally this, namely, that a sage gives his scholars instruction in such brief sentences. The sage is the father, the scholar the son. There are in Arabic and Persian two large collections of the kind; the first is called "*Proverbs of Ali*," and was published in Arabic and Latin at Oxford, in 1806, under the name of *Proverbia*; the second, called *Pent Name*, "Book of Counsel," in Persian, and was published in 1819, at Paris, by Sylvester de Sacy.

The very prominent doctrine of recompense (Section xlv.) connected with practical prudence, both of which appear here as the essence of wisdom, makes us feel strongly the difference that exists between Christian morality, which has a far holier and deeper basis in the love of God, and the morality that is taught in Solomon's Proverbs. The Old Testament doctrine, which knows nothing of that love, or of its source, the redemption through Christ, is nevertheless to be highly valued, and we must carefully distinguish between the import which the Proverbs of Solomon had originally and for Hebrew readers, and the import which we find therein as Christians, to whom the spirit of God discloses these weighty sayings in their deeper meaning, so that they only then possess eternal truth and full validity when set forth with Christian significance and feeling.

The divine wisdom, which in viii. is figuratively described as a person, who was made by God before the Creation (22-26), was his assistant in the Creation (27-30), and then descended to earth for the good of man (31-36), gave, among the later Jews, occasion to the distinct dogma of the divine reason (*Λόγος, σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ*), as we find it developed in the works of Philo of Alexandria. John, in his Gospel (i. 1-14), makes reference to it, and shows how this divine wisdom became visible on earth in the Saviour.

ECCLESIASTES.

Section XLVII.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AND AUTHORSHIP.

The author describes the nothingness and perishing nature of all earthly things, and the inconceivableness of the Divine government of the world; therewith he gives exhortations to enjoy life wisely, and to keep the commandments of God (i.-xii.).

The name *Ecclesiastes*, taken from the Septuagint Ἐκκλησιαστής, denotes properly one who addresses an assembly; hence the addition in the English translation, “or the Preacher.” Here it signifies a teacher of wisdom, who speaks in the presence of an assembly of sages. The Hebrew name is *Koheleth*, by which the book is often cited in German theological works. This Hebrew name is taken from the original, in which the work begins thus, “The words of Koheleth.” The addition, “the son of David, king in Jerusalem,” shows that Solomon is intended. The spirit of the book is that of doubt. It is much less pervaded by religious faith than any other portion of the Bible. The author stumbled at the doctrine which the book of Job makes prominent, namely, that the virtuous is not always the happy man, but his reflections brought him to the conviction that good and evil, as well as all earthly things, are vain, and that, in consequence, and in the uncertainty of what happens to man after death (iii. 21), the enjoyment of life, and the use of our natural resources (ii. 24, iii. 12, 22, v. 17, viii. 15, ix. 7, seq.), is the best and wisest course that man can pursue. His considerations touching the inconceivableness of the divine government of the world (viii. 17, 18) involve him in contradictions (ix. 2, seq.), from which it follows that man should enjoy the good and bear the evil, since no one knows how long he may live (ix. 7, seq.), and that also he should fear God and keep his commandments, since at some time God will call man to account (xi. 9, xii. 1). A fixed and steadily pursued plan is not visible in the work, but the writer yields himself to his reflections, all of which run on the main idea, namely, that “all is vanity.” The different utterances of the author appear to have been written down at different times and for different purposes; for sometimes his opinions contradict each other (iii. 20, 21, xii. 7, 14); in some passages he appears dissatisfied with God and with fate (iii. 14, 18, vi. 2, 8, 12, vii. 15, viii. 10, 14, 17, ix. 2, 3); in others he is sorrowful at the sight of undeserved sufferings (ii. 22, 23, iv. 1, 2, v. 15, 16); in others, again,

he exhorts men to fear God and keep his commands (v. 1-6, viii. 12, xii. 1): in some passages he praises wisdom (vii. 11, 12, 19, viii. 1, ix. 16); in others, he characterises it as useless and vain (i. 17, 18, ii. 14, 16, 21, seq.). Nevertheless, the book contains a treasure of excellent observations on life, and the close of the whole shows how the writer, in all his doubts and complaints, never allows himself to go astray in regard to a God-fearing deportment, and the commendation of true piety (xii. 13, 14). The language stands midway between poetry and prose, inclining much to the latter. It is full of Chaldee and Syriac forms; even Persian words present themselves; so that the book betrays the late period of its composition.

The formation of the book can, therefore, by no means be ascribed to Solomon. Indeed, its spirit is thoroughly dissimilar to that which prevails in the proverbs written by that monarch. Moreover, we find passages which contradict that opinion, for the author makes Solomon speak of his rule and his kingdom as something past and gone, something no longer in existence (i. 12, ii. 7, viii. 2), and even speaks of him in the third person (xii. 9, seq.): also the spirit of doubt, and the entire view of life in the book, direct us to the time when Sadduceism was rising, and direct us in so decided a manner, that the origin of the work in the Persian, perhaps even the Macedonian, period is generally acknowledged. There begun to prevail in this era the custom of publishing writings under the name of distinguished men. Thus among the heathen, we have the supposititious writings of Zoroaster, Pythagoras, and Orpheus; among the Jews, Daniel, and, at a later time, the Wisdom of Solomon and the book of Enoch. The unknown author of our work, in a similar manner, put his sayings into the mouth of Solomon, since the doctrine of the vanity of all earthly happiness and all earthly things, even of wisdom itself, would make so much deeper impression, when spoken by a monarch that had enjoyed such brilliant prosperity.

Section XLVIII.—OBSERVATIONS ON ECCLESIASTES.

Viewed in a Christian light, all the doctrines of the book are not of equal value. Luther complained of its sceptical character (*Forrede zum Cohelet*, Th. 14). The Jews also took offence thereat, and the later Jewish teachers gave an injunction that no one should read the book before he was thirty years of age; nay, they asserted that many Rabbis had wished to exclude it from the Canon, as it contained wavering doc-

trines, and inclined to the side of the heathen and the heretics, that is, the Sadducees. Others gave the opinion that probably it was to be taken ironically. The description of the perishableness of all things (i., ii.), the excellent observations on life and practical rules (iv. 17-v. 16, vii., xi. 9, xii. 1, 13, 14), will, however, always be of value among Christians; but in many views and injunctions given in the book, it is necessary to advert to the distinction between what is there taught, and the Christian view of existence, and to restrict the expressions and doctrine of the work within the limits of Christian truth. Of this kind is the frequent and almost unlimited encouragement given to sensuous enjoyments (ii. 24, iii. 12, 22, v. 17, viii. 15, ix. 7, xi. 9), though afterwards there follows a wise reference to the judgment of God (xi. 9). Further, the doubt of the immortality of the soul (iii. 21), and the statement that man and beasts have the same fate in death (iii. 19), that good and bad men suffer alike (ix. 2, seq.), and that after death all is over (ix. 5, 6, 10),—nay, that men ought not to be too just, wise or pious (vii. 16), nor yet too wicked,—require to be rectified, and may the more easily be so, because the better convictions of the author (xii. 7, 13, 14) afford the Christian the needful opportunity.

A certain art in handling and expounding the Bible has been made manifest in connexion with this book. By skilful contrivances, efforts have been made to modify and put right the original sense of the words, as may well or ill bring them into a certain harmony with the doctrine of the Gospel, and as much as possible conceal or remove what is offensive to Christian feeling. But such a proceeding is neither upright nor honourable, nor can it really maintain the true honour and worth of the sacred writings. Let us simply acknowledge how high the Gospel stands above the Old Testament, and that the conclusions and views of life which we owe to the revelation in Christ are, in all points, neither to be sought for nor found in this Old Testament writer. This is far better than to feign for and ascribe to him Christian thoughts, Christian feelings, and Christian doctrines. What, however, he has and gives of everlasting divine truth, and in proportion as the divine spirit of truth imparted to him rays of light, that may and must be ever acknowledged, and, with thanks to “the Father of lights,” be employed as his revelation. The Gospel remains in all things the test and the judge.

THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

Section XLIX.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AND AUTHORSHIP.

The book contains a series of disconnected songs or idylls, in which true love is described under images and comparisons (i.-viii.). The scene is partly at Solomon's court in Jerusalem, partly in the country near Lebanon.

The name "*Song of Solomon*" is taken from the English translation of the first words in Hebrew, which run,—“The Song of Songs, which is Solomon's” (i. 1). In Hebrew, the name is *Shir hashirim*, “The Song of Songs,” that is, the most excellent songs. In a similar way, and in imitation of the Septuagint, the Vulgate has *Canticum Canticorum*, whence our *Canticles*. In German, the title is *Hoheslied* (“The Sublime Song”), which was chosen by Luther in reference to the allegorical import of the work. The language is not purely lyrical. It often describes and paints in the manner of idylls. The whole is the only specimen that has reached us of the lyric erotic poetry of the Hebrews. The images and descriptions are full of the glowing feeling and the brilliant fancy of the east, and are sometimes offensive to our taste (iv. 4, 5, vi. 4, 5, vii. 2-5, 8, 9); at the same time, the love is purely moral, faithful and inward (vi. 3, 8, 9, vii. 11, viii. 1, 2, 6, 7). The chief persons are Sulamith (vi. 12), a shepherdess carried away into the palace of Solomon, and her lover, a shepherd, to whom she is faithful, and to whom she is at last again united (viii. 6, 7). The division of the whole into separate songs has its difficulty, since the chapters have no reference thereunto. But the following is probably the right division:—

IDYLL.

- | | |
|-------|--|
| I. | i. 2-8.—The desire of a maiden for her beloved among the shepherds. |
| II. | i. 9-ii. 7.—An alternating song of the two lovers. |
| III. | ii. 8-17.—Visit of the lover to his mistress in a vineyard, where he invites her to come forth and enjoy the spring. |
| IV. | iii. 1-5.—The maiden seeks her lover in the city during the night. |
| V. | iii. 6-11.—An epithalamium in honour of Solomon. |
| VI. | iv. 1-v. 1.—An alternating song of the two lovers, in which the male specially praises the charms of the female. |
| VII. | v. 2-vi. 3.—The maiden seeks her friend in the night, and asks the daughters of Jerusalem to aid her in her search. |
| VIII. | vi. 4-9.—The lover praises the beauty of the maiden, and extols her as the finest of all in the king's court. |

IDYLL.

- IX. vi. 10-viii. 4.—An alternating song, in which the lover calls his mistress into a nut-garden, and eulogises her charms, while she invites him to fly to her mother's in the country.
- X. viii. 5-7.—The lovers come out of the desert and are united. Encouragement to fast and faithful love.
- XI. viii. 8-12.—Self-protecting innocence, which needs neither castle, doors, nor watchmen.

The last verses (viii. 13, 14) appear to be fragments, and to stand in no connexion here.

The whole seems to be the production of one author, and has this striking peculiarity, that while the language, by frequent Chaldaisms, directs the thoughts to the later age of Hebrew literature, the fresh life and the images and allusions in the work carry the student back to the age of Solomon.

Hence the determination of the age of the poem has great difficulty. That Solomon himself, as the heading states, is the author, may well be doubted, for he is not the hero, since he is spoken of eulogistically in the third person (iii. 7, seq.). It is probable that a shepherd in Solomon's age was the poet, and that at an early time it was ascribed to Solomon, as he is often mentioned, and the scene is in part in his palace; and as, also, he is known to be familiar with and favourable to such compositions. His name, however, was the occasion of the poems being received into the Canon. The Chaldaic or Syrian forms are best accounted for on the supposition that the shepherd who wrote it lived at the foot of Lebanon, and therefore near Syria, so that Syriaisms in his mouth are natural and easy of explanation.

Section L.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

The assumption of a love-song into the sacred Canon long since occasioned suspicion, and called forth attempts at explanation. In the Jewish church recourse was had to allegory, and it was declared that the book spoke of the love of Jehovah towards the Jewish people. From the Jews the allegorical method of explanation passed over to the Christians, who maintained that it was the love of Christ for his church. This view was rejected by Luther, who, assuming a political allegory, made it refer to the happy consequences of Solomon's reign.

Still later the work was taken for a prophetic description of the history of the Christian church, and even for a song sung by the angels at the sepulchre of Christ.

Herder was among the first to bring back the literal interpretation, and to show how unsuitable was allegory of any kind. Some recent expositors, e. g. Hengstenberg, have gone back to the old view. The Herrnhuters borrowed their imagery of Christ specially from the Canticles. Against the allegorical import are these considerations,—1. If the Old Testament, especially the Prophets, describe the relation of God to the Jewish people, under the figure of a marriage, yet is the idea something quite different, for here the question is not of a wedded relation and wedded fidelity, but of the love of a young man and a young woman. 2. If in the New Testament (Matt. ix. 15, xxv. 1, 5; Mark ii. 19; Luke v. 34; John iii. 29), Christ names himself a bridegroom, yet the allegory is perfectly clear; but he never alludes to the Song of Solomon, or adopts any of its figures, or applies it in any way to himself. 3. The allegorical explanation is thoroughly arbitrary, as experience shows; for the Canticles have been made to mean the most diverse things, and no two allegorical expounders agree. 4. Some expressions and images in the poem applied to Christ, contain what is unworthy and offensive. How, for instance, do the declarations of love suit the lips of Christ or God? (iv. 1-15, vi. 5, 7, vii. 2-14,) and how can such descriptions as may be found in v. 11-16, suit the holy person of the Saviour? Appeal has been made to a Mohammedan sect, the Sufis, who set forth the union of the pious with God under very sensuous images, and in doing so carry what is offensive much further; but the Bible knows nothing of such distorted extravagance.

As, then, the allegorical explanation is unsuitable and untenable, so the literal interpretation is in no way dishonourable to the Bible. For true inner love, as is this, being morally pure, is conformable to the holy will of God, as marriage itself, and finds here, in the re-union of the pair, the evidence of the divine approval (viii. 5-7). If Jewish Rabbis have determined that the book should not be read by any one under thirty years of age, the reason is, that youth may find moral injury in some of the descriptions; but the same is the case with many other passages of Holy Writ, and yet they are not, on that account, excluded from the Canon. The misuse which may arise, is no reason for casting anything aside as useless.

III.—THE PROPHETIC BOOKS.

Section LI.—ON THE PROPHETIC OFFICE GENERALLY.

While the historical books of the Old Testament, in their narratives, unroll to us the past, and show how, under the divine guidance, the later condition of the world gradually arose, and specially how the Mosaic theocracy was developed and kept alive during various fates; the prophetic books, on their part, conduct us immediately into the present, place before us the personal activity of those men of God who, filled with the divine spirit, and engaged in actual life, are in holy Scripture described by the name of Prophets.

Their Hebrew appellation, נָבִיא (*Nabi*), signifies properly a man inspired of God, one by means of whom God makes known his will. They are also called the messengers of God, men of God, and seers. They received the last name because they saw divine truth and the future from a more lofty position. The word "prophet" (*fore-shower*) was chosen by the Septuagint because, from their divine gifts, the prophets foresaw and foretold things to come. The power by which they were actuated was the spirit of God (Isa. xlii. 1, xlviii. 16—comp. 1 Sam. xvi. 13; 2 Kings ii. 15). Therefore the prophet is also called "the man of the spirit," or "the spiritual man" (Hos. ix. 7), and the following expressions are used of their prophetic inspiration: "The spirit of God came upon him" (1 Sam. x. 10); "The word of Jehovah came unto Ezekiel" (Ezek. i. 3, xxxvii. 1; 2 Kings iii. 15); "Jehovah spake to me with a strong hand" (Isa. viii. 11).

As to what concerns their agency, they formed a special class, separate from, and often opposed to, the priests, having far more culture than they, and in word and deed operating immediately on actual life. Wherever they found themselves, wherever they were led by the spirit, there they came forward, uttering instructions, rebukes, and warnings. They delivered their message before the people, the king, in the courts of the temple, in cities and villages, in the market and in the palace. Their mission was to see that the theocracy was kept pure, in its general relations, in particulars, within and without. In consequence, they took supervision of the external relations of the state, as well as its internal misdeeds, embracing the moral and religious transgressions both of monarch and people. They presented themselves, accordingly, —1. As heralds and watchmen over the theocratic faith. As such they

sternly rebuked apostacy from the living God, idolatry, unbelief, superstition, contempt of the law, and threatened the guilty with divine punishments, by defeat in battle, conquest and devastation of the country, capture and exile. 2. As preachers of repentance and morality. With dauntless openness and resistless power they lashed, not merely the grosser crimes, as unchastity, revelry, oppression of the poor, injustice, and venality, on the part of rulers and judges, but also the less repulsive sins of pride, haughtiness, luxury, dissipation. Security in good fortune and the amassing of riches were objects of their severe reprobation and of their impressive warning, for, in relation to God, humility and a sense of the divine omnipotence were the only proper feelings. They threatened the guilty with the divine judgments, by which all earthly glory perished, and repeatedly and urgently called on men to repent, in order to avert the impending doom, and rescue themselves from the wrath of God by contrition and newness of life. Those who repented and turned to God they consoled with prospects of coming good, and directed their eye to the Redeemer whom God would send. 3. As counsellors in state affairs, both external and internal. They stood by the side of king and people, and, asked or unasked, gave their counsel and uttered their warning, always, from a lofty, religious point of view. They incessantly present the truth, that God only can and will give effectual aid, and that nothing is or can be done by merely human resources; and in order to prevent baneful alliances with the too powerful neighbouring states, namely, Assyria and Egypt, they often announced how misfortune and ruin were coming on the kingdom with which they wished to ally themselves, since God had chosen it as the instrument of his judgments (Isa. xxx., xxxi., xxxix.). The result showed only too often how truly the prophet had spoken, and how unjustly the kings had acted in listening so seldom to the prophetic warnings. As long as the state stood, they encouraged Israel to trust in God, to seek his almighty aid, and to put forth its own strength; but when the downfall of the state was no longer to be averted, they advised a willing surrender into the hand of the enemy, who executed God's commands in their punishment, lest useless opposition should make the evil greater. The former course is that of Isaiah, the latter that of Jeremiah. Sometimes they were held in high respect by kings themselves, and were intimately connected with the royal family. Thus Nathan was employed by David to educate Solomon. Thus Isaiah was high in favour with Hezekiah, who willingly gave himself up to his guidance. 4. The prophets, moreover, were possessed of extraordinary knowledge and power. Elisha healed Naaman the Syrian, of the leprosy (2 Kings v. 10, seq.). Isaiah cured Hezekiah of a dangerous malady (Isa. xxxviii. 21). Elisha disinfected foul

water (2 Kings ii. 19-22), and rendered poisonous vegetables harmless (2 Kings iv. 38-41). On these accounts the confidence of the people in the prophet was so great that they sought prophetic counsels in other relations of life (1 Sam. ix. 6, 8, 20). Finally, they were also, 5. The authors and historians of the nation, and, from the time of the Exile, almost exclusively so. In the historical books, the Kings and the Chronicles, works are repeatedly mentioned as having been written by prophets, and as containing the history of both kingdoms and of the kings severally (Sections xxix. and xxxii.). The older books of the Canon doubtless proceeded from their hands.

Their manner of life was very rigorous; they wore skins or hair-cloaks (2 Kings i. 8; Zech. xiii. 4—comp. Matt. vii. 15; Heb. xi. 37); lived apart in a desert, or on a mountain, whence they came forth only on special occasions, as Elias and John the Baptist; or without a fixed abode they wandered over the land, or finally they dwelt together in a kind of fraternity; for instance, at Gibeah, not far from Jerusalem (1 Sam. x. 5-10); at Ramah, south of Bethel, where Samuel dwelt (1 Sam. vii. 17, viii. 4, xv. 34); and at Bethel and Jericho (2 Kings ii. 3, 5). Some prophets were married, as Isaiah (Isa. viii. 3) and Hosea (Hos. i. 2, seq.); others appear to have remained out of wedlock. They lived partly by agriculture and tending cattle (Amos vii. 14, 15), partly on the free-will gifts of those who sought their counsel (1 Sam. ix. 7, 8; 2 Kings iv. 42, v. 15—comp. iv. 8, seq.). Their scholars were called their sons (2 Kings iv. 38). Consecration to the prophetic office sometimes took place, by anointing, as in the case of Elisha (1 Kings xix. 16). Similar in their manner of life were the hermits of the ancient Christian church, especially in the east, who also lived in deserts and forests, and appeared among their fellow men only from time to time, and then as moral preachers.

The investment of the prophetic ideas is as follows: The writers begin with lamentations over present wretchedness, and with a description of existing immorality, represent the wretchedness as God's punishment for the sin of the people, and threaten yet greater calamity, but end with a consoling promise of a better future, and a happy period, if the nation repent and amend. Sometimes their discourses are accompanied by a symbolic act, in order to make visible that which is to come. Thus the prophet Ahijah tore his cloak into twelve parts, ten of which he gave to Jeroboam, in order to announce to him that he would be king over ten of the tribes (1 Kings xi. 29-31). The prophet Zedekiah appeared with iron horns before the kings Ahab and Jehoshaphat, with a view to show them how they would beat and gore the Syrians (1 Kings xxii. 11). Isaiah appeared naked and barefoot, in

order to signify the fate of the Egyptians, who were to be carried away captive into Assyria (Isa. xx. 2, seq.). Jeremiah hides a linen girdle near the Euphrates until it is destroyed, in order to show that Judah and Jerusalem should in a similar manner be destroyed (Jer. xiii. 1, seq.); he breaks an earthen bottle before the eyes of the elders, in order to point out the fate of Jerusalem (Jer. xix. 1, 10); he hides stones in a brick-kiln in Egypt, to indicate the subjection of Egypt to the dominion of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xliii. 9, seq.). Ezekiel cuts the hair from his head, and dividing it into three parts, burns one, cuts in pieces another, and scatters the last to the winds, in order to set before the eye the fate of the kingdom (Ezek. v. 1, seq.); he draws on a brick an outline of the city of Jerusalem, and places around it towers and walls for assault, in order to foretell the siege of the city by Nebuchadnezzar (Ezek. iv. 1); he brings forth in the evening his goods as one about to quit his home, in order to make clear and certain the captivity of the people (Ezek. xii. 3). These examples show how suitably the symbolical acts were chosen, and how speaking they were. The prophets, also, often relate visions which they had either by inspiration or in dreams by night, and by which they were instructed in regard to the future. Thus the prophet Amos sees in a vision locusts, which lay waste unsparingly, a fire which destroys all things, a plumb-line in the hand of God, to indicate ruin; a basket of ripe fruit, showing that the people are ripe for destruction; and, lastly, God himself on an altar, which is to be cut down (Amos vii. 1, seq., 4, 7, viii. 1, seq., ix. 1, seq.). Isaiah in a vision sees God surrounded by seraphs, by one of whom he is purified from sin, and receives a commission to go forth among the people as a prophet of God (Isa. vi. 1, seq.). Jeremiah sees the rod of an almond tree, and a seething pot directed towards the north. The first shows him the divine watchfulness; for the Hebrew word denoting almond comes from a verb, which signifies "to watch." The second sets before him the calamity that was coming from the north (Jer. i. 11, seq.). On another occasion, he sees two baskets of figs, one filled with good, the other with bad, fruit, by which are signified to him the different lots of those who have been, and those who are to be, carried away (Jer. xxiv. 1, seq.). With Ezekiel and Daniel, visions are more common, but they are also less simple and more dark (Ezek. i. 4, seq., ii. 9, seq., iii. 23, seq., x., xxxvii.; Daniel vii.-xii.).

The writing down of the prophetic discourses took place partly by the prophets themselves, partly by their assistants (Jer. xxxvi. 1, 7, 8, 16). Of Jeremiah we know that he dictated to his friend Baruch the prophecies which he had previously delivered (xxxvi. 4); and when king Jehoiakim had burnt the rolls, he dictated them anew to the same

amanuensis (Jer. xxxvi. 27, 32). The prophet himself wrote in a book his prophecies, and gave them to Seraiah, that he might read them to the captives in Babylon (Jer. li. 59, seq.). Our prophetic books, then, were for the most part written and collected by the prophets themselves. Many discourses, however, appear to have been published separately or without name; afterwards they were collected and added to the work of some eminent prophet, as we see was the case with Isaiah (xl.-lxvi.). At a later time, when the prophetic spirit had died out, many prophecies were put into the mouths of distinguished prophets, as for instance into Daniel's. The most ancient prophets of whom we possess no written prophecies, namely, Elijah and Elias, probably committed nothing to writing, since they had more power in living discourse and action, while with writing and composition they were not familiar. The prophetic literature begins about 800 years before Christ.

Section LII.—AGE OF THE PROPHETS.

It is of the greatest consequence for the knowledge of each prophet, to possess an exact knowledge of the time in which he lived and taught, and the political and religious relations of the age to which he refers; for without such knowledge we grope in the dark, and, according to our pleasure or caprice, apply his words to this or to that, whilst he had in view definite persons, relations, and designs. It is only when we have ascertained the sense which he intended, that we are at liberty to go back and ask what intimations and foreshowings the spirit of God, who guided the prophets, put into their words with a view to "the latter days" of the Saviour. But to confound the two, or to seek only the latter without possessing a clear insight into the former, leads to the most monstrous perversions, as experience too often proves. We can here only in general advert to the times and circumstances in which the prophets whose works we possess, lived and taught.

In the time before Samuel, specially in the patriarchal age, the communication of the spirit of God did not take place by a special class of men, such as were the prophets. The patriarchs themselves received it immediately from God (Gen. xv. 13, xviii. 14, xxv. 23), and only in moments of inspiration did they prophesy (Gen. xlix.). Moses, however, appears as a prophet who stood in the inmost relations with God. After the narrative of the heathen prophet Balaam, only few

prophets are mentioned in the age of the judges (Numb. xxii.-xxiv.), and never one by name (Judg. vi. 8; 1 Sam. ii. 27). With Samuel the class of prophets, properly so called, begins. Samuel was himself a prophet (1 Sam. iii. 20), who in small as well as large things led the people, and to whom is probably owing the foundation of the school of the prophets (1 Sam. x. 5, 10). Under David, in consequence, we find several prophets who lived at court in great respect. Thus we have Nathan, the tutor of Solomon (2 Sam. xii. 25); Gad, "David's Seer," who announced to that monarch the pestilence (2 Sam. xxiv. 11, seq., 18, seq.); after the severance of the kingdom there appear, in Israel, Elijah and Elias. But of none of these do we possess any writings.

About the year 800, A. C., begins the series of those prophets whose works have come down to our times. Nearly all of them lived in the kingdom of Judah, and only seldom did they go into the kingdom of Israel, as for instance Amos (vii. 10). We subjoin the order in which they succeeded each other.

The two oldest are Jonah and Joel, who lived about 800, A. C., when Jeroboam II. was king in Israel (825-784). The first belonged to Israel (2 Kings xiv. 25), in which he seems to have laboured: the book, however, which bears his name, contains only a narrative respecting him, and was written at a later period. Joel lived in Judah in the early part of the reign of king Uzziah (811-759).

The Assyrian period begins under these kings of Judah, namely, Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. In this age (750, A. C.), when Assyria was prosperous, and became constantly more dangerous to Judah and Israel, until the latter was overthrown by Shalmaneser (722), there came forward, as prophets, Amos, Hosea, Micah, and Isaiah. The two former, as the older, foretold before all the ruin of Israel, and their oracles refer almost exclusively to that kingdom. Micah, and still more Isaiah, saw further, and announced also the fall of Jerusalem.

Not long after this time appeared Nahum, who prophesied of the devastations made in Judah by the Assyrians under Sennacherib, and the destruction of their capital, Nineveh. He lived about 715, A. C., under king Hezekiah.

Before the Chaldean period, and under king Josiah (640), appeared Zephaniah, who announced the judgment of God on Judah for the idolatry which afterwards Josiah rooted up. He does not name, but alludes to, the coming enemy, the Chaldeans or Babylonians.

In the Chaldean period, when Nebuchadnezzar ruled, and the danger through him became greater until he completed the overthrow of Judah

(588), lived (about 600, A. C.) the four prophets Habakkuk, Obadiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. The first spoke of the judgment as yet distant, but certainly coming. Ezekiel was carried away into Mesopotamia in the first deportation, and foretold the destruction of Jerusalem. This was done also by Jeremiah, who, in Jerusalem itself, experienced fearful sufferings. Obadiah announced the ruin of Edom, as a punishment of the unworthy joy manifested by the Edomites at the overthrow of Jerusalem.

In the Captivity (588-536, A. C.) the prophets still laboured, warning the people against heathenism, and consoling them with the hope of a return. Thus did Ezekiel, the unknown author of the latter part of Isaiah (xl.-lx.), and Daniel. The book which bears the name of the last was, however, composed at a later time.

After the Exile there appeared in Jerusalem Haggai and Zechariah, in the 16th year after the return (520, A. C.); they laboured in favour of the building of the temple. They were followed in the time of Nehemiah (445) by Malachi, who reprov'd the same abuses against which Nehemiah bore testimony.

Of nearly all these periods it may be remarked that the prophets had to conflict with difficulties which were thrown in their way, partly by idolatrous kings, partly by the priests of the idolatrous people, partly again by men of position and wealth, by whom they, as preachers of righteousness, were hated. Especially was this the case as the downfall of the state came nearer and nearer. Jeremiah, before all others, is a striking example (Jer. xi. 18, seq., xv. 15, 21, xviii. 22, seq., xx. 2, seq., xxvi. 8, xxxiii. 1, xxxvii. 15, seq., xxxviii. 6, 28, xliii. 2, seq.).

Section LIII.—PROPHECIES.

We may distinguish three kinds of prophecies. These appear either separated one from another, or intimately united.

1. *Prophecies respecting Judah and Israel.*—The divine judgments, which were to come as a punishment for idolatry and moral corruption, form the chief subject. At first the prophecies of the coming calamity are general and dark, the nation by which it is to be brought is not named. The threatened ruin stands in the distance. Thus is it in Joel, Amos, and Hosea, before the Assyrian deportation of the ten tribes, and thus also, at a later day, before the Chaldean age, in Zephaniah. Then, the

nearer the time of the ruin came, the prophecies became more definite, giving even the names of the kings by whom the destruction was to be effected, and even the time of its arrival. Such a progress to a more and more definite prediction is found in the Assyrian period in Micah, and then in Isaiah, and in the Chaldean period in Habakkuk, Ezekiel, Jeremiah. The result shows how rightly the prophets knew their times and the events of the nearest future. The eyes of their mind were opened. What they foretold, literally took place.

II. *Prophecies respecting foreign nations.*—In the greater prophets these are placed together. Thus, in Isaiah (xiii.-xxi.), in Jeremiah (xvi.-li.), in Ezekiel (xxv.-xxxi.). Not only against the greater heathen states, as the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Phœnicians, are these prophecies directed; but also against the smaller neighbouring peoples, the Edomites, Ammonites, Moabites, Philistines. Ruin is foretold against them all, partly because of their idolatry, partly because of their hostility to Israel. God employs them, indeed, as instruments of his wrath against his people, but afterwards he breaks and destroys them (Isa. x. 1, 2, xii. 15, 16, 24, seq.). In the prophecies against separate nations, Egypt, Assyria, Tyre, expression is given to the hope that some time they will turn to Jehovah (Isa. xix. 23, seq., xxiii. 17, seq.). Some of these predictions did not take place. To deny this is to oppose history. Thus, according to Isa. vii. 20, Judah was to perish at the hands of the Assyrians; the city of Babylon was to be altogether destroyed by the Medes and Persians (Isa. xiii. 4, 5, 19-22); Edom, for its faithlessness towards Judah, was to “be cut off for ever” (Isa. xxxiv., lxiii. 1-6.; Jer. xlix. 7-22; Obadiah). But according to the testimony of history and of the Bible itself, Judah was destroyed by the Chaldeans; Babylon was only conquered by the Persians under Cyrus; and the Edomites, during the Exile, spread themselves over Palestine; and, in a later day, an Idumean, namely, Herod, was king of Judea. We must however add, that, as the example of Jonah and Nineveh shows, prophecies might be recalled, and that what the prophet expected in an earlier, took place, under God’s direction, at a later, period.

III. *The Messianic Prophecies.*—Here, especially, have we reason to admire the divine wisdom which first called forth the idea of a Messiah in the mind of the nation, then developed it, and finally caused it to be fulfilled in a way which had not been suspected by either the prophets or the people. The following is the origin of the idea of a Messiah:—Under David and Solomon the Jewish kingdom was in its highest bloom. From that time, after the division of the kingdom, the power and glory of both kingdoms waned more and more. Their downfall

came ever nearer. Israel's fate, in the time of Isaiah, showed what stood before Judah. The ruin and the captivity, therefore, rose ever more clearly in the prophet's mind. The retrospect, however, to the brilliancy of earlier days, excited a wish founded on the divine promise of a perpetual possession of the land, and of a blessing through Abraham's seed on all nations of the world—excited a hope that the coming inevitable calamity would not be permanent, and that the former glory of the kingdom would at some time return. God would again be gracious to his people when they had turned from their evil ways, and restore them to their former greatness. This is the idea which forms the basis of the hope of a Messiah. The prophets, however, whom God specially led to this idea, connected their hope with the family of David, without which a restoration was not to be thought of; for David and Solomon ever shone as the ideal of earthly dominion and grandeur. Thus this thought ever appeared more clear as a certainty in the prophet's soul, and he felt assured that an offspring of the house of David would be called of God in order to bring back that brilliant era. The idea of this future glory was still further unfolded. A king of the race of David, wise, pious, just and powerful, shall rule over the whole nation, subdue all enemies, restore all captives; a universal peace, wealth, abundance, will enhance the happiness of the land; the traces of idolatry shall be effaced, and heathen nations shall come to Jerusalem and give their hearts to God. This is the Messianic hope, which comes forward differently modified in the different prophets. It is, however, to be remarked that the words Messiah and Messianic age do not occur. The expression was, at a later time, borrowed from the Messianic interpretation of the second psalm. All the older prophets spoke of the great expected king, the restorer of the kingdom, as one who was to come from David's family. The later prophets, however, since, by the Captivity, David's dynasty was overthrown, spoke in more general terms of a restoration of the kingdom, and described the hoped-for deliverer more as a prophet sent from God, who would again set up religion and the true worship of God, hold firm to moral purity, and the true fear of the Creator, and so make Jerusalem the gathering-place of all nations who would turn to God, and there offer him their oblations (Isa. lviii., lx., lxx.). The more heavily their lot pressed on the downcast people, the more firmly and gladly did they cling to this hope, and look for the coming of the promised deliverer as being near at hand. Thus quite decided was the feeling that the glorious time would come immediately after the Exile (Zech. ii. 6-13), and when this hope was disappointed, and there came the religious persecutions under the Syrian monarchs, the belief arose that

now certainly the Redeemer would appear (Macc. xiv., and Daniel). We subjoin the chief passages in which this Messianic hope and prediction were uttered by the prophets : Joel iii. ; Micah v. ; Isa. ii. 1-4, ix. 1-6, xi. 1-xii. 6, lx., lxx. 13-lxxi. ; Jeremiah xxiii. 5-8, xxxiii. 6-26 ; Ezekiel xxxiv. 11-31, xxxvii. ; Daniel ii. 31-45, vii., viii., ix. ; Zechariah ii. 10-13, xii., xiii., xiv. ; Haggai ii. 6-9 ; Malachi iii. 17-iv. 6.

From this exposition and the cited passages we learn two things : 1. The Jews, and with them the prophets themselves, expected in the Messiah an earthly king, and with him an earthly glory. Even the disciples of the Saviour, as all the Jewish people at the time of Christ, were full of this hope. The passages in the prophets speak so decidedly of such a king, that the sense which their hearers and readers, and which they themselves, connected with the words, remains not in the slightest degree doubtful. In this sense, however, their words, as history shows, were not fulfilled : and it clearly appears how. 2. The spirit of God who actuated them, connected with and placed in their words another meaning, which in Christ only found its high fulfilment. No attentive reader can fail to see that references, allusions, descriptions, are contained in their prophecies, which very completely, and in most special features, apply to the life, the person, and the fate of the Saviour, nay, even paint him before our eyes. To deny here the hand of God, to deny the wonderful influence of his spirit in the heart of the prophets, is the same as not to see with seeing eyes, and not to hear with hearing ears. The awakening of the hope of a Messiah, its development, its expansion down to the time of the Captivity, is clearly the work of God, who thus prepared the way for his only begotten son. His spirit led the prophets so that they, with the consolation and the hope which they announced to the people, should at the same time speak forth the eternal truth which had its reality only in the Redeemer, as was acknowledged at a later time, and as is now gratefully acknowledged by us Christians for the confirmation of our faith. Consequently, in the exposition of their prophecies two things are to be distinguished : first, what the prophets really intended in their words, what immediate reference they had, and how they must have been understood by their auditors ; for a clear insight into this, aid is afforded by a knowledge of their age, their position, their actual circumstances and relations : and, in the second place, we must learn what meaning we, as Christians, after the revelation made to us in Christ, ought to connect with their words, how they are to be applied to Christ, how to be expounded, and how understood : and here we have for a guide the Gospel itself, which so often applies the Old Testament prophecies to the Saviour. Only in this way can a

true understanding of the prophets be attained, and their words be preserved against arbitrary misinterpretation.

THE PROPHET ISAIAH.

Section LIV.—CONTENTS AND CHARACTER.

The book has been divided into *two parts*,—one more, the other less, ancient.

In the older portion (i.-xxxix.) the prophet dissuades the people from alliances with foreign nations, and foretells the downfall of Assyria (vii. 18, seq., x. 1, seq., xiv. 24, seq.), of Babylon (xiii., xiv.), of Egypt (vii. 18, xviii., xix.); announces the destruction of Israel and Jerusalem (vii. 1-9, xxviii., v.), and consoles the nation with Messianic hopes (viii.-x.). He also prophesies the fall of other states; of Moab (xv., xvi.), of Syria (xvii.), of Tyre (xxiii.), and relates the overthrow of the Assyrians before Jerusalem and the cure of king Hezekiah (xxxvi.-xxxix.).

In the second part (xl.-lxvi.) the author foretells their return to the Jewish captives in Babylon, and a more prosperous future, as well as redemption through the Messiah (the servant of God), whose sufferings he describes (liii.).

All the prophecies of the book are not arranged according to the time in which they came into existence, nor do they all proceed from the same author. A chief difference makes itself felt between the first and the second part. This difference in regard to the diction is so exceedingly great, that no impartial student can doubt that the two did not emanate from one author. The diction in the older portion, which is by Isaiah, is concise, compressed, forcible, rich in thoughts and images, full of a deep earnestness, and often hastening from one picture to another. These passages are undoubtedly among the finest that the Hebrew literature produced. The author lived under the four kings of Judah, whom he mentions (i. 1), far more than a century before the Captivity, and all his prophecies have their explanation in the then existing circumstances and political relations. The diction in the second part is, on the contrary, light, flowing, clear, as well as diffuse, and somewhat tautological. Different phrases, different peculiarities of style, even Chaldaic forms, occur. The position of the writer is alto-

gether different. The scene has completely changed. Jerusalem and the temple are already destroyed (xliv. 26, li. 3, lii. 9, lviii. 12, lxiv. 10, 11), the people live in prisons and chains (xlii. 22, 24), Babylon is at the summit of its power, but its fall is near (xlvii. 1, seq.). Cyrus has already gained many victories (xli. 2, 3), he is himself named, and is crowned with victory by God (xlv. 1, seq.); he will restore Jerusalem (xliv. 28, xlv. 13). The prophet also stands in the midst of the exiles, who no longer have any offering or worship, but only keep fast days and sabbaths (lvi. 2, lviii. 1-14), many of whom have fallen away to idolatry (xlvi. 1, xlvi. 9, 12, 13, lxv. 11, lxvi. 3-5). He appeals to earlier prophecies, which were now fulfilled (xlii. 9, xliv. 8, xlvi. 9), and in inspired hope announces a brilliant return and glory in the New Jerusalem (lx., lxv. 13-25, lxvi. 10-14, 18-24). Besides, (and this fact is specially striking,) the book in its present condition stood in the Canon at an earlier period, behind Ezekiel. This cannot be explained unless, in its actual state, it was more recent than Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Apparently, these prophecies were known in the Captivity without the author's name, and they were afterwards added to the book of Isaiah.

In the first or authentic part of the book there are some prophecies which from their substance and style cannot be assigned to Isaiah. These are, xiii.-xiv. 23, on the downfall of Babylon, and the return of the captives; xxxiv., xxxv., on the devastation of Edom, and the return from the Exile; also, xxiv.-xxvii., on the ruin of the hostile capital, and the return out of captivity. Here, also, the position of the writer is not doubtful; it is the time of the Exile. The diction of the two former passages, by its resemblance to the second part of the book, claims the same author. The diction of the last passage is dissimilar, and suggests another hand.

This, then, is the origin of the whole: First, there were collected all the prophecies of Isaiah (i.-xii.); this is the original collection, in which all is authentic. Hereto was added a second collection, containing all Isaiah's prophecies against foreign nations (xiii.-xxiii.); only chapter xxii. refers to the siege of Jerusalem; here there are some foreign passages. Next came the third collection (xxiv.-xxxv.), in which chapters xxviii.-xxxiii. belong to Isaiah; to which was subjoined an historical fragment of the time of Isaiah and Hezekiah (xxxvi.-xxxix.), which, with some changes and enlargements (xxxviii. 9, seq.), was taken out of 2 Kings xviii.-xx. 19. At last there was appended the second part (xl.-lxvi.), which is the connected work of a prophet who lived in exile.

It is one of the peculiarities of Isaiah, that he refers to Christ in a more marked and distinct manner than any other prophet (vii. 14, ix. 1, 5, 6, xi. 1, 5). Especially is this the case in the second part, in which

the writer speaks of the servant of God (liii.), and which is distinguished by peculiar beauties, such as a glowing lyric style and fine lofty thoughts, though the powerful grandeur of Isaiah is wanting. Surpassing that towards all others was the respect in which Isaiah was held in both the Jewish and Christian church. Sirach calls him the greatest prophet (Sir. xlviii. 25). In the New Testament he is oftenest cited, and the Christian fathers entitle him "the Evangelist and the Apostle of the Old Testament."

Section LV.—LIFE OF ISAIAH.

The prophet Isaiah ("aid" or "salvation of Jehovah") was the son of an otherwise unknown person, named Amoz (Isa. i. 1). In the year when king Uzziah died (759, A. C.), he came forward, teaching and prophesying in Jerusalem. Here exclusively he seems to have laboured, in the second half of the eighth century, under the successive kings, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah (759-699). He wore the hair-cloak of the prophets (xx. 2), was married (viii. 3), and had three sons (vii. 14, viii. 3, 8, 18). He was nearly connected with Hezekiah, who honoured him greatly, sought his advice, and gave himself up to his guidance (xxxvii. 2, seq., 21, seq., xxxviii. 1, seq., xxxix. 3, seq.), and, as his physician, cured him of a malady (xxxviii. 21). Besides the prophecies, he wrote two historical works, the Life of King Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 22), and the Life of Hezekiah (xxxii. 32), of which nothing remains. According to a Jewish tradition in the Talmud, he was sawn asunder with a wooden saw (comp. Heb. xi. 37), under king Manasseh, and so suffered martyrdom. There is nothing improbable in his living till the time of Manasseh (699-644), for in chapter xix. he treats of the Egyptian Dodearchy, which ended in 696. Accordingly, he performed the duties of the prophetic office sixty-one years, and was, when he died, above eighty years of age.

The circumstances of the times in which he composed his prophecies were briefly these :—

Under king Uzziah, that is, in the year of his death (759, A. C.), the prophet received his consecration to the prophetic office, in a simple but solemn vision in the temple (vi.).

Under king Jotham (759-743), the state was full of idolatry, warlike equipments, and licentiousness (2 Chron. xxvii. 1-5). The prophet therefore foretold an invasion, as a divinely-sent punishment (ii.-v.).

Under king Ahaz (743-728), the state moved to and fro in great danger, for the Syrians, under Rezin, had allied themselves with the Ephraimites, under Pekah, and laid waste the land, so that Jerusalem itself was threatened (2 Kings xv. 37, xvi. 5, seq.; 2 Chron. xxviii. 5-8). King Ahaz expected his deliverance from Assyria, and, in consequence, turned to Tilgath-pilneser. Help was rendered, but at the cost of an annual payment, so that from now the state was tributary (2 Chron. xxviii. 16-25; 2 Kings xvi. 10, seq.). In vain did the prophet endeavour to prevent the Assyrian alliance, and announced that hence would come ruin and devastation (i., vii.-x. 4, xvii. 1-11).

Under king Hezekiah (728-699), the following particulars deserve notice:—

Shalmaneser led an army against Israel, since that kingdom had by an alliance with Egypt sought protection against Assyria, from which it had set itself free, having refused to pay the tribute. Samaria was conquered and destroyed, and its inhabitants led away captives into Assyria (722, A. C. 2 Kings xvii. 3-6). The prophet accordingly foretold the downfall of Samaria (xxviii.), and of Tyre (xxiii.), for Shalmaneser on his expedition threatened Tyre, and destroyed the city on the main land though he could not capture that on the island (721).

Judah also withheld the tribute to Assyria, and relied on Egyptian aid. Thereupon came an Assyrian army, which was marching against Egypt, when for its Egyptian alliance Judah had every thing to fear (716). The prophet foretold the ruin of Assyria, and consoled the people with a view into Messianic times (x. 5-xii., xvii., xviii., xx.).

The Assyrians under Sennacherib came a second time against Judah when on their way into Egypt. They laid siege to Jerusalem, but were destroyed by a pestilence which broke out in their camp (714—2 Kings xviii.-xx.; 2 Chron. xxxii.). The prophet cautioned the Hebrews not to rely on Egypt. Rebuking the haughtiness, the vanity, the recklessness of the great, God yet interposed and delivered the city (xxii., xxix.-xxxiii., xxxvi.-xxxviii.). As Babylon rose against Assyria under Sennacherib, and Babylonian envoys came to Jerusalem in order to bring Judah into alliance with Babylon (2 Kings xx. 12-19), the prophet protested against the connexion, and foretold the deportation of the people to Babylon (xxxix.).

Under king Manassah: If the prophet lived under this monarch, which many doubt, chapter xix. refers to the civil war in Egypt, by which the Dodecarchy was overthrown, and Psammetichus became master of the whole country (696).

The time of the Exile (588-536): The political relations of this period, as well as the condition of the captives, have been already men-

tioned (Section liv.). The prophet consoled the people, foretold their return home, and described the brilliant times of the Messiah ; in doing which, he brought forward the sufferings and glory of the servant of God (xl.-lxvi. ; also xiii., xiv., xxiv.-xxvii., xxxiv., xxxv.).

Section LVI.—OF THE SERVANT OF GOD.

Of all the prophecies of Isaiah, those are, for us Christians, the most important which treat of the servant of God, since in them the fate and the work of the Saviour are set forth more distinctly than in any other part of the Old Testament. The passages which treat of the servant of God are the following : xlii. 1-9, xlix. 1-9, l. 4-11, li. 16, lii. 13-1iii. 12, lxi.

The substance of these passages is this : the servant of God is called and powerfully guarded from his mother's womb. The spirit of God is upon him, and God puts His word in his mouth (xlii. 1, xlix. 1, l. 4, 5, li. 16). He has to announce to the captives the opening of their prison and to comfort the people ; he will declare the true religion and salvation to the world, will be the mediator of the new covenant which God forms with all nations, and the founder and prince of the new kingdom which God will govern (xlii. 1, 4, 6, xlix. 6-8, li. 4, 5, 16). He is indeed despised, derided and marred with sufferings, but he bears patiently injuries, scorn, pain, nay death, on which account he is highly glorified by God (xlix. 7, l. 6, 7, lii. 14, liii. 7-9). Kings and princes will do him honour, he will see a late posterity and enjoy his work, that is, the spread of true religion (xlix. 7, liii. 10-12). The people who saw him suffer, believed he suffered and was punished for his own misdeeds ; he suffered, however, not for himself, but died as a victim for the sins of the people (liii. 3-6, 8, 12). They buried him with the wicked (liii. 9), but after his atoning death he would have long life, and make many persons just (liii. 10, 11). As, therefore, he voluntarily surrendered his life, he would have his part among the mighty, and share the spoil with heroes (liii. 12).

Different expositions have been given of these prophecies, according to the different views that have been taken of the servant of God. Under that appellation the Jews understood the Messiah, until their opposition to Christians led them to renounce this explanation. The Christians, on their part, always referred these prophecies to Christ

until new investigations, combined with scepticism or positive unbelief, turned them away from the proper Messianic explanation. The following views have been taken of the servant of God.

Some understood thereby a definite historical person in the Jewish history, particularly Cyrus, who came forward as the deliverer of the Jews; then king Uzziah, who, smitten with leprosy, suffered this malady as a punishment for the sins of the people; in the next place, king Hezekiah, of whose sickness the same view was taken; also king Josiah, who perished in an expedition against the Egyptian Pharaoh; and, lastly, the prophet Isaiah himself, or Jeremiah, whose sufferings were held to be vicarious on behalf of the Jewish nation. All these explanations so obviously conflict with the entire contents of the predictions, and are in themselves so improbable, that they do not require any formal confutation.

Others, among whom are ancient Hebrew expositors, understand by the servant of God the whole Jewish people, in opposition to the heathen, who, in liii. 1-10, are supposed to be introduced as speaking; so that the meaning is, the Jewish people had suffered in place of the heathen, who had hitherto altogether disowned the Saviour. It speaks against this interpretation, that the servant of God is decidedly distinguished from the Jewish people (xlix. 6, 8-10); and it would at least be in the highest degree surprising that, in the passage above given, the heathen should be the speakers, when in general only the prophet speaks, and speaks either in his own name, in the name of the people, or in the name of God.

Many among recent expositors understand by the servant of God only pious Israelites, and especially the prophets. On behalf of this explanation it is alleged,—1. That frequently in Hebrew the collective singular stands for the plural, e. g. Jacob, or Israel, for the whole people, or a city as a female for its inhabitants, so that the servant of God is a phrase meaning the servants of God, that is, pious worshippers. 2. That many passages of Scripture allude to this collective idea; as, for instance, in xlix. 3, the servant of God is explained by Israel, meaning faithful Israelites; also in xlv. 26, where we find in the first member of the sentence the servant of God, and in the second “his messengers;” again, in liii. 8, where in the Hebrew we find the plural, “the blow was on them,” not “him.” To these remarks it is added, that the pious portion of the people, especially the prophets, had much to endure in consequence of their piety, and that the sufferings of the prophet Jeremiah in many places of his book are so described as are here the sufferings and persecutions of the servant of God (Jer. x. 19, 20, xii. 1-3, xv. 10, 11, xvii. 14, xviii. 18, 19, xx. 7-10; Lament. iii.). But as, in

Hebrew antiquity, sufferings were accounted punishments, so here the sufferings of the prophet are spoken of as sufferings on account of the sins of the people; for the prophets, or pious Israelites themselves, merited no punishment in consequence of their piety. But whatever may be said on behalf of this explanation, it is not sufficient for the purpose, for in many places the author had in view nothing collective in its nature, but a definite person, e. g. xlii. 6, where the discourse is of the mediator of the people; also xlix. 1, where the servant of God speaks of himself in the first person singular, and continues to do so uninterruptedly to the ninth verse (comp. li. 16); and, finally, liii. 10, 12, where mention is made of the death, and, after death, of the life, of one and the same person.

In consequence, many eminent theologians of recent times have maintained that the Messianic view is found in the signification, so that all that is said of the servant of God was by the prophet intended to refer to Christ. The obvious resemblance of the whole description to the fate of the Saviour, the promises which found their fulfilment in Christ only, loudly, it is thought, speak on behalf of this opinion. Also the Messianic application which the servant of God and the passages that refer to him find in the New Testament (Luke xxii. 37; Mark xv. 28; John xii. 38; Rom. x. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 22; Acts viii. 28, seq.; Matt. viii. 27) afford a striking argument for this as the only correct interpretation of the whole.

If we would obtain the truth, we must unite this last view with the last but one. For that the prophet had perfectly clear before his eyes the image of Christ, and with the full consciousness thereof spoke only of him, cannot be made to unite with that interpretation which history and grammar produce and require. Against this stands the fact,—1. That all that he says of the sufferings of the servant of God, the prophet narrates in the past tense, in consequence as historical and already accomplished results; while, on the other hand, what he announces of his glory he utters in the future tense, and consequently as things yet to be expected. 2. Some passages, like all the rest properly considered, do not suit Christ; for how can it be suitable to Christ that he was buried with the wicked (liii. 9), that he should see his posterity and share the spoil with heroes (10, 11), that he should announce the return out of captivity, and himself conduct the people (xlii. 7, xlix. 5, 9, lxi. 1-3),—nay, that sometimes he should be spoken of in the plural? In order to bring these into accordance with other passages which suit Christ, recourse must be had to an allegorical interpretation; but this is contrary to all the laws of exegesis, since now you interpret properly, now allegorically, accordingly as a passage is suitable or not. Conse-

quently there remains only this view, namely, the prophet very distinctly had in mind his own times and its relations, and spoke of the fate of pious Israelites and prophets. At the same time there arose before his soul a definite person, as one who was to be the restorer of the theocratic kingdom; and what he prophesied of him applies, through the influence of the divine spirit, which here obviously and wonderfully reveals itself, to the person of Christ so distinctly and clearly that the Messianic meaning remains the only right one. If the prophet himself did not with entire clearness know the Saviour as he afterwards appears (1 Pet. i. 10-12; 2 Pet. i. 20, 21), yet in spirit he saw him who was to come, had already the most definite conceptions of his greatness, his divine mission and work, and centuries before announced that which God really caused to be fulfilled in his Son. No impartial person can here deny that God himself wrought on the heart of the prophet by his spirit, and that the Messianic interpretation of his words has its full justification in the New Testament.

Note.—Down to a recent period, the authenticity of all the writings commonly ascribed to Isaiah was recognised in all parts of the Christian world. And at the first view it seems no little strange that a lengthened passage which contains the finest flow of sublime thought expressed in the most eloquent and impressive diction—perhaps the highest literary production in any language—should be suspected of spuriousness, and be thought to be created in the hour of national weakness and captivity. We subjoin a few reasons for ascribing the second part (xlii.-lxvi.) of the book to Isaiah. Zechariah (vii. 4-12) seems to refer to a passage in this part (lviii. seq.) in such terms as imply that it was written by a prophet before the Exile, “when Jerusalem was inhabited and in prosperity.” The writer rebukes misdeeds, sins, and idolatrous practices in his contemporaries, which are known to have existed in the days of Isaiah, and could scarcely have been prevalent among the captives in Babylon (lvi. 9-12, lvii. 1, 4-10). The writer repeatedly affirms that the announcement which he makes of the downfall of Babylon and the return of the Israelites, is in his time new and unheard of (xli. 26, xlvi. 6-8). It was new in the days of Isaiah; but not new at the end of the Exile, when “the pseudo-Isaiah” is supposed to have lived (comp. Micah iv. 10. Jer. l, li.). Gesenius (*Comment.* ii. 23) has acknowledged that the diction in the second part shows so little the traces of a later period, as, for instance, such traces as are to be found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, that it may be placed side by side with the first part. Most worthy of notice are the correspondences in things and in words which prevail between the two parts, so as to warrant the opinion that they are both by one author. The second part contains a multitude of favourite expressions and peculiar phrases which occur either exclusively or chiefly in the undisputed prophecies of Isaiah. We subjoin one or two examples: The appellation of God, “the holy one of Israel” (xli. 14, 16, 20, xlvi. 3, 14, 15, xlv. 11, xlvi. 4, xlvi. 17, xlix. 7, liv. 5, lv. 5, lx. 9), which is found in the other books of the Old Testament only five times,

but is frequently employed by Isaiah, as may be seen in i. 4, v. 19, 24, x. 17, 20, xii. 6, xvii. 7, xxix. 19, xxx. 11, 12, 15, xxxvii. 23. The phrase, "thou shalt be called," &c., for "thou shalt be" (xlvi. 5, xlviii. 8, liv. 5, lvi. 7, lx. 14, lxi. 6, lxii. 4, 12—comp. i. 26, iv. 3, xxx. 7); the same images occur in both (comp. vi. 10, and xlv. 18—comp. iii. 26, and xlvii. 1, 2, 11—comp. i. 22, 25, and xlviii. 10—comp. xxix. 9, and li. 21—comp. xxx. 22, and lxiv. 5). A striking instance of almost verbal agreement is found in xi. 6, compared with lxx. 25. But the style of the second part is said to be inferior to that of the former. This is too much a matter of taste, or at least of individual opinion, to carry with it much weight. So far as considerations of the kind may prevail, they appear to the writer to speak in strong terms in favour of the unity of the two parts, if they do not actually prove that the latter is the superior portion. Certainly in loftiness of thought and graphic description of the high spiritual good which was to ensue from the Messiah's reign, the second part surpasses all other literature. It is alleged that there are in the second part peculiarities of expression. But these are very few in number, exist in other books though not in the first part, and are nothing but what the diverse circumstances of the writer at the time would occasion. It is also stated that language is used which implies that the time when the prophecies were uttered was the Exile. But it is one peculiarity of the prophetic style to employ the figure which Cicero terms *visio*, or actual sight, by which future events, painted to the eye, are made present. Deny this property to prophetic poetry, and you go some way to reduce it to prose. Poetry can be criticised only by poets. It is a little curious, that while German criticism has turned the prose of the Pentateuch into epic poetry, it has also done its best to reduce the sublime poetry of Isaiah into the dullness of a chronicle. There is a striking passage, the authenticity of which has never been doubted, which shows beyond a question that the period of the prophet's vision took in, not only the future as well as the present, but also the ruin of Jerusalem, the expatriation of the people, and the return of a portion there denominated "a tenth" (vi. 9-13); so that the existence of these objectionable statements as to the condition of the capital and the people, and the recognition, as authentic, of the second part, are necessary in order to complete the task which was imposed on the prophet at the time of his consecration in the temple.

THE PROPHET JEREMIAH.

Section LVII.—CONTENTS AND CHARACTER.

The book contains prophecies dating near the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, mixed with portions of history. Critics have recognised *three parts*,—1. Writings that were composed before the destruction of Jerusalem (i.-xxxix.): in which the prophecies become more and more

definite; first enemies from the north (i. 13, 14, iv. 6, seq., 15, v. 1, 15, vi. 1, 22); then Chaldeans (xx. 4-6, xxi. 4); and, at last, Nebuchadnezzar himself (xxi. 7-9, xxiv. 1); between are rebukes (xiv., xv.) and complaints touching his own sufferings (xii. 1-4, xv. 10, xvii. 14-18). 2. Prophecies and events which took place after the destruction of Jerusalem (xl.-xlv.); the prophet remains in Jerusalem (xl.), speaks against the flight into Egypt (xlii.), is himself compelled to go thither (xliii.), and prophesies the ruin of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar (xliii., xlv.). 3. Prophecies against foreign nations (xlvi.-li.), against Egypt (xlvi.), against smaller peoples (xlvii., xlviii.); and, lastly, against Babylon (xlix.-li.). Finally, comes an appendix on the destruction of Jerusalem (lii.), taken from 2 Kings xxiv. 18, and xxv.

The *first part* of the book has an introduction (i. 1-3), which determines the time in which all the prophecies of this part were delivered. The time is that which intervened between 630 and 588, A. C.; that is, the period of forty-two years before the destruction of Jerusalem. The separate prophecies also bear headings in which their date is more nearly given, so that they are easily set in order, for they follow one another in the book, not exactly in the order of time. *The other two parts*, also, and the separate portions, have headings in which partly the time and occasion, partly the chief contents, are denoted. The prophet speaks of himself in the first person, so that his authorship cannot be doubted. Only occasionally is he spoken of in the third person (vii. 1, xiv. 1, xviii. 1, xxv. 1). This feature proceeds from the amanuensis, for the prophet dictated his prophecies. The style is somewhat abundant in words, and rhetorical, and, instead of the lofty, lyric flight, it breathes the mournful tone of elegy. Warm, living emotion, connected with deep grief, finds utterance throughout the whole, which goes forward in a light and flowing exposition. The diction approaches to prose. Yet in the prophecies against foreign states is it more kindled, more powerful, and more lofty, since here the prophet has fine ancient models (comp. xlviii. and Isa. xv., xvi.). The later age of the language betrays itself by properly Chaldaic forms, and most resembles that which is found in Deuteronomy. Many symbolical acts, but only a few visions, occur. Both are simple and clear.

Among the peculiarities of Jeremiah we may specify these—that he seldom gives consolation by means of Messianic predictions, though he decidedly gives utterance to such predictions, and announces the return from captivity (iii. 14-18, xxiii. 3-8, xxiv. 5-7, xxviii. 10-14, xxx. 1-22, xxxiii. 6-18, 26, l. 4-20); that he fixes the period of the Exile at seventy years (xxv. 12, xxix. 10), which is to be regarded either as a round number, since from the destruction of the city to the return

under Cyrus only fifty-two years passed, or, which is more likely, it must be reckoned from the first deportation under Jehoiakim; and, lastly, that his elegiac complaints have much resemblance to the psalms of complaint, since he had to endure the same sufferings as the persecuted holy men who uttered their sorrows in the psalms (xii. 1-4, xv. 10, xvii. 14, seq., xviii. 18, xx. 7). Moreover, he paints exceedingly well the folly of idolatry (x. 2-17—comp. Isa. xlv. 9-20), and reproveth, besides the vices of the great, and the contempt of the divine service and of the law, the false prophets, with whom he had a great conflict (xiv. 13, seq., xxiii. 9-40, xxvi. 7, seq., xxviii., xxix. 24-32). The Septuagint, in its translation, in various ways departs from our Hebrew text, for it has not only an entirely different arrangement of the prophecies, so that those against foreign peoples are introduced in xxv. 14, but also many additions and omissions; whence it is clear that the translators must have had under their eyes another and a diverse text from ours.

Section LVIII.—LIFE AND TIMES OF JEREMIAH.

Jeremiah ("Jehovah throws" or "hurls") was the son of Hilkiah, a priest of Anathoth, a small place not far from Jerusalem. Under the pious king Josiah (643-612), he, in the 42nd year before the destruction of Jerusalem (630), began his prophetic mission in his native city (i. 1-3—comp. xi. 21). While yet young, the men of Anathoth plotted against his life (xi. 19-23, xii. 6). In consequence, he repaired to Jerusalem, where he taught mostly in the temple; but as he required submission to the Chaldeans, and constantly announced ill-fortune, he brought on himself the hatred of the people, and still more that of the priests and false prophets, who were in no way disposed to listen to such prophecies or follow such counsel. A priest, by the name of Pashur, in consequence, seized him in the temple, in the first year of king Jehoiakim (611), and put him into confinement, whence he the next day set him free (xx.). Similar persecutions came upon him from a combination of priests and false prophets who threatened his life. He was rescued by the princes of the nation (xxvi.). When, thereupon, he, in the fourth year of the same king (607), was confined at home, and unable to go into the temple, he dictated to his friend Baruch all the prophecies he had hitherto delivered, and caused them to be read to the people on a fast day in the temple. In consequence, Baruch was apprehended, and the king, who had caused him to be brought into his

presence, cut the roll in pieces, and consumed them in the fire. Thereon Jeremiah dictated his prophecies to Baruch anew, and added others (xxxvi.). When, then, the ensuing king Jehoiakim, with a part of the people, were led by Nebuchadnezzar into captivity (600), Jeremiah wrote a letter of consolation to the exiles in Babylon, wherein he entreated them to amend their lives, promised them a return at the end of seventy years, and warned them against false prophets (xxix.). Under king Zedekiah, against whom Nebuchadnezzar led an army, he repeatedly advised submission (comp. xxi.), and as he was going out of his house he was apprehended as a deserter to the Chaldeans, and cast into prison. After some time, the king caused him to be brought into the royal presence, but as he again announced to him ruin from the Chaldeans he was sent back into prison (xxxvii.). Since, however, he still counselled the people to submit to the Chaldeans, he was as a traitor thrown into a worse dungeon; but having, by the king's permission, been brought forth by a eunuch, he was again consigned to chains on continuing still to recommend submission (xxxviii.). After the conquest of the city, Nebuchadnezzar delivered him from imprisonment, and gave him the option of either going with him to Babylon or of remaining in the country. He chose the latter, and remained with the Chaldean governor, Gedaliah, who resided at Mizpah (2 Kings xxv. 23, 25). But when Gedaliah had been put to death by a Jewish party, Jeremiah was compelled to fly into Egypt, although he had opposed his countrymen in their wish to seek a refuge there (xl.-xliii. 7). Here he declared the approaching devastation of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar (xliii. 8-13); and here he seems to have died, in the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem (583), for in that year Nebuchadnezzar came to Egypt,—an event which did not fall within the experience of Jeremiah. According to a tradition in the Ecclesiastical Fathers, he was stoned to death in Daphne, by the Jewish populace. In 2 Macc. ii. 1-8, however, is found the tradition, that at the destruction of Jerusalem he saved the ark, and hid it in Mount Sinai.

The relations of the age appear from what has been just said. It may be added that Pharaoh Necho, on his expedition against Assyria, having reached the Euphrates, defeated and slew (612) king Josiah at Megiddo. Thereupon, having imprisoned Jehoahaz, Josiah's son, who had been raised to the throne by the people, he gave the crown to the other son of Josiah, namely, Jehoiakim, making him his vassal, and imposing tribute (2 Kings xxiii. 29-35). Conquered by Nebuchadnezzar, and, during three years, made subject to that monarch, Jehoiakim revolted; when the Chaldeans again came, and, laying waste the country, deposed its king, and put on the throne Jehoiachin (2 Kings xxiv. 1-4),

who, with his great men, warriors, smiths, artisans, in all 10,000 persons, was, after reigning three months, carried away captive by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxiv. 6-16). The treasures of the temple were plundered (13). Zedekiah, the deposed king's uncle, was invested with a show of power. Pursuing the destructive policy of former reigns, he renounced the Chaldeans, and threw himself for aid on Egypt (Jer. xxxvii. 7-10); but within six months the Chaldeans laid siege to Jerusalem, and captured it. Zedekiah, seeking safety in flight, was overtaken near Jericho, when, having seen his sons slain, he was deprived of his eyes, and led in chains to Babylon. The last blow fell on the people. The city was razed, and all the vessels of the temple were taken to Babylon (2 Kings xxv.). This happened in the year 588, A. C.

We here see how clearly and correctly Jeremiah understood, in the whole time of his labours, the political relations of his native country. His advice was, in all, the best and most suitable to the circumstances, and his prophecies of the ruin that impended from Babylon were all fulfilled in the most minute particular. The indifference towards his counsels and threatenings, the rejection of the divine admonitions given by him, were fearfully punished in the sufferings of the infatuated sovereign and people of Judea (Lament. ii., iv., v.).

Section LIX.—THE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH.

These lamentations consist of *three elegies*, written by the prophet :—
 1. On the deportation into captivity, of Jehoiakim (i.); 2. On the destruction of the city by Nebuchadnezzar (ii., iv., v.); and 3. On his own sufferings (iii.).

The Hebrew name is taken from the first word, “How,”—in Hebrew, **איכה** (*Eleha*, “Alas! how,” referring to the mournful topics that follow). The English name comes from the Latin *Lamentationes*, which is a version of the Greek title in the Seventy, namely, *Θρῆνοι*. In the Hebrew Bibles these songs of sorrow stand in the third part among the *Hagiographa*, or “holy writings,” since no author thereof is mentioned; though the Septuagint properly recognised Jeremiah as their author, and added them to the prophet's longer work. The entire similarity of the language, the situation of the writer, exactly corresponding with the time and personal relations of Jeremiah, and the remark made in the

Chronicles (2 Chron. xxxv. 25), that Jeremiah wrote lamentations over Josiah, leave no reason to doubt of the authenticity of these elegies ascribed to that prophet.

All three elegies have a very definite rhythmus, and are accordingly more artificial than most of the poetic works of the Hebrew literature. Each verse in the two first chapters consist of three members of equal length, in the third and fifth chapters of two members, and in the fourth chapter of four members. This parallelism, however, has reference to the form, not the thought. The first four chapters, moreover, present an alphabetical arrangement of the verses, so that each following verse begins with the next letter in the Hebrew alphabet.

The complaints of the prophet respecting his own sufferings (iii.) are entirely like those in his prophetic works, and, as do these, resemble the painful gushings and supplicating entreaties addressed to God in the psalms of sorrow. From the three elegies on the destruction of the city, we gain a speaking picture of the horror of the devastation in the miserable city. All is in ruins, corpses lie on every hand (ii. 21), children and sucklings swoon from hunger in the streets (ii. 11, 12, 19, iv. 4, 5), mothers, driven by famine to despair, devour their own children (ii. 20, iv. 10), water is bought at the price of gold (v. 4), mothers and maidens are dishonoured by the foe (v. 11, 12), men are killed, and youths and boys reduced into the severest slavery (v. 12, 13), while enemies, that ought to be friends, rejoice in the universal woe (ii. 15-17, iv. 21). The whole description shows how torn the heart of the prophet was at the sufferings that he witnessed (comp. ii. 11, vi. 15, 20).

THE PROPHET EZEKIEL.

Section LX.—CONTENTS AND CHARACTER.

There have been found in the book *four parts*: 1. The call and consecration of the prophet (i.-iii.), in which we read of Jehovah on a shining throne, having wheels, and being carried by cherubim (i.); and of a roll full of lamentations, which is swallowed by the prophet (ii. 9, seq.). 2. Visions and prophecies before the destruction of Jerusalem (iv.-xxiv.), on idolatry (viii., xvi., xxiii.), false prophets (xiii.), sins of all kinds (xxii.), but especially on the captivity and ruin of the capital by Nebuchadnezzar (iv., v., vi., vii., viii., xii., xvii., xxi., xxiv.). 3. Prophe-

cies against foreign nations (xxv.-xxxii.), especially respecting Tyre and Sidon (xxvi.-xxviii.), and Egypt (xxix.-xxxii.). And, 4. Prophecies after the destruction of Jerusalem (xxxiii.-xlvi.), chiefly of a consoling tendency; rising of the dead; invasion of the northern Gog and Magog (xxxviii., xxxix.); description of the new temple (xl., seq.).

The diction and manner of Ezekiel is altogether peculiar. He especially loves the dress of visions, allegories, and symbolical acts, and his exceedingly rich fancy supplies him with constantly new images and forms, in which he gives utterance to his prophecies. Sometimes these are not altogether clear. In consequence you cannot obtain from them a perfectly distinct and harmonious conception. For the most part, however, they are excellent, lofty and beautiful. We may specify his portrayal of a besieged city, and his cutting off his hair, and dividing it into three parts, in order to indicate the fate of Jerusalem and its inhabitants (iv., v.), his going forth by night (xii. 3, seq.), the comparison of the unfruitful vine-branch (xv.), of the plucked branch of cedar (Jehoahaz), and of the newly-planted vine (Zedekiah), of the cedar planted by God (xvii.), of two young lions (Jehoahaz and Zedekiah), of the plucked-up vine (the people—xix.), of the furnace (xxii. 17, seq.), of the cauldron filled with flesh (xxiv.). Some of the allegories are less conformed to our taste (xvi., xxiii.). The language is poetic in the substance rather than the form. It has very many grammatical deviations, and certain favourite expressions recur frequently; as “son of man,” words that denote the prophet himself (ii. 1, 6, 8, iii. 1, 17, iv. 1, v. 1), “the hand of the Lord came upon me” (iii. 14, viii. 1, 3, xxxvii. 1), and, lastly, “Behold I am against thee,” as a formula of threatening (xxi. 3, xxxiv. 10, xxxv. 3, xxxviii. 3, xxxix. 1).

It belongs to the peculiarities of Ezekiel that in his Messianic prophecies he describes, under the beautiful image of a shepherd, God, and the deliverer whom God would send, giving to the latter the name of David (xxxiv.); that he paints in an impressive vision the resurrection of the dead, that is, of the Jewish people (xxxvii. 1-14); that he announces the union of all the tribes of Israel, and of the two kingdoms (xxxvii. 15-28); that he in detail describes the new temple in Jerusalem (xl.-xlii.); and, in a fine allegory, makes a fountain break forth under the temple, which becomes first a brook and then a river (xlvi. 1-12); and that he gives the new division of the land among the twelve tribes, with the boundaries (xlvi. 13-xlviii. 29). It also remains to be mentioned as peculiar to Ezekiel, that he announces the invasion after the return from exile, of northern tribes, under the name of Gog and Magog (the Scythians), who would find their overthrow in Palestine (xxxviii., xxxix.).

The prophecies stand in chronological order. That Ezekiel was the author of the book, is open to no doubt.

Section LXI.—LIFE AND TIMES OF EZEKIEL.

Ezekiel ("God strengthens") was the son of Buzi, a priest. In the eleventh year before the destruction of Jerusalem (599, A. C.), he was carried into captivity in Mesopotamia in the first deportation under Jehoiachin (i. 1-3). There the captives formed a colony near the Chebar or Chaboras, a tributary of the Euphrates (i. 1, 3, iii. 15), and there, in the fifth year after the deportation, and the sixth before the overthrow of Jerusalem (594), Ezekiel opened his prophetic mission (i. 2). He continued his teachings till the sixteenth year after the downfall of that city (572). His period of duty therefore extended over two-and-twenty years (xxix. 17). With his companions in misfortune, the captive Jews, he stood in high respect, for often the elders of the people came to him in order to ask his advice (viii. 1, xiv. 1, xx. 1); he was, therefore, a younger contemporary of Jeremiah, to whom he bears a great resemblance in this, that like Jeremiah he announces the fall of Jerusalem as unavoidable, and as a punishment for the sins of the people, utters warnings against injurious alliances, and attacks the false prophets. He exhorts the exiles to submit quietly to their lot, and cautions them not to rise in insurrection, since the false prophets flattered the people with vain hope. Whether he lived beyond the time just indicated, is uncertain, as later information respecting him is wanting. According to the Fathers, he was in his youth a servant of Jeremiah. In later times his sepulchre was pointed out between the Chaboras and the Euphrates.

The historical relations of his day are clear from what has already been remarked. He specially alludes to the already accomplished deportation of Jehohaz into Egyptian captivity (xix. 4), and still more frequently to the impending fate of Zedekiah (xii., xvii., xix. 5, seq.). The oracles on Tyre and Sidon (xxvi.-xxviii.), and Egypt (xxix.-xxxii.), refer to the conquests by Nebuchadnezzar, who destroyed Tyre and subdued Egypt five years after the fall of Jerusalem. The prophecies respecting the smaller states bordering on Palestine, the Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites, and Philistines (xxv., xxxv.—comp. xxi. 28-32), are threatenings of divine punishment for their unseemly joy at the destruction of Jerusalem after they had appropriated to themselves the

devastated land (xxxv. 10, seq.). Gog and Magog, as has been intimated, were probably Scythians, who, according to the testimony of Herodotus (i. 103-106), about this time made an incursion from the north into Palestine and Egypt.

THE PROPHET DANIEL.

Section LXII.—CONTENTS, CHARACTER, AND AUTHORSHIP.

The book may be divided into *two parts*, namely,—1. Historical statements respecting Daniel (i.-vi.), containing the carrying away of Daniel and his education at Babylon (i.), the explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream (ii.), the three friends of Daniel in the fiery furnace (iii.), Nebuchadnezzar's dream and insanity (iv.), announcement of the fall of Babylon (v.), the lion's den (vi.). 2. Daniel's visions, which give prophecies of the approaching times of the Messiah (vii.-xii.), and which speak of the four beasts (vii.), of the two animals, one with four horns (viii.), of the seventy weeks (ix.), of the last kingdom, of the times of the Messiah, and of the resurrection of the dead (x.-xii.).

The character of the book leaves it in no way doubtful that it was not written by Daniel, but contains prophecies ascribed to him and historical details respecting him written long after his day. For,—1. The author does not represent himself as being Daniel, but speaks of him, praises him, and mentions his death (i. 17, 19, 20, v. 11, 12, vi. 3, 4, 28, ix. 22, 23, i. 21—comp. x. 1, xii. 13); where Daniel is introduced as speaking (vii. 1, 2, x. 1, 2), he, in order to prevent a misunderstanding, adds to "I" and "me" the word Daniel (vii. 15, viii. 1, ix. 2, x. 2). 2. There are historical inaccuracies and mistakes in the history of Daniel. According to this book (i. 1-6), Daniel was carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar with Jehoiakim in the third year of that king's reign; but according to 2 Kings xxiv. 6, Jehoiakim was not carried into exile, but his successor Jehoiachin; and according to Jeremiah, the eye-witness of the whole period, Nebuchadnezzar ruled not in the third year of Jehoiakim, but entered on his dominion in the fourth year of that monarch (Jer. xxv. 1): even in the fifth year Jehoiakim is still king in Jerusalem (Jer. xxxvi. 9, 29). The conqueror of Babylon is named Darius the Mede (v. 31), and his father Ahasuerus (ix. 1); yet, according to the classics, the first bore the name of Cyaxeres II., and

was the son of Astyages. But Cyrus made his first conquests as a general of Cyaxeres his uncle, and so took Babylon. Besides, the division into Satrapies, which was of later origin, is ascribed to the time of Nebuchadnezzar (iii. 3—comp. vi. 2), and in the Exile the holy Scripture is mentioned as a collection of books (ix. 2), yet it was not till after the Exile that they began to collect the sacred writings. All such inaccuracies and mistakes might escape from a writer who lived a century later, but could not have been committed by Daniel himself, who lived at that time and in the Exile. 3. The language is full of Chaldaisms, and more so than any of the more recent books; nay, in a long passage it becomes Chaldee, and has even Greek words (as in iii. 5, 7, 10, *κίθαρς*, “*harp*,” and *συμφωνία*, “*dulcimer*,” *ψαλτήριον*, “*psaltery*”), whose intrusion into the Hebrew tongue could scarcely have taken place before the time of Alexander the Great. 4. The dogmatical views are altogether those of the later Judaism, e. g. angels here appear as they were afterwards conceived of, namely, in the character of the guardians of separate peoples, who bear the title of “holy ones” and “watchmen” (iv. 13, viii. 16, ix. 21, x. 13-21, xii. 1). Further connected with the advent of the Messiah is the resurrection of the dead and a judgment (xii.), and the Messiah’s kingdom as the fifth monarchy of the world (ii. 34, seq., 44, seq., vii. 26), whose establishment is very near, just as it was expected by the Pharisees (xii. 1, seq.). The morality approaches to that of Pharisaism, for great value is attached to almsgiving (iv. 27), to prayer thrice a-day (vi. 10), and abstinence from forbidden food (i. 8, seq.). 5. The clear tendency of the whole to strengthen Israelites suffering for their faith, partly by reference to the fate of earlier kings, who had been their adversaries, partly by the wonderful deliverance of those who remained faithful, clearly points to a time when such support was specially important and necessary, on account of persecutions that had arisen. This state of things existed under the Syrian kings.

In consequence, there can scarcely be a doubt that the time of the books being written was the period of the Maccabees (168-165, A. C.). Besides the preceding general grounds referring to the language and the spirit of the book, which give it the greatest resemblance to the Greek apocryphal writings that came into existence about this time, there are the following considerations:—1. The history itself is, in the prophecies, continued down to the time of the religious persecutions under Antiochus IV., who unmistakably is with correctness described without being named (comp. xi. 31, seq.). From the Exile till then the course of events is exactly and historically pursued, and now, according to the four visions and the dream of Nebuchadnezzar (ii.), comes the advent of

the Messiah. Thus did the Israelites hope and believe in the time of the Maccabees. Also, according to the reckoning of seventy years, on the part of Jeremiah, after whose course the Messianic age was to arrive, and which, in Daniel, are indicated as 70 weeks (year-weeks, that is, $7 \times 70 = 490$, see chap. ix.), the time of the Maccabees is the last before the coming of the Messiah. The consolation in the book, as appearing at this time, is clear, and the aim of the author visible. 2. In the book of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), which was written before the age of the Maccabees, Daniel is not mentioned; for in xliv.-l., in which all other prophets are brought forward, Daniel is not found, so that Sirach did not know it as a work by the prophet. 3. In the Canon, Daniel stands among the last books, so that it was added at a late period. The Septuagint placed it with the prophetic books, among which it stands in our Bible. 4. The Jews always thought less of this work, ascribing to it an inferior degree of inspiration—a fact which can be explained only on the supposition of its origin at a late day, when prophecy was considered to be extinct.

If to this it is objected that the Saviour and the apostles, often under the name of Daniel, cite words from the book (Matt. x. 23, xvi. 27, xxiv. 15, xxvi. 64—comp. Dan. vii. 13; 1 Peter i. 10—comp. Dan. xii. 8, seq.; 2 Thess. ii. 3—comp. Dan. vii. 8, 25; 1 Cor. vi. 2—comp. Dan. vii. 22; Heb. xi. 33, seq.—comp. Dan. vi.), it must, on the other hand, be remarked that they express themselves in these occasional citations taken in their then universally accepted meaning, without in the least intending to pronounce a critical judgment, for which they had neither any occasion nor any divine commission. Faith in Christ must not set limits to critical investigations, otherwise it would be a hindrance to the knowledge of the truth.

But if the book that we have under Daniel's name came into existence at the assigned time, it by no means follows that its author invented the historical particulars that it contains. Daniel was known to Ezekiel (Ezek. xiv. 14, 20, xxviii. 3) as a specially wise and pious man, whom he places side by side with Noah and Job, and there is not the least reason to doubt that he lived and taught, as our book sets forth, during the Captivity, and at the court of Nebuchadnezzar. Also that he, as a prophet, wrote down his prophecies, is more than probable, from the example of Ezekiel, of the writer of xl.-lxvi. in Isaiah, and of the prophets generally; and the fact is expressly asserted by our author (Dan. vii. 1, xii. 4, 9). If, then, as appears likely from an exact comparison of the prophecies with the history, these prophecies were, at a later period, made more definite, yet Daniel, a distinguished prophet of the Captivity, prophesied, like all his prophetic contemporaries, of the Messianic

salvation, and the coming deliverer ; and the prediction of the resurrection of the dead (comp. Isa. xxvi., and Ezek. xxxvii.), the representation of the Messiah, as the Son of Man, in the clouds of heaven (vii. 13), and, in general, many other things found in the book, may quite well be regarded as originally prophecies by Daniel, the prophet, which here appear as modified and expanded by our author.

Section LXIII.—THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF DANIEL'S LIFE, AND THE HISTORICAL RELATIONS IN THE BOOK, AT AND AFTER HIS AGE.

Daniel ("God's judge"), a Jewish youth of high rank (Dan. i. 3, 4, 6), was carried into captivity, and, with three other young Hebrews, was brought up and educated in the Chaldean court, at Nebuchadnezzar's command, in order that there they might render service. They remained faithful to the Jewish laws respecting food, and made great progress in knowledge. Daniel, especially, became skilful in the interpretation of dreams (i. 17). When, then, Nebuchadnezzar had a dream, and found the information he wanted in none but Daniel, he made Daniel the chief of the Magi. The prophet resigned the honour in favour of his three Hebrew friends, and remained in the royal palace (ii.). Afterwards, he explained to the king another dream, according to which he, having lost his senses, was for seven years to live among the beasts of the field. When the event had taken place, and Nebuchadnezzar was restored, that monarch communicated the whole to his people by an edict. The last Babylonian king, Belshazzar, on the night of the capture of Babylon by Cyrus, in carousing with his court, employed as drinking-vessels the sacred objects plundered from the temple, in order to enhance the revelry by derision of the Jews, when, of a sudden, he saw a mysterious hand tracing illegible letters on the wall. Daniel, being called in, read the writing, and applied it to the conquest of the kingdom. The fulfilment forthwith ensued (v.). The ensuing king, Darius the Mede (uncle of Cyrus), made Daniel one of his three chief ministers, and since the prophet, contrary to a royal edict, prayed to God thrice a-day, he was thrown into a lion's den, where God wonderfully preserved him. This the king made openly known, and forthwith gave commands that Daniel's God should be worshipped (vi.). Daniel then remained in high honour under the government of Darius and Cyrus (vi. 29). In the reign of the latter he died. The year is va-

riously given. In i. 21, it is the first; but in x. 1, he is alive in the third year.

The political relations of the time in which Daniel lived are in general clear from what has preceded. His deportation with the Jewish king Jehoiakim, according to 2 Kings xxiv. 1-6, rests not on a solid historical basis; for the deportation of Jehoiakim, as mentioned in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, took place in the eleventh year of that monarch (2 Chron. xxxvi. 5); but according to Daniel i. 1, it happened in the third year of his reign. It is therefore probable that the expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against Judah and Jerusalem, when Jehoiakim, after three years' dependence on him, had revolted, and was, therefore, punished by the devastation of his country, is intended (2 Kings xxiv. 1-4), and that on this occasion Daniel came to Babylon.

Nebuchadnezzar's disorder of mind (iv.) is not historically established beyond question. The disorder in question (Lycanthropia, wolf-madness) is in itself quite possible, only the author appears to have had before his eyes Antiochus IV., who was certainly insane. There may also, in the punishment of Daniel's three friends, be a reference to Antiochus of Syria, who, erecting a column in honour of Jupiter Capitolinus, required worship to be paid under penalty of death, and specially enjoined on the Jews the adoration of idols (1 Macc. i. 41, 44, 47, 50). At the conquest of Babylon, Cyrus, according to Xenophon (*Cyrop.* vii. 5) and Herodotus (i. 190), availed himself of a great national festival which was attended by a banquet in the night; and when the watchmen had fallen asleep, he, in the middle of the night, penetrated into the city by the emptied bed of the Euphrates. Darius the Mede, who ruled between Astyages and Cyrus, is not mentioned by Herodotus, who makes Cyrus follow Astyages; but according to Xenophon (*Cyrop.* v. 5, viii. 5-7) this Darius was called Cyaxeres, and ruled over Media, whence his surname, "the Mede." Cyrus married his daughter (*Cyrop.* viii. 5), and so gained possession of Media.

The prophecies refer to the following historical facts: The dominion of the Chaldeans was followed by that of the Medes; then came that of the Persians; and, lastly, that of the Greeks. Out of Alexander's kingdom arose smaller kingdoms, governed by his generals, among which Syria, under Antiochus IV., became specially hateful to the Jews. These successive kingdoms appear distinctly in the prophecies. In Nebuchadnezzar's dream, the gold head of the image denotes the Chaldean power; his silver arms, the Median; his brazen belly and thighs, the Persian; his legs of iron, the Macedonian; and his feet, part of iron and part of clay, the Syrian. But the stone which breaks all to pieces is the expected universal monarchy of the Messiah (ii.). The

same is signified in the first vision (vii.); for the lion denotes the Chaldeans; the bear, the Medes; the leopard, the Persians; and the beast with ten horns and iron teeth, the Macedonians. The ten horns, however, denote the ten Syrian kings, down to Antiochus IV. With the appearance of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven begins the everlasting kingdom of the Messiah. In the second vision (viii.) appears a ram having two horns, which, according to the explanation given by the angel Gabriel, is the kingdom of the Medes and Persians. The ram, however, is beaten down by a he-goat having one horn, instead of which grow up four horns, out of one of which comes a little horn, which rises against heaven and heaven's king. By the he-goat is meant the Macedonian kingdom, which was governed first by one person, Alexander. This kingdom was broken into four, in one of which, namely, the Syrian, a king, that is Antiochus IV., came forward and fought against God. According to the explanation given by the angel Gabriel, of Jeremiah's seventy years (Jer. xxv. 12, xxix. 10), that is, from the deportation into captivity to the days of the Messiah, 70 weeks of years are intended; of which, 7 weeks of years, that is, 49 years, extend to the Exile; and 62 weeks, or 434 years, to the time of Antiochus IV. The anointed prince at the end of the first seven weeks is Cyrus, who permitted the Jews to return; the anointed one, who is cut off at the end of the 62 weeks, is Alexander; and the prince named after him, who devastates Jerusalem, is Antiochus IV. In the first half of the last week Antiochus causes the sacrifices to cease, and places his idolatrous abomination in the temple. This abomination is the image of Jupiter Capitolinus, which Antiochus set up for adoration as his protecting divinity. In the last vision (x.-xii.) is given the history of the Macedonian kingdom down to Antiochus IV. We have here successively described the wars between the Seleucidæ (in Syria) and the Ptolemies (in Egypt), their treaties, and their attempted union by marriage (xi. 6, seq., 17). Then follows an account of the impiety of Antiochus IV.; and the beginning of the time of the Messiah is announced, for the protecting angel of the Jews, Michael, about this time (xiii. 1, seq.) gains the upper hand, and the universal monarchy of the Israelites, the kingdom of God, and the resurrection of the dead, begin. Only one time of difficulty and persecution precedes.

These clear historical details scarcely leave a doubt as to the age when the book was written.

Note.—The conclusion proceeds on the assumption that these events are narrated, not foretold; that in truth they are history in an assumed prophetic

dress. And this assumption rests on another, namely, that miracle, if not impossible, is so improbable as to make any other supposition preferable. We cite in confirmation the words of a learned German (Lisco, *Die Bibel*, ii. 614), who says, "Disbelief in God's power and grace, which have again and again been made known by miracles, is the real root of these attacks; for he who has beforehand settled it in his mind that God neither works miracles nor by prophecy reveals the unfolding of his kingdom, will, of course, take great offence at the contents of the book of Daniel. It is the details as to time which have excited opposition; the more definite and exact these are, the greater efforts have been made to get rid of them by means of the theory of the late origin of the book; for if the work came into existence in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes (iv.) and the Maccabees, then what stands in Daniel as prophecies is really a history of the past." As to the definite details found in the prophecies of Daniel, other instances may be seen in Micah v. 2; Isa. xxxviii. 5, xxxix. 5-7; Jer. xxviii. 16, 17, xxix. 10, l., li.

A few historical statements will aid the reader to form a just conception of the facts in regard to the Median and Persian monarchs. Dejoces having again won independence for the Medes in the Assyrian empire, was, according to Herodotus, followed by three kings, Phraortes, Cyaxeres, and Astyages. From the time of Phraortes the Persians were under the Median government, and Cambyses (the father of Cyrus) was only a Persian vassal king; his wife Mandane was the daughter of Astyages, who, in Dan. ix. 1, is called Ahasuerus. Astyages was followed by Cyaxeres the Second, who, in the Bible, bears the name of Darius the Mede (Dan. xi. 1). Under him the Medians laid waste Nineveh and the entire Assyrian empire: as he was given to self indulgence, he soon resigned to his nephew Cyrus, who was also his son-in-law, the chief command of the Median army, that he might carry on the war against the sinking power of the Chaldeans in Babylon. Cyrus captured Babylon, and thus Darius the Mede was sovereign of Media, Persia, Assyria, and Babylon. After two years he died (537, A. C.); and now the new monarchy of the world fell to Cyrus, and thus passed from the Median to the Persian race. Here then begin the sole dominion of Cyrus and the empire of the Persians. The mutual relations of the two houses appear in this view:—

ASTYAGES OR AHASUERUS

Cyaxeres II., or Darius the Mede

Mandane marries Cambyses.

His daughter marries

Cyrus.

Commentators are not agreed as to what kingdoms were intended in the figures employed in this book. Our author assigns the Chaldean, the Median, the Persian, the Macedonian, and the Syrian. Others give the Chaldean, the Persian, the Macedonian, the Syrian, and the Egyptian: others again, the Chaldean, Persian, Macedonian, and Roman. This last view has found valid support. If correct, it at once confutes the argument derived for the late origin of the book of Daniel from the commencement of the Messianic age, since that age could have begun only after the subjugation by the Romans. This is the view which is implied in the New Testament. There is, however, no ground for the intimation in the text, that the angel in Daniel (ix. 21) intends to interpret the prophecy of Jeremiah respecting the seventy years of detention in Babylon. Nor does the angel reckon from the commencement of the Exile, but from the decree of Artaxerxes,

issued in the thirteenth year of his reign (445, A. C.), which referred to the building, not of the temple, but, as Daniel (ix. 25) states, the city, while previous decrees respected the building of the temple. This year 445, A. C., was 299, U. C. Say that Christ was born in 752, U. C. : from 445, A. C. the prophet counts to the Messiah 69 weeks of years, that is, 483 years. Add 299, U. C. to 483 years, we get the required 782, U. C., since Jesus was 30 years of age when he entered on his ministry : minute exactitude is not to be expected. Authorities differ as to the true year of Christ's birth. But it is quite sufficient if, by going back 483 years, from the beginning of Christ's public ministry, we are brought within the reign of Artaxerxes.

Some slight chronological difficulties, alleged by our author, we pass over here, not having space for their discussion, and knowing that ancient chronology is not in the condition which would allow us to feel assured that errors to the extent of a few years might not remain. On this point, as on many others, we may, however, remark that the real difficulties are so comparatively small in number and in weight, as to excite and justify our wonder as well as gratitude, and make the impartial student repose unwavering trust in the general tenor of scriptural testimony and instruction. After a most hostile criticism has done its worst, they are but specks in the sun that it has really discovered.

It will remove some of the difficulties alleged above, if we hold that two persons were concerned in the formation of the book ; namely, 1. Daniel, who saw the visions, delivered and wrote the prophecies, and on whose authority their substance rests ; and 2. The collector of these writings, to whom we owe what is said of Daniel, the author. This collector, as writing at a later period, might be mistaken, for instance, in regard to the deportation of King Jehoiakim.

The existence, in the book, of foreign words, is explained by the origin of the work in Babylon, where, as the great centre of civilisation, foreign terms, both from eastern and western sources, would come into use in conjunction with the foreign objects which they represented. And if the language has a strong infusion of Chaldaism, if too the morals and the dogmas have a similar tinge, what else could be expected in a book composed in Babylonia—in the midst, that is, of Chaldean influences? The facts—so far as they are facts—alleged by the objector, speak in favour of, rather than against, the authenticity and credibility of the substance of the book. Had the language and tone been purely Hebraic, we should have had a phenomenon of real difficulty to deal with.

So inconsiderable are some of the arguments in the text, though they are taken from the highest rationalistic authorities, that in our narrow limits we must, and we safely can, leave them to the tribunal of common sense. As a specimen, what is said of almsgiving may be just noticed. The word which in our version stands as "righteousness" (iv. 27), may mean "alms." Let it have this signification, was liberality not taught or practised till the "latter days" of pharisaism?—comp. Isa. lviii. 7-10. But Daniel prayed three times a-day, as was done in later and worse days. Yes, and as was done in earlier and better days : see Ps. lv. 18. The place of the book in the Hebrew Canon may be ascribed to the fact that Daniel was a prophet rather by his gifts than by his deeds or office. The Jews who received the book, received it because they held it to be authentic. So far their authority is decisive in favour of its authenticity. The position of the book was a secondary consideration, and there was nothing to prevent them from assigning the book to what they judged its proper place. But while the Canon was not commenced till after the Exile, Daniel refers to it.

This is erroneous. In the original it is simply "the books;" and surely there were prophetic books then in existence. Besides, the reference is specifically to Jeremiah (comp. Jer. xxv. 11). Importance is given to the fact that Daniel is not mentioned in Ecclesiasticus. But this proves too much—for it proves another thing: it proves not merely that the book, but also that the man called Daniel, did not then exist. But Daniel is mentioned by a much more ancient authority, namely, Ezekiel (xiv. 14, 18, 20, xxviii. 3). Besides, Sirach omits many other distinguished Hebrews who lived before his day.

The objection taken to Nebuchadnezzar's mental disorder arises from the irrational and arbitrary dislike of whatever is extraordinary. That disorder, as we have intimated, was Lycanthropia, which Palmer, in his *Pentaglott Dictionary*, defines "a kind of madness in which the patient thinks himself transformed into, or howls like, a wolf." A remarkable confirmation of the reality of this event is found in the statement of Megasthenes, which Abydenus, in Eusebius (*Præp. Evang.* ix. 41), cites, to the effect that Nebuchadnezzar, on the roof of his palace, brought forward a prophecy of the conquest of Babylon by the Medes, and then disappeared.

There are two important historical witnesses who prove that the prophecies of Daniel existed long before the age of the Maccabees: 1. Josephus states (*Antiq.* xi. 8-5), that the Jews showed them to Alexander the Great, when he came to Jerusalem; and 2. Mattathias (1 Macc. ii. 59, 60), when dying, holds out to his sons the example of Daniel and his companions, to encourage them in piety, patriotism, and courage.

THE TWELVE MINOR PROPHETS.

The twelve minor prophets followed each other in regard to time in this order (see Section lii.): Jonas, Joel, Amos, Hosea, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. They always formed in the Canon one book (comp. Sirach xlix. 10). Taking them in the order of the biblical arrangement we come first to the prophet Hosea.

Section LXIV.—THE PROPHET HOSEA.

The book may be divided into *two parts*: Part 1 contains two symbolical acts (i.-iii.), namely, the marriage of the prophet with two unchaste women. Part 2 contains rebukes against Israel (iv.-xiv.), that is, against idolatry (iv.), especially the worship of calves (xiii.), vice and ungodliness (iv., vi.), hypocrisy and deceit on the part of the great (vii.), alliances with Assyria and Egypt (viii., xiii.), together with threatenings of devastation and ruin (v.), deportation to Egypt and Assyria (ix.-xi.), promise of happier times (xi., xiv.).

As one of the oldest prophets, Hosea is one of the most difficult. His diction is often hard, rough, rapid, and broken. He heaps metaphor on metaphor, or hurries from one figure to another. His maxims are the same as those of Isaiah. He speaks against foreign alliances, rebukes idolatry and immorality, and threatens overthrow and expatriation. His prophecies refer almost exclusively to the kingdom of Israel; to Judah they look but occasionally (v. 10, 12-14, vi. 4, 11, xii. 1, 3). The symbolical acts narrated in the commencement are striking, and to our taste somewhat offensive. It has been a question whether they were conceptions or realities. The former is the more probable. In his Messianic prophecies, a definite person, as the Messiah, does not appear. Among his threatenings, however, are the words quoted by the Saviour (Luke xxiii. 30),—"They shall say to the mountains, cover us, and to the hills, fall on us." Of the particulars of the prophet's life, we know the following: Hosea ("God's salvation") was the son of an otherwise unknown person named Beeri. He lived under the same kings as Isaiah, namely, Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. The name of Jeroboam II., king of Israel, is added (Hos. i. 1). Jeroboam II. died 784, A. C., that is, twenty-five years before the death of Uzziah, in the year of whose death (759) Isaiah appeared. The labours of Hosea therefore fall in between 784 and 728: a period during which there followed in Israel violent changes. Kings were assassinated, the Assyrian monarch Tilgath-pilneser conquered a great part of the country, whose inhabitants were transferred into Assyria, and Hoshea, who murdered his predecessor Pekah, became tributary to Shalmaneser, and vainly sought aid against him by alliance with Egypt (2 Kings xv. 8-31, xvii. 3, 4; Hos. vii., xi., xii.).

As most of Hosea's prophecies relate to Israel, it has been thought that he lived in that kingdom. This receives some countenance from the words "our king" in vii. 5, applied to the king of Israel. Of Hosea's domestic relations, nothing is known. If we must regard the symbolical marriages as realities (i.-iii.), his home was designed to give a living picture of the state. Such a view, however, is not sufficiently established. The same end would in a measure be answered by the prophetic imagery. The destruction of Samaria and the deportation under Shalmaneser (722), the prophet did not live to witness.

Section LXV.—THE PROPHET JOEL.

The book, which consists of only three chapters, contains a single prophecy, namely, the description of a devastation by locusts as a divine punishment (i.-ii. 11), which is followed by a promise of a fruitful and happy time on condition of repentance and amendment (ii. 12 to the end).

The diction is excellent and flowery, and at the same time pure and classical; the thoughts are noble and forcible. The whole book belongs to the finest productions of Hebrew literature. The description of the array of locusts, which, like a numberless army, darkens the sun, spares nothing, is restrained by nothing, presses into the cities and the houses, and lays waste the whole land, and finally finds its grave in the sea, is picturesque, and quite true to nature. Just thus appear these fearful pests in Palestine, and generally in great droughts (comp. i. 19, 20, ii., iii. 23). The south wind brings them out of the Arabian desert, and wherever they settle they thickly cover the whole surface of the country. In a few days everything is destroyed: even the foliage and the bark of the trees are destroyed (i. 11, 12). In the towns they cover the houses and streets, climb up the buildings and walls (ii. 7, 9), and continue their course unchecked (ii. 5, 7, 8), until they commonly perish in the Mediterranean (ii. 20). Against the allegorical interpretation of the prophecy, by which a real army of foes is set forth under the locusts, stands, besides the naturalness of the description, the fact that every such attempt fails, and the attempt here appears in many places forced (comp. i. 12, 17, 20, ii. 4, 5, 9, 20).

Among the Messianic prophecies, these are peculiar to Joel: that in the time of which he speaks, God will pour out his spirit on all flesh (iii. 1, 2—comp. Acts ii. 16, seq.); that God will hold a solemn judgment on the enemies of his people in the valley of Jehoshaphat (iii. 2, 9, seq.); that there will be signs in heaven and on earth, as precursors of this solemn event (iii. 14, 15); and, lastly, that a fountain shall come forth from the house of God to water the valley of Shittim—a heathen district in Moab (iii. 18). In Ezekiel this fine image is more fully carried out (Ezek. xlvii. 1-12). Joel also announces the restoration of prisoners in the time of the Messiah (Joel iii. 7, 16), though the prophet does not speak of the Messiah himself.

Joel ("Jehovah (is) God") was the son of Pethuel, and lived in the kingdom of Judah. To this conclusion we are led by his frequent allusions to Jerusalem, Zion, and the temple, as well as by the fact that his promises have reference to Judah (i. 14, ii. 1, 15, iii. 6, 8, 16-21). By

the enemies, not Syrians or Assyrians, but Egyptians, Phœnicians, Philistines, and Edomites, are meant (iii. 4, 6, 8, 19). The prophet must, therefore, have lived before the two first-named enemies of Judah made their appearance. Amos mentions the same foes, but adds to them the Syrians. Joel, in consequence, lived before Amos, that is, in the early part of the reign of Uzziah (811-759), or about 800, A. C. For this time also speaks the purity of his style as well as the circumstance that the temple and worship are flourishing. In agreement with this, Uzziah, in the former part of his reign, was pious and God-fearing, conquered the Philistines and other neighbouring peoples, and even Egypt feared him as a powerful monarch (2 Chron. xxvi. 4-15).

Section LXVI.—THE PROPHET AMOS.

The book divides itself into *two parts*: 1. Rebukes (i.-vi.) to neighbouring nations (i.), to Judah and Israel (ii.), exhibiting to the kingdom of Israel its stubbornness (iii., iv.), its idolatry, specially in star-worship (v.), the luxuriousness and injustice of the great (vi.); and 2. Visions (vii.-ix.), in which the prophet, in different ways, shows the downfall of Israel, and ends with the announcement of better days (ix. 11, seq.).

The diction of Amos is exceedingly regular, pure, and beautiful. His images are fanciful, and replete with spirit and life. Some of his prophecies have the appearance of being polished after their delivery. With the exception of the two first chapters, wherein besides strangers—Syrians, Philistines, Phœnicians, Edomites, Ammonites, and Moabites—Judah and Israel are mentioned (ii. 4, 5), his rebukes and visions all refer to the kingdom of Israel, of whose crimes and ruin he repeatedly speaks. The rebukes (iii.-vi.) form a complete whole; also the visions (vii.-ix.); but in the last there is a short historical narrative in prose touching the prophet himself (vii. 10-15). In his prophecies respecting the destruction of Israel, he does not mention the Assyrians, by whom it was effected, but he points to the district whither the Israelites would be carried captive (v. 27, vi. 14). In his Messianic promises, besides the return from exile (ix. 14), and the perpetual possession of Palestine (15), he, employing a figure peculiar to himself, announces that God would raise up the fallen tabernacle of David, and build it as in the days of old (11).

Amos ("a burden") was a herdsman of Tekoa, a small village a few

miles south of Jerusalem (Amos i. 1). While living here, in care of his cattle, he was led by the divine spirit to go as a prophet into the kingdom of Israel. In that land lived a certain priest, named Amaziah, who accused Amos to the king as an enemy of the state, and advised the prophet to return to Judah and prophesy there (vii. 10-17). Amos uttered a severe rebuke, and continued his ministry; but whether in Judah or Israel does not appear. According to the distinct statement in the beginning (i. 1), Amos lived in the age of Uzziah (811-759), in the former half of that king's reign; for he also prophesied under Jeroboam II of Israel, who died in 784; so that his ministry falls in the period from 790. At this time the Assyrians had not appeared as enemies of Israel, for Jeroboam restored the old boundaries of the kingdom and conducted successful wars against Syria, from which he took Damascus (2 Kings xiv. 25-28). Nevertheless, idolatry was at home in his dominions (2 Kings xiv. 24), and the prophet sees the disorder of his whole country, and foretells its entire ruin, while he alludes to the power of Assyria which was growing up in the east (v. 27, vi. 14). As we know from his own statement that Amos was a peasant, some have wished to find a certain want of culture in him. The supposition is groundless; and the example of David shows how ability and culture were to be found among shepherds.

Section LXVII.—THE PROPHET OBADIAH.

The prophet announces in one chapter the overthrow of Edom as a punishment for their unseemly rejoicing at the downfall of Jerusalem.

The prophecy is very similar to that of Jeremiah respecting Edom (Jer. xlix. 7-22). In Isaiah also (xxxiv.) the ruin of Edom is announced, as well as in Ezekiel (xxxv.). The relation of these four prophecies to each other is the following: Isaiah speaks in the strongest and warmest terms, painting the overthrow of Edom as utter devastation and extinction. Ezekiel describes the hostile conduct of the Edomites, and threatens retribution in sanguinary destruction. Jeremiah extends the prophecy of Obadiah, and describes more fully the ruin of the transgressors. Obadiah himself is more restrained and calm, declaring the ill fortune coming on Edom with less passion but equal confidence. As Jeremiah and Obadiah have a great resemblance in expression as well as in thought, critics have asked which of the two

profited by the other's labour. It is in favour of the originality of Obadiah that his arrangement and connexion are better and more natural, and that Jeremiah on other occasions makes use of the older prophets (comp. Jer. xlviii. and Isa. xv., xvi.). The fulfilment of this prophecy respecting Edom cannot be historically proved (comp. Section liii.).*

Nothing in detail is known of the life of Obadiah ("servant of God"). Mention is made of one Obadiah who, in the time of Ahab and Jezebel, concealed a hundred of God's prophets in two caves (1 Kings xviii. 3, 4); of another who was one of the "princes" of Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii. 7); and a third, a Levite, who lived at the time of Josiah (2 Chron. xxxiv. 12): but none of these can be our prophet, for he lived at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and was consequently a contemporary of Jeremiah. The destruction has already taken place (Obad. 11); and as Jeremiah probably profited by this oracle, and Jeremiah died in the fifth year after the fall of Jerusalem (Section lviii.), it must have been written between 588 and 583, A. C.

The circumstances of the times are known. The disgraceful rejoicings of the Edomites who entered the land with the Chaldeans, and made depopulated parts their own, are described by Obadiah (11-14), by Jeremiah (Lament. iv. 21), and Ezekiel (xxxv.). The position of Obadiah in this part of the Canon is explained by Amos (ix. 12), which also has reference to the threatened punishment of Edom.

Section LXVIII.—THE PROPHET JONAH.

The book contains not a prophecy, but a narrative, respecting the prophet Jonah, who, by flying to the sea, from Joppa to Tartessus (Spain), endeavours to escape from a mission to Nineveh. Thrown by the sailors into the ocean, he is swallowed by a fish, which, after three days, casts him up on the land, when he goes to Nineveh and announces

* This opinion has for its basis the assumption that prophecy cannot and does not in any case regard any but the immediate future. But for this unwarranted assumption, the fate of Edom, as ascertained by recent geographical discoveries, particularly in the discovery of the city of Petra, would have been regarded as presenting a wonderfully exact and complete fulfilment of the threatenings pronounced thereon by God in the word of his prophets.

the overthrow of the city. Nineveh is saved by repentance. Jonah, discontented thereat, is instructed by a speedily perishing tree for which he has pity (i.-iv.).

The whole differs from the other prophetic books in this,—that while they contain the speeches of the several authors, this presents an incident in the life of the prophet, narrated for the sake of instruction and encouragement. Jonah himself is not the author of the book, as appears from,—1, the traditional spirit of the narrative; 2, the language, which, by its Chaldaisms, looks to a later period, and, in the prayer of Jonah in the belly of the fish, consists of words and phrases from the psalms; 3, the fact, that the writer does not represent Jonah as the author, but simply gives a narrative concerning him. In consequence, many have brought down the origin of the book to some time after the Exile, and explained the whole as a parable. But clearly of the greatest importance for the prophets and their hearers was the doctrine of the book, namely, that a prophet is unable to withdraw himself from the will of God, and the impulse of his spirit,—a doctrine which points to a time when the prophets still taught, and were for their unacceptable announcements often assailed and persecuted. The book, too, stands among the prophetic books, where it could not have been had it come into existence after the Exile. Moreover, the citation of the history of Jonah in the biblical books (Tob. xiv. 4, 8; 3 Macc. 6, 8), and by the Saviour himself (Matt. xii. 39, 40, xvi. 4; Luke xi. 29, 38), indicates a distinct historical fact, and not a parable. We may therefore suppose that the history of the prophet Jonah, as being very instructive and suitable to the times, was, as a warning and a mirror for many, written down at the time of the Captivity, when the prophets were specially ill-treated. This view is supported by the language and the spirit of the book, for if it was written centuries after the prophet lived, its traditional character is explained; and the example of Job, Tobit, and Daniel, shows how definite historical persons and events were wrought up with a view to edification. That a real historical event lies at the foundation of the narrative, is established by the fact, that in the neighbourhood of Joppa, and thence southward along the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, was spread the idea of sea-monsters that devoured men, and the Philistines had certain observances in order to placate these monsters (Boehart, *Hierozoicon*, ii. 793). The doctrines contained in the book are these: 1. A prophet cannot fly from the impulse of the Divine Spirit; 2. God is also the God of the heathen, and pities them; 3. God forgives more readily than he punishes; 4. The prophet is not to be blamed if his prophecy does not take place according to expectation.

The quickly perishing plant (iv. 6) is a biennial shrub called *Ricinus*.

Without a stem, it springs up quickly, and perishes at the least injury, so that the bite of a worm is sufficient to destroy it.

Of the circumstances of the life of Jonah ("a dove"), besides what the book relates, we know only that he lived in the days of Jeroboam II. (825-784), to whom he predicted a victory over the Syrians. His father, by name Amittai, was of Gath-Hepher, a town in Zebulun, and consequently in the kingdom of Israel (2 Kings xiv. 25 ; Jonah i. 1). The mission of Jonah, therefore, is to be placed about 800, A. C., when the Assyrians had not yet assumed so hostile an attitude towards the kingdom of Israel.

Section LXIX.—THE PROPHET MICAH.

Micah prophesies against Israel (i.), especially against Judah and Jerusalem (ii.-vii.), overthrow and captivity, in consequence of injustice, avarice, the vices of the great (iii. 1, seq., vi. 10, seq., vii. 1, seq.), idolatry and false prophets (i. 7, ii. 11, iii. 5, v. 12), and promises a happy time under a Davidical ruler sprung from Bethlehem (iv. 1-8, v. 1-14, vii. 7, seq.).

Micah has great resemblance to Isaiah, is full of thought and feeling (i. 8, vii. 1), loves contrasts and verbal skill, and sometimes employs the form of dialogue (vi. 1-8, vii. 7-20): only one prophecy applies to Israel (i.); all the rest refer to Judah. Of the happy future after the day of retribution, he has the boldest and the loftiest hopes, for then all enemies lie in the dust, and the nations will stream to Jerusalem to pay their vows there (iv. 1-8, 13, v. 1-8, vii. 11, 17). From Micah, Isaiah (ii. 1-4) borrowed a passage (Micah iv. 1-3), in which Jerusalem is mentioned as the centre of the religions of the world. This passage Isaiah employs as a text, making the application that the people must be animated by a different spirit before the prophecy can be fulfilled, for at present, trusting on earthly power and on idols, it was rejected of God. By Jeremiah also (xxvi. 17-19) was a passage cited from Micah (iii. 12), wherein the downfall of Jerusalem is foretold, in order to prove that Micah had previously predicted the calamity, and yet the king and people had not persecuted and slain him as they now were ready to do to Jeremiah. It is peculiar to Micah, that in his Messianic prophecies he mentions Bethlehem as the birthplace of the future Redeemer, who, in the power of Jehovah and in the majesty of God's name, should feed the people as his flock (v. 1-4—comp. Matt. ii. 5, 6).

Micah ("who is like God?") was a native of the village of Moreseth in the tribe of Judah, whence he is called the Morasthite (Micah i. 1; Jer. xxvi. 18). According to the heading, he lived under Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and was in consequence a contemporary of Isaiah (725, A. C.). Accordingly, Assyria is the chief enemy of the state; to which nation he refers (v. 4, 5), also Egypt (vi. 12); for by treaties with the latter, protection was sought against the former to the great injury of the state (comp. Isaiah). Once only is there a threatening of expatriation to Babylon (iv. 10), which at this early time is explainable from the fact, that Babylon was an Assyrian province, whither prisoners were often conveyed by the Assyrians, e. g., according to 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11, the idolatrous king Manasseh. Here also we cannot mistake the operation of the spirit of God, which had already shown the prophets the deportation to Babylon, and caused them to predict it. Under Ahab, king of Israel, and Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, is mentioned another Micah (1 Kings xxii. 8), who was the son of Imlah, and prophesied misfortune to Ahab. As this prophet lived about 900, A. C., he could not be the same as our Micah. Between the two there was a space of nearly 200 years.

Section LXX.—THE PROPHET NAHUM.

The book contains a prophecy against Nineveh, whose destruction is announced (i.-iii.).

The diction and style are fresh, lively, full of fire, and yet distinct and well turned. Here, as divine punishment for the devastations committed in Judah, is described the downfall of the rich, haughty, and secure city, Nineveh. To Judah, however, cast down by the Assyrians, liberation and restoration of its power are promised (i. 12, 13, ii. 1, iii.).

Nahum ("consolation") was a native of the village Elkosh, which stood according to some in Galilee, according to others in Judea. Scarcely can another Elkosh, which lay on the Tigris, be intended, since the contents of the book clearly betray a citizen of the kingdom of Judah (i. 12, ii. 1). Nahum lived at the time of king Hezekiah (728-699); for in the reign of that king, the Assyrians under Sennacherib made an incursion into Judah (714), and committed great ravages (Isa. x. 28, seq., xxxvi., xxxvii.; 2 Kings xviii., xix.), to which allusions

are made in some passages (i. 11, 12, ii. 1, iii. 13, 14). The kingdom of Israel is not mentioned, for it had already been destroyed by Shalmaneser. Somewhat later was Thebes in Egypt taken by the Assyrians, to which, as to a recent event, reference is made (iii. 8-10). As this city had been destroyed, so would Nineveh perish (iii. 11, 12). By whom it would be laid waste, is not stated in the prophecy. According to all this, Nahum lived somewhere about 715-712. The actual ruin of Nineveh was wrought by the Medes and Babylonians (625, *A. C.* Herodotus i. 106) at the time of king Josiah.

Section LXXI.—THE PROPHET HABAKKUK.

This prophet describes the Chaldeans as destructive foes (i.); beholds their punishment, yet at a distance, but certain (ii.); and sees God himself appear and destroy the enemy (iii.).

The language is fresh and pure, full of fire and loftiness. Habakkuk is a most excellent writer. In chapter iii., where he describes the majestic and fearful appearance of God, he surpasses all others in force and elevation. He, in his mind, foresees the miseries inflicted on Judah by its enemies, and first names the Chaldeans (i. 6), as a wild, swift, and terrible foe. Standing on his tower he sees, at a distance, the evil that is certainly coming on the enemy (ii. 1, seq.), who, before they are punished, bring oppression and wasting (iii. 16, 17). Finally, God gives aid and strength (18, 19). The prophet's view into the distant times of salvation finds utterance in these lofty and inspiring words:—"The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea" (ii. 14—comp. Isa. xi. 9). A distinct reference to the Saviour himself does not occur.

Habakkuk ("embrace"), according to the contents of his prophecy, taught at the time when the Chaldeans were extending their dominion, and the kingdom of Judah had reason to fear them as the future devastators of the country (i. 6, seq., ii. 3, seq., iii. 16, 17); accordingly, he was an early contemporary of Jeremiah, and lived under the Jewish king Jehoiakim (611-600), about 605, *A. C.* (comp. 2 Kings xxiv. 1, seq.), so that he is the first prophet who foretold the downfall by the Chaldeans. According to the apocryphal addition to Daniel, "The Dragon at Babylon" (33-39), he lived near the end of the Captivity, for he brings Daniel food into the lion's den; which, in regard

to time, is scarcely possible, since, according to his prophecies, he hardly saw the destruction of Jerusalem, for he is altogether silent respecting it, and sees it only in the distance (iii. 16, 17). That apocryphal statement has however, as such, no credibility.

Section LXXII.—THE PROPHET ZEPHANIAH.

Zephaniah announces (i.-iii.) the approaching downfall of the state and of Jerusalem, in consequence of idolatry (i. 4-6, iii. 2), of the injustice of the heads of the nation (i. 8, seq., iii. 3), and false prophets and wicked priests (iii. 4); he also declares the punishment of other peoples, as the Philistines (ii. 4, seq.), Moabites (8, seq.), Ethiopians (12), and Assyrians (13, seq.), but gives consolation by reference to the Messianic age, involving the return of a portion of the captives (ii. 7, 9, iii. 12, 18-20), conversion of the Gentiles (iii. 9), and the dominion of Jehovah (iii. 15, 17).

The style is simple, pure and clear, as well as lively. It resembles that of Jeremiah. The prophet does not name the foe by whom the overthrow is to come, but clearly alludes to the Chaldeans, for from the exceedingly animated description of the destruction and devastation, the enemy appears as wild, fleet, and cruel, just as are those whom Habakkuk calls Chaldeans (Hab. i. 6). The destruction itself is termed "the day of Jehovah" (i. 7, 9, 10, 14), "a day of trouble and distress," and "the day of Jehovah's wrath" (i. 15, 18, ii. 3, iii. 8); and of the Messianic time, it is said that "all nations shall call on the name of Jehovah, and serve him with one consent" (iii. 9), so that "Jehovah thy God will save, he will rejoice over thee with joy, he will rest in his love" (iii. 15, 17). The coming deliverer is not designated as a person in this prophet.

Zephaniah ("whom God protects"), according to the heading, lived in the reign of Josiah (643-612); but since the prophet rebukes idolatry (i. 4), and Josiah rooted it out (2 Kings xxiii. 4, seq.), the prophet must have come forward in the early years of Josiah (about 640). To this conclusion we are led by the mention of Nineveh, whose destruction is looked for (ii. 13), and which was destroyed in the 17th year of Josiah, or 625, A. C. To the same effect is the circumstance that the Chaldeans are not yet mentioned as enemies. As the genealogy of the prophet is brought down to the fourth generation (i. 1), it has been rightly con-

cluded that his family was well known and distinguished. Among his ancestors one Hizkiah (Hezekiah) is mentioned. Hence it has been inferred that Zephaniah was of the blood royal. But the data do not warrant the conclusion, for the title of "king" is not appended to the name of Hezekiah.

Section LXXIII.—THE PROPHET HAGGAI.

The book contains four prophecies respecting the building of the temple, which the people are again exhorted to undertake (i., ii.), and speaks of drought and famine as Jehovah's punishment for the neglect of the work (i. 10, 11, ii. 16-19), also of the promise of a more beautiful temple (ii. 6-9). Intervening are historical particulars, in part introductory, in part explanatory (i., ii.).

The power and inspiration of the prophets, before and during the Captivity, are here on the decline. The contents are more brief and scanty, the diction somewhat tame. The prophecies themselves are addressed to the civil governor Zerubbabel, and to the high-priest Joshua (i. 1, 12, ii. 2, 21), and are delivered during the course of three months (i. 1, ii. 1, 10, 20). Drought and disappointment are the preceding events to which the prophet refers, as to positive punishments inflicted by God in consequence of the discontinuance of the temple-works; for the new settlers preferred repairing their own abodes to attending to the house of Jehovah (i. 9-11). The promises of Haggai have two peculiarities,—1. That, in a short time, God will shake all nations, and compel them to contribute to the adorning of the temple, so that the glory of the latter house will surpass that of the former, the temple of Solomon (ii. 6-9); 2. And that, in the assigned period, the prince Zerubbabel shall be God's chosen servant (ii. 21-23). Hence it would appear that the prophet's view of the Messianic time was confused.

Haggai ("God's festival"), the first of the three prophets after the Exile, was a contemporary of Zerubbabel and Joshua: he appeared in the second year of the Persian king Darius Hystaspis (i. 1), that is, in the sixteenth year after the return from captivity (520, A. C.). The building of the temple had been hindered by the unfriendly Samaritans (Ezra iv. 23, 24), who had obtained a prohibition from the Persian monarch Pseudo-Smerdis. Haggai and Zechariah then came forward, under the new king Darius Hystaspis, to arouse and urge the

people, and by their impulse led them to resume the undertaking, Darius giving permission (Ezra v. 1, 2, vi. 6, seq., 14); so that, in the sixth year of that sovereign (515, A. C.), the temple was completed (14-16).

Section LXXIV.—THE PROPHET ZECHARIAH.

The book is divided into *two parts*:—1. *The first* contains prophecies in visions, which refer to the new settlers (i.-viii.), and specially to God's care for Judah, and his punishment of its foes (i.); the rebuilding of Jerusalem (ii.); the exultation of the high-priest Joshua, in view of the Messianic period (iii.); Zerubbabel's work; God well-pleased (iv.); reproof of robbers and perjurers (v.); the high-priest ruler and king (vi.); the days of contrition and sorrow of the Exile, now days of joy; Messianic times (vii., viii.). 2. *The second part* (ix.-xiv.) comprises a collection of prophecies dating before the Exile; which treat of the conquest of all foes, and the Messianic age under a victorious and gentle ruler (ix.); the return of those that are scattered abroad (x.); the devastation of the land, and faithless shepherds (xi.); the Messianic period (xii.-xiv.).

In diction and substance the two parts are very dissimilar. In the first, everything is clad in visions, often difficult to understand; the language is prosaic and Chaldaical, and the scene is the condition of the new settlers under Joshua and Zerubbabel. In the second there occur prophecies, properly so called, in pure, powerful, ancient diction, and the scene is anterior to the destruction of Jerusalem; the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel are yet in existence (ix. 10, 13, x. 6, 7, xi. 14), and the royal house of David (xi. 6, xiii. 7—comp. xii. 7, 12), also idolatry and false prophets (x. 2, seq., xiii. 2, seq.); Assyria and Egypt are enemies of Judah (x. 10, seq.). It is scarcely, then, to be thought of, that both parts came from the same author. The author of the second part must have lived before the Exile, and at a time when the two kingdoms were standing. This author may have been the Zechariah mentioned by Isaiah (viii. 2). He is there called the son of Jeberchiah, and a disciple of Jehovah (16), which is the designation of a prophet (comp. Isa. liv. 13): as now the author of the first part was the son of Berechiah (Zech. i. 1), so, as the two names are very much alike, may the prophecies of two separate persons have at a later time been regarded as the work of one.

In the Messianic prophecies of the first part, the following is what is

essential, namely, that Jerusalem and Judah shall again be fully peopled (i. 16, 17, ii. 4, 5), and shall enjoy great abundance (viii. 12, seq.), and long life (viii. 4); God himself will dwell in the midst of the people (ii. 10, seq., viii. 3); a branch will spring from the house of David (iii. 8, vi. 12), who shall be priest and king (vi. 13); the people shall rule over their former enemies (ii. 9), be a blessing to the nations (viii. 13); many, yea all (viii. 23), peoples of the earth shall come to Jerusalem, and build in the temple (vi. 15), to pray to God, and by consorting with Jews will bring good on themselves (viii. 20-23). The beautiful promise of Ezekiel deserves to be here repeated,—“My tabernacle shall be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people” (viii. 8—comp. Ezek. xxxvii. 27; 2 Cor. vi. 16).

The Messianic prophecies of the second part are yet more full of import, for not only will God collect and bring back the captives (x. 8-12, ix. 6), and destroy all the enemies of his people (ix. 8, 13, seq., xii. 6, 9), but the residue shall be refined and purified by fire (xiii. 8, 9); a just, victorious and peaceable king shall come and make his entrance into Jerusalem, riding on an ass (ix. 9); only thirty shekels of silver shall be given for the good shepherd, which are thrown into the house of Jehovah (xi. 12, 13); after a fearful day, a day of glory will come, known only to God (xiv. 6, 7), on which occasion living waters shall flow forth from Jerusalem (xiv. 8, xiii. 1), whose inhabitants shall contritely turn their eyes to Jehovah, whom they pierced, and mourn for him bitterly (xii. 10); when at last Jehovah will be king over all the earth, and be worshipped by all nations (xiv. 9), who will then every year go up to Jerusalem, and celebrate there the feast of tabernacles (xiv. 16-19).

If these prophecies in their primary sense contain lofty hopes that look only to the future condition of the Jewish state, yet do they so clearly contain allusions and references to the person and the fate of the Saviour himself, that all impartial persons must feel compelled to recognise the working of God's spirit in the heart of the prophet, and the Messianic application of his words to Christ.

Zechariah (“Jehovah remembers”), the author of the part i.-viii., was a contemporary of Haggai, and appeared a few months later than he: Haggai came forward in the sixth, Zechariah in the eighth, month of the second year of Darius Hystaspis, that is, in 520, A. C. (Hag. i. 1; Zech. i. 1). Accordingly, the political relations are the same as those already mentioned in connexion with Haggai (Section lxxiii.). In regard to the person of Zechariah, we have to remark as follows:—He calls himself the son of Berechiah, and grandson of Iddo the prophet (i. 1). In Ezra (vi. 14), he is described as the son of Iddo. The facts

are to be explained thus, namely, that Ezra, passing over the father's name, gave that of the grandfather, who, as a prophet, was better known and more celebrated. He, without doubt, had his education in the Exile, whence he returned into Judea. We find tokens of this in the mention of Satan (Adversary iii. 1), the doctrine of angels, the seven eyes of God (iv. 10—comp. iii. 9), by which are probably denoted the seven archangels, as well as in the clothing of his prophecies in visions and symbols. According to Matthew (xxiii. 35), he was slain by the people between the temple and the altar. But this Zechariah is probably the person mentioned in 2 Chron. xxiv. 20-22, under the reign of Joash (877-838), who was stoned to death in the outer court of the temple, because he exposed their injustice to the people, and prophesied calamity. This prophet is indeed called the son of Jehoiada (20), but there may have been a change of name, of which traces are found in the ancient MSS., so that, instead of Barachias in Matthew, stood Jehoiada (Ἰωδᾶς). Respecting the life of the second author (ix.-xiv.), nothing more than is said above is certainly known.

Section LXXV.—THE PROPHET MALACHI.

In six short prophetic speeches, Malachi protests against the same misdeeds that Nehemiah endeavours to put an end to (i.-iv.); such as irregularities in sacrifice (i. 6, seq.), marriage with heathen women (ii. 10, seq.), and refusal of tithes (iii. 7-10); he threatens transgressors with divine punishment (ii. 17-iii. 6), and consoles the pious with views of the times of the Messiah (iii. 10-iv. 6). First, Elias has to come (iv. 5, 6).

In style, Malachi took the ancient prophets as his model, though we miss their fullness of thought and expression, and their lofty inspiration. One feels in reading Malachi, that the prophetic spirit is departing; only short though not unsuccessful bursts of the old prophetic spirit appear in his speeches. The conversational is the prevailing form. His reproaches regard not only the alleged abuses, but also injustice, pride, and other crimes (iii. 5, 15, iv. 1, 3). He gives consolation to the settlers dissatisfied with their condition, by urging that other nations are worse off (i. 2-5), that divine punishment will overtake prosperous criminals (iii. 5, 6, 13-18, iv. 1), and that the pious may anticipate Messianic happiness (iii. 17, iv. 2, 3). In his Messianic prophecies it is peculiar to him, that before God comes to judgment (iii. 5) a mes-

senger, "the messenger of the covenant," has to appear, whose advent will be fearful, as he has to purify the sons of Levi, as linen garments are purified with potash and silver with fire (iii. 1-3), and that before the day of Jehovah the prophet Elijah is to return, in order to produce a great moral reform (iv. 5, 6).

Of the person of Malachi ("God's messenger") we possess no direct information. But from the contents of his book we see that he was a contemporary of Nehemiah, for he rebukes the same abuses (Neh. v. 1-14, xiii. 23-25, xiii. 10, xii. 44, seq.); only it is to be remarked that he severely condemns marriages with heathen women, yet disapproves of divorce (ii. 11, 14-16). The temple is now completed (i. 10, iii. 1), and the governor of the city is expressly mentioned (i. 8). All this, as well as the position of the book in the Canon, leads to the time of Nehemiah (about 440, A.C.). The assumption that Malachi is not the name of a real person, but a symbolical appellation, descriptive of the office of the author, as a divine messenger, has no satisfactory ground.

B.—THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Section LXXVI.—ON THE APOCRYPHA IN GENERAL.

The Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament are the productions of the younger Jewish literature, and have been transmitted to us by the Greek Jews, as additions to the Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Septuagint (Section ii. and Section viii.). Originally they were written, partly in Hebrew, partly in Greek. It is in Greek, however, that they have all come into our hands. In many cases we clearly recognise the Hebrew original, either in mistakes committed in the translation, or in the Hebrew tone and form of speech, which strikingly deviates from what is usual in the Alexandrine Greek; or again, in the prevailing spirit which, among the Palestinian Jews, was always different from that of the Alexandrine Jews, who were familiar with Greek literature. From their own qualities the following show themselves to have originally been Hebrew works, namely, *Judith*, *Tobit*, *Sirach* (Ecclesiasticus), and the *First* book of the *Maccabees*. As productions of the Alexandrine Greek spirit, we may recognise these, namely, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, *Baruch*, the *Second* book of

the *Maccabees*, the rest of *Esther*, and of *Daniel*, and the *Prayer of Manasses*. The time of their origin falls in the three centuries which preceded the advent of Christ. They were not taken into the Canon, partly in consequence of their late foreign origin, partly from internal grounds.

They may be divided into three different classes :—

| I. | II. | III. |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <i>Historical Books.</i> | <i>Poetical Books.</i> | <i>Prophetic Books.</i> |
| Judith. | Ecclesiasticus. | Baruch, with the Letter of Jeremiah. |
| Tobit. | Wisdom of Solomon. | |
| Two Maccabees. | Prayer of Manasses. | |
| Additions to Esther and Daniel, excepting one. | Song of the Three Children. | |

Besides the books here mentioned, there are, in the Septuagint, two apocryphal books not translated by Luther, namely, the Third book of Ezra (i. & ii. Esdras—comp. Section xxxvi.), and the Third book of the Maccabees (Section lxxxiv.). On the other hand, in many MSS., and editions of the Septuagint, there is not found the Prayer of Manasses, which Luther translated out of the Vulgate, and which is not received in the Canon of the Catholic church. The Letter of Jeremiah, which Luther has as the sixth chapter of Baruch, since it so stands in many manuscripts, forms, according to others, a separate writing. It is, moreover, to be remarked, that the ancient translations, including the Vulgate, often depart much from the original Greek text, and in several apocryphal scriptures are re-castings of the same text; on which account Luther, in translating these books from the Latin, deviates considerably from the Greek text, especially in Judith and Tobit. Nor has he translated the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, wherein the Greek translator represents himself as the grandson of the Hebrew author.

In the Historical Books the peculiar beauties of the old Hebrew histories are for the most part wanting. The contents ramble into the legendary, and are sometimes only ornamental additions to the more ancient documents. The chronology, however, especially in the Maccabees, is determinate and certain. A distinction must, too, be made between those books that were originally written in Hebrew, and those that were originally written in Greek, for the style is strikingly dissimilar. In the former it is simple, much resembling the ancient historical style of the Hebrews; in the latter it is more oratorical, and even declamatory—a fact which is made evident by a comparison of the First and the Second book of the Maccabees. It must be added, that the true historical spirit

fails in the Greek Apocrypha, as appears from the additions to Esther and Daniel, and the Second book of Maccabees.

The Poetical Books offer in didactic poetry two beautiful works, namely, Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon. The former is a fine proof that proverbial wisdom still survived in Palestine; while the latter shows how the Greek philosophy had gained influence over the Jews that lived in Alexandria, and, united with Hebrew faith, bore noble fruit. It is not, however, to be denied that the poetic style sometimes sinks into prose. Lyric poetry was quite dead. It shows itself here only in the use made of hymns and prayers of earlier historical persons; e. g. the Prayer of Manasses and the Song of the Three Children.

The Prophetic Books show how the prophetic diction had become prose, and had passed over into the simple tone of instruction. The book of Baruch and the Letter of Jeremiah give evidence of the rising practice of one community's sending to another long religious essays in the epistolary form.

Various is the order in which the apocryphal books succeed each other in the manuscripts and different editions. We follow that chosen by Luther, who took the additions to Esther and Daniel out of the Greek translations of these books in the Septuagint, and, as being unauthentic, placed them in the Apocrypha.

Section LXXVII.—JUDITH.

The book relates how the king of Assyria, Nebuchadnezzar, sent his general Holofernes, with a large army, to enslave Western Asia. After a long expedition he comes to Judea, where he besieges the town of Bethulia. A Jewish widow, by name Judith, delivers the city by cutting off the head of Holofernes while asleep.

The book is so crowded with geographical and historical errors and contradictions, and so blends together the history before and the history after the Captivity, that Luther was of opinion that the whole was a fiction, intended to set forth the victory of the Jewish people over all their enemies. To the obvious inaccuracies belongs this, that Nebuchadnezzar governs in Nineveh, and is called king of Assyria (i. 6), for his father, Nabopolassar, had destroyed Nineveh, and it was Babylon of which he was king; that Arphaxad, king of Media, repaired Ecbatana, (i. 1), was one of the most ancient Median monarchs, and, living at the

time of Nebuchadnezzar, was slain by him (i. 6); that Arphaxad is properly the name of a country, and, according to the derivation, denotes Chaldea (comp. Gen. x. 22, 24); that the Jews had returned from exile (v. 20, 21), into which, however, they were led by Nebuchadnezzar; that Nineveh is yet standing (i. 6), after the Jews had returned, (v. 21); that the narrative of the expedition of Holofernes offends so much against geography, that he must twice have passed through Palestine (ii. 12, 13, and 15, 16) before he heard of the Jews, then a people entirely unknown to him (v. 1, 2, 3), and thereupon the country is invaded (vii. 1); finally, that the city of Bethulia is a quite unknown place, which according to this account must have stood not far from Jerusalem, in the mountains, or in the plain of Esdraelon (iv. 2, 3, v. 1, vi. 6-9).

The object of the whole is clearly to show how the Jews, when faithful to their religion, were unconquerable, and would be delivered in the most wonderful manner. Hence the assumption that the whole is an instructive fiction, in which Judith denotes Judea, or the Jewish people, Bethulia ("God's virgin") denotes pious Israelites, and Holofernes ("godless prince") denotes the enemies of the Hebrews. As general history is silent on the whole matter, and the book is of late origin, since it was not known to Josephus, it is difficult to prove that it has for its basis any historical fact. The character of Judith cannot be approved by a Christian mind; for while her resolution to deliver the besieged city may display heroism, she employs, in order to gain her end, lies, dissimulation, and murder (x. 13, 14, 23, xi. 4-6, 11, seq., xii. 14, seq., xiii. 5, seq.), and the connexion of such immorality with the piety here ascribed to the heroine, is not of a nature to win a Christian heart. The original text was written in Hebrew, for much is to be understood then only when translated into Hebrew. Luther, who translates from the Latin, seriously departs from the Greek text; which is very striking in the first chapter, since the slaying of Arphaxad, and the conquest of Eebatana (i. 13-16), are not found in him. The reason lies in the fact, that Augustin, in the Vulgate, had under his eyes a Chaldee text, from which he translated, and which varied much from our Greek. This Chaldee text, however, does not appear to have been the original text, for our Greek bears clear marks of having been translated from a Hebrew original.

As the contents of the book undoubtedly advert to the condition of the times in which the author lived, the date of its formation may be inferred. It is either the time of the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans under Titus, or the time in the second Jewish war under Hadrian, in which the Jews for many years obstinately defended a small fortifi-

cation called Bethor. The aim was to encourage the besieged, and to lead them to look for special aid from God. The name Bethulia ("God's virgin") is then to be taken figuratively for an unconquered stronghold, as, in Isaiah (xxiii. 12), Zidon, as a conquered citadel, is called a dishonoured virgin. In this case Nebuchadnezzar represents Titus or Hadrian, and in Jewish prayers each of these Romans bears the name of the second Nebuchadnezzar. As, however, the ecclesiastical father, Clemens Romanus, was acquainted with the book towards the end of the second century, the second supposition, which refers it to the time of Hadrian, is excluded, unless we assume that Clemens in this, as in other parts of his writings, has been interpolated.

Section LXXVIII.—THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON.

The book may be divided into *three parts*:—1. An address to all the great of the earth, requiring them to apply themselves to wisdom, that is, piety and virtue, as the sole way to immortality (i.-v.); in which the writer speaks of the infatuation of the godless (ii.); the happiness and immortality of the good, and the destruction of the wicked, after death (iii.-v.). 2. Solomon portrays wisdom (vi.-ix.), stating what it is, an efflux from God (vii. 25, 26), what it produces, namely, the four virtues, temperance and prudence, justice and courage (viii. 7), and how he himself had been honoured thereby (viii. 9, seq.). 3. Proof (x.-xix.) from Hebrew history how wisdom operates (x.-xii.), together with a description of folly and idolatry (xiii.-xv.), and some connected historical disquisitions (xvi. 19).

The style is very flowing, and is so oratorical that the reader feels at once how complete a mastery the author had obtained over the Greek, and there is no doubt that the original was written in that tongue. When then Hebraisms occur here and there, and the Hebrew parallelism may be observed, these facts are satisfactorily explained by the author's being a Jew, a highly cultivated Jew, who was perfectly familiar with the Old Testament and the peculiarities of Hebrew poetry. His doctrine of immortality in several particulars approaches the Christian, for he teaches that God hath no pleasure in the destruction of the living (i. 13), that righteousness is immortal (15), that God created man to be immortal (ii. 23), that the just shall after death find mercy and remain with God (iii. 9), shall be numbered among God's children,

and live for evermore (v. 5, 15), receive retribution and reward (iv. 7, v. 15), shall judge the nations and have dominion over the people (iii. 8), and shall receive a glorious kingdom and a beautiful crown from the Lord's hand (v. 16), and their Lord also shall reign for ever (iii. 8). Respecting the wicked, on the other hand, the writer teaches that the account of their sins shall afflict them with fear and confusion of face (iv. 19, 20), that their hope is like dust that is blown away with the wind, like a thin frost that is driven away with the storm, like the smoke which is dispersed here and there with a tempest (v. 14—comp. iii. 18, 19). Respecting wisdom, he teaches that it is an efflux from God, a ray of eternal light, the spotless mirror of the divine power, the image of his goodness, more radiant than sun and stars, purer than light, and that it unites with only the purest souls, making them friends and prophets of God (vii. 25-28). Being initiated into the mysteries of God, she gives man knowledge and virtue, especially temperance, prudence, justice, and fortitude (viii. 3-8). She comes from God only (vii. 15), with whom she was when he made the world (ix. 9), and who sent her down on earth to men (ix. 10, 17, 18). From these statements it appears that the religious doctrine of the author was without doubt derived from three sources:—1. The ideas of Plato, with which he became acquainted in Alexandria: to this conviction we are led by the mention of the four cardinal virtues, which stand here as they were set forth by Plato (*De Repub.* vi. 430), and by the representation of the divine wisdom compared with Plato's doctrine of the divine understanding and the soul of the world; according to which the highest God is a being of light, out of which proceeds the divine understanding, in which the ideas or images of all earthly things have their abode; the soul of the world formed the world, and permeates it as the soul permeates the body. 2. The oriental doctrine of the efflux of all things from God, according to which also God is conceived of as a being of light, from whom individual spirits and divine influences flowed forth like rays of light; on which account the first influence of God was called the first beam or the first begotten son of God; united with the Christian doctrine, these representations at a later period led to gnosticism. 3. Jewish ideas of the divine wisdom, according to which it was conceived of as a person which came forth from God before the creation of the world, and by which God made the world (*Prov.* viii. 22, seq., 30, seq.; *Eccles.* i. 1, 4, 9, 10, xxiv. 4, seq., 14). Nearly everything which our author says of the divine wisdom is said by *Philo** of the divine understanding, which he calls the

* Philo was born in Alexandria about from 25 to 30 years before Christ, in a wealthy sacerdotal family. He lived as an independent private person, and occu-

eldest son of God, an image of God, a teacher of men, even a high priest, an intercessor, a mediator. From this, however, he distinguishes the spirit of wisdom, which proceeds from God and is communicated to men.

The aim which our author had before him is unquestionably to instruct the unbelieving Jew, who, denying immortality (ii. 1-5), led a vicious and luxurious life (ii. 6, seq., 10, seq., iii. 10, seq.); also the superstitious heathen, who showed hatred and hostility towards Judaism, and wished to impose their idolatry on Jews, in the way in which the divine wisdom took precautions against the perversions of both; for it surely conducted to virtue and immortality, taught the folly of idolatry, and ever preserved itself in the history of the Jewish people. And as he exhibited this wisdom, so he clothed it in the dress of the philosophical views of the world which prevailed in Alexandria, and was the more sure of attaining his purpose with the cultivated, because he put himself before them as himself a man of cultivation. To the rulers and princes of the world he addressed his recommendation of wisdom, since from them chiefly came the oppression under which Judaism suffered, and they, in consequence, might be considered as the representatives of hostility to the Jews, and of everything not Jewish. The recommendation of wisdom, as it appears here, has for us Christians the highest recommendation, then, when we understand thereby the divine wisdom which made its appearance in Christ (Col. ii. 3, 8, 9); for of it only in its fullest sense is that true which we here read, though in Judaism the rays of divine wisdom are found, and they commend themselves to the heart as an outflow of lofty wisdom.

The name of Solomon as the author is feigned, as is proved by the fact that the entire spirit of the book is that of cultivated Alexandrine Jews. Some, in consequence, as is mentioned by Jerome, have ascribed it to Philo, but without reason, since the style and the religious philosophy of Philo, though like in some respects, differ essentially from what we have here. We can, therefore, only say that the author was a cultivated Alexandrine Jew who lived in the second century before Christ. He ascribed his book to Solomon because that monarch was, with the Jews of later ages, the ideal of wisdom, since thereby he was likely to obtain greater attention and acceptance for his writings.

pied himself with the Alexandrine philosophy. His chief object was to unite this philosophy with the doctrine of the Old Testament, which he sought to effect by allegorical interpretation. Being unacquainted with Hebrew, he made use of the Septuagint.—A.

Section LXXIX.—THE BOOK OF TOBIT.

Tobit, a pious Ephraimite, led into captivity at Nineveh, under Shalmaneser, becomes rich there, but loses his sight. His son, who wishes to receive a sum of money deposited in a remote city, Rages, in Media, is accompanied by the angel Raphael, and delivered from a fish that was about to swallow him. With the liver of the fish the young Tobit, in Ecbatana, drives away a wicked demon named Asmodi, and thereupon marries a Jewish maiden called Sarah, and on his return he restores his father's sight with the gall of the fish (i.-xiv.).

The whole is an instructive fiction, in the shape of a narrative, wherein it is shown that all goes well at last with the truly pious man, since God well rewards piety and virtue. The style, recommended by idyllic simplicity, is highly attractive; the spirit of the piece, compared with that of Judith, is far more pure and moral. Many have regarded the book as a pure invention—as a religious romance; but this view cannot be established, and this only is clear, namely, that instruction is the writer's great aim. The original was in Hebrew, as appears from the Hebraising tone and errors in the translation. Besides the Greek translation, there are versions of the book in Chaldee, Syriac, Latin, and even Hebrew. The last is from a Jew of the middle ages. All these versions, however, are very free, and vary much from each other. Luther, who translated from the Vulgate according to the translation of Jerome, which that father prepared according to the Chaldee text, departs in many essential points from the Greek text. Some of these deviations, which consist either in omissions, additions, or diversities of statement and representation, are the following:—The Greek text makes Tobit the elder relate his history in chapters i. and ii. (in Luther as far as iii. 6). According to this statement, he was a purveyor to Shalmaneser, and left in trust with a relative named Gabael, living at Rages, in Media, ten talents of silver, which he had got together out of his savings (i. 13, 14; Luther, i. 14-17). His loss of sight was occasioned by sparrows, and the physicians could give him no aid (ii. 10, xi. 13, 16—comp. Luther, ii. 11). But his son, who after his death proceeds to Ecbatana, survives here the destruction of Nineveh (xiv. 15—comp. Luther, xiv. 14-17). In Luther is also found (iii. 7) the incorrect statement, which stands in the Latin Bible, that Raguel, who was afterwards the father-in-law of the younger Tobit, lived in Rages, which, according to ix. 3, 6—comp. vii. 1, is not possible; and for Rages, Ecbatana should be read, as it stands in the Greek translation (iii. 7). Even the name

is different in different translations, being given thus: Tobis, Tobias, and Tobit. In the English the father is called Tobit—the son, Tobias. Tobit is the Greek name, and the son is called Tobia (or Tobias), for the sake of distinction. The meaning of the name, according to the Hebrew Tobi, is “my goodness;” and Tobia, “my goodness (is) God.”

The book is specially important in regard to the later religious opinions of the Jews, particularly as to angels and evil spirits. Seven archangels are mentioned, who carry the prayers of the pious up to God (xii. 12, 15), and are sent down upon the earth to help and rescue the good (iii. 17, xii. 14). Here, however, they have bodies only in appearance (xii. 19), and, after fulfilling their mission, they disappear and return to God (xii. 20, 21). The evil spirits inhabit deserts (viii. 3), burn with deadly lust for mortal women (vi. 14), are driven away by incense (vi. 9, 20, viii. 2), and may be bound by good spirits (viii. 3). The evil spirit has a name, Asmodi, which signifies *the tempter*. The rising Pharisaism may be recognised in the book by its four cardinal virtues, prayer, fasting, alms, and righteousness (iv. 6, seq., xii. 8, 9). Messianic hopes also find utterance in the book, though mention is not made of the appearance of a personal Redeemer; but Tobit declares to his son that the dispersed Jews would some time return and re-build Jerusalem and the temple, when all the heathen would be converted, and worship Jehovah (xiv. 5, seq.). If, judging the book in a Christian light, we pronounce the whole an invention, as Luther intimated, it nevertheless is a lovely picture of domestic life, and of the severe trial which the pious man overcomes by divine aid. The life and fate of the elder Tobit are, without doubt, the main objects, and the account of the events that befel the son serves only to develop the history of the father.

The spirit of the book, which decidedly adverts to the rising Pharisaism, leads to the conclusion that it was composed in Palestine at the time of Daniel, or about the beginning of the second century before Christ. To this conclusion we are led by the circumstance, that the book was originally written in Hebrew. Not till a later period, however, did it become known, for Josephus and Philo do not quote it. Jerome is the first to mention the book, and he characterises it as apocryphal. In the Western Church it is strongly recommended by Augustin, with whom Luther unites in the opinion which he pronounces thereon.

Section LXXX.—ECCLESIASTICUS.

The book contains a rich collection of wise remarks respecting the most diverse relations of life, especially in the middle class, and gives excellent rules of conduct (i.-li.), of which the basis is, that the knowledge and fear of God is the crown of all wisdom (i.).

It is translated from the Hebrew, and resembles the Proverbs of Solomon in substance and form. It founds its morality on the recompense which shows itself in this life, and so appears as the doctrine of prudence, wanting the deep motives of Christianity. Nevertheless, it forms an exceedingly abundant treasure of experience and excellent moral precepts, for the author draws, not merely from his own thoughts and experience (27), but also from the writings of others, and even from the Proverbs of Solomon (comp. xxxiii. 16, li. 13, seq.). On several topics there is found greater fullness and more connexion, but no general plan is to be discovered. The writer begins with an introduction on the origin and value of wisdom, and the art by which to obtain it (i., ii.), to which belongs the eulogy of wisdom, which wisdom, represented as a person, afterwards gives of itself (xxiv.). The whole is like the portrait of divine wisdom contained in the Proverbs of Solomon. Between and afterwards come proverbs of the most various kinds, now separately, now connectedly, regarding the course of things, the life of sages, their conduct, their strivings, their labours, in which the author goes through all the ages, conditions and relations of existence, sometimes describing, sometimes warning, sometimes encouraging. His words are, now mere prudential rules (viii., xii., xiii.), now the most excellent teachings of wisdom and virtue, e. g. respecting the duties of children towards parents (iii.), the proper management of the young (xxx.), friendship (vi. 7, seq., ix. 10, xxii. 20, seq., xxvii. 16, seq.), falsehood (xx. 26, seq.), forgiveness of enemies (xxviii. 1, seq.), and so forth. There are added more general but not less valuable disquisitions and explanations; for instance, regarding the purposes of human life (xvii., xviii.), the excellence of the Divine Word (xv.), the praise of God from nature (xliii.), concluded by a review of the most famous men of the Hebrew nation, according to the order of the biblical books (xliv.-l.). This review comes down to Simon, the high priest, under whom began the religious persecutions (comp. xxxvi.), and under whose direction the people are said to have sung the song beginning, "Now bless ye the God of all." It may be remarked, that the author addresses himself to the middle class, and but occasionally has in view those in higher positions, e. g.

princes and rulers (x.), physicians (xxxviii.), the learned (xxxviii. 24). The most noble principle, according to Christian truth, enjoining forgiveness to enemies (xxviii. 1, seq.), appears in conflict with the feeling of hatred against national foes, for whose destruction prayer is uttered (xxxvi. 2, seq.). The author gives expression to Messianic hopes. He desires the annihilation of enemies, the glorification of Jerusalem, the re-union and restoration of the tribes of Jacob (xxxvi. 1-17), the spread of the worship of Jehovah (18, 19), and the return of the prophet Elijah (xlviii. 9, 10). While, then, the Wisdom of Solomon represents the religious views of the Jews who dwelt in Alexandria, Ecclesiasticus exhibits the cast of Jewish mind that prevailed in Palestine. The latter is not, indeed, free from Greek influence and Greek culture, but approximates much more to the earlier Hebrew view of the world and of life, and in substance and form bears much of the stamp of the ancient Hebrew proverb and true Hebrew nationality.

That the book was originally written in Hebrew, appears partly from its entire character, partly from errors of translation, and partly from the Greek Prologue, which was not translated by Luther, who worked on the Latin version. In this Prologue the Greek translator represents himself as the grandson of the author, and entreats indulgence if he should fail in giving the exact force of any Hebrew term. Jerome states that he had seen the Hebrew original. The Hebrew author, according to the heading and his own statement (l. 27), was Jesus, the son of Sirach, a native of Jerusalem. We have nothing but conjectures respecting his condition and his life. The time in which he lived is, in a measure, declared in the fact, that he terminates his series of great men with the high-priest Simon (l. 1, seq.). But, as there were two high-priests of that name, it is a question whether the first or the second is intended. Views on the point are divided. The first lived in the age of the Egyptian king Ptolemy Lagi (323-284), and, as this Simon was surnamed *the Just*, it is thought that the eulogy pronounced in the book is most suitable to him. Accordingly, the work was composed about 290 or 280, A.C. But since religious persecutions are referred to in it (xxxvi. 9), and the high-priest Simon appears as he who protected the people against the dangers (l. 4), while under Simon I. the people were not troubled by Ptolemy I., but were in a good condition, it seems more likely that Simon II. is meant, who lived in the time of Ptolemy IV., surnamed Philopator, who, according to the Third book of the Maccabees, persecuted the Jews. Simon II. lived as high-priest from 217-195, so that, according to this, the book was written about 190, A.C. This view is supported by the circumstance, that the writer shows great enmity towards the Samaritans and Idu-

means (l. 25, 26), which enmity at that time received fresh fuel from the circumstance, that both these peoples then separated themselves from the Jews, and a temple in honour of Jupiter was erected on Mount Gerizim (Joseph., *Antiq.* xii. 5. 5). The grandson of the author, the translator of the book, represents himself in the Prologue as a Palestinian Jew, who went to Egypt in the reign of Ptolemy VI., surnamed Energetes II. (169, A. C.), and in that country made his translation. Now, as he mentions the year 38, meaning thereby the thirty-eighth year of that monarch's reign, we thus gain the year 131, and accordingly he wrote his translation about 130, A. C. The translator does not give his own name, but later authorities state that he, as well as his grandfather, was called "Jesus, Sirach's son." This is not improbable.

The Greek title of the book is "The Wisdom of Jesus, Sirach's Son;" the Latin is "*Ecclesiasticus*" (*Liber*). The latter title, according to Athanasius, was given because the book was put into the hands of Catechumens, and made the foundation of instruction in morals. Yet Jerome expressly says that it was used only for the edification of the church ("*Ecclesia*," hence *Ecclesiasticus*), but not for the proof of religious doctrines. The Greek Fathers called it Πανάρετος, or "Treasurer of Virtue." There are, besides, two collections of Hebrew proverbs in alphabetical order, under the name of Sirach, but these are certainly of a later age.

Section LXXXI.—BARUCH, WITH THE EPISTLE OF JEREMIAH.

The book of Baruch may be divided into two very dissimilar parts:

1. The first contains (i.-v.) a Letter which Baruch, in the name of the captives in Babylon, writes in that city to the Jews that remained at Jerusalem, wherein, on the occasion of sending a collection of money to them, he asks for their prayers on behalf of the Chaldean king and the exiles (i. 10-ii. 10), adding a supplication to God for mercy and pardon (ii. 11-iii. 8); he also describes the wisdom which had been sent from heaven and enshrined in the law (iii. 9-iv. 4), as well as bewails the fate of Jerusalem, concluding with consolatory promises (iv. 5-v. 9).
2. The second part is a Letter of Jeremiah, in which that prophet cautions the captives against idolatry.

The two parts were originally two separate compositions, as they still appear in several manuscripts. In order, probably, to preserve the

Letter of Jeremiah from being lost, it was added to the book of Baruch. According to the representation contained in the work, the Baruch here intended is the same person as appears in Jeremiah, to whom the prophet dictated his prophecies (Jer. xxxvi. 4, 32), and who, after the destruction of Jerusalem, accompanied him into Egypt (xliii. 3, 6). These statements do not correspond with the fiction in the book, according to which Baruch went to Babylon with king Jehoiachin, and consequently before the destruction of Jerusalem under Zedekiah (Bar. i. 1, seq.). Other discordances with known history present themselves; for, according to Baruch (i. 3), the book was read in the hearing of Jehoiachin and the people in Babylon; but from 2 Kings xxv. 27, we learn that the king was kept in prison so long as Nebuchadnezzar reigned; according to Baruch (i. 8), the sacred vessels were sent back to Jerusalem, together with this Letter, but those treasures were returned by Cyrus (Ezra i. 7); according to Baruch (i. 14), this letter was read in the temple "upon the feasts and solemn days," but the temple was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxv. 9); according to Baruch (i. 11, 12), Belshazzar is the son and successor of Nebuchadnezzar, and yet Belshazzar was the last Babylonian king, and before him reigned Evil-merodach (Dan. v. 1, 30, vi. 1, seq.; 2 Kings xxv. 27; Jer. lii. 31). Moreover, there are, in Baruch, imitations of later books, particularly of Nehemiah and Daniel; so that no doubt remains that the work is founded on a pure fiction. Luther says thereon: "Very trivial is this book, whoever good Baruch is. For it is not credible that Jeremiah's servant, who is also called Baruch, to whom this epistle has been ascribed, should not have been higher and richer in mind than is this Baruch. The dates also do not correspond with the histories." He thus justifies his having translated Baruch among the apocryphal writings: "We allow Baruch to go forth in this class, because he writes so severely against idolatry, and maintains the law of Moses." The epistle of Jeremiah, however, contains (vi.) obvious imitations of Isaiah (xliv.) and Jeremiah (xxix., x. 1-16), in passages where they utter warnings against idolatry. The Letter is not worthy of the prophet Jeremiah. Of the custom on which the whole invention of both books rests, namely, that of one religious community's sending to another long letters and treatises containing religious instruction, the first example occurs in Jeremiah himself (xxix.), who wrote a letter of the kind to the captives in Babylon.

Opinions are divided as to whether the book of Baruch was originally written in Hebrew or in Greek. Its character and style speak in favour of a Palestinian author; yet, inasmuch as frequent citations are made according to the Septuagint, the assumption that the author wrote in

Greek may deserve the preference. Nothing certain can be ascertained respecting its age, only it cannot have come into existence prior to the rise of Greek culture among the Jews. The epistle of Jeremiah, however, had for its author a Jew who spoke Greek, since the expressions taken from Isaiah and Jeremiah are borrowed from the Greek translation of those two books. The time of its formation is apparently that of the Maccabees.

Section LXXXII.—THE FIRST BOOK OF THE MACCABEES.

This book narrates the war of liberation maintained by the Jews under the leadership of the Maccabees against the Syrian dominion, from the ascent to the throne of the Syrian king, Antiochus IV., surnamed Epiphanes, to the death of Simon Maccabeus—that is, from 175 to 135, A. C. (i.-xvi.)—including the persecutions of the Jews by Antiochus (i.), the flight of the priest Mattathias into the mountains, and his incursions for the destruction of the idolatrous altars (ii.), the defeat inflicted on the Syrians by his son Judas, surnamed Maccabeus, and his re-consecration of the temple (iii., iv.), his further victories, and his death in fight (v.-ix. 22). Then his brother Jonathan, profiting by contests for the Syrian throne, is made governor and high-priest, but falls by assassination (ix. 22, xiii. 24). His brother Simon becomes high-priest and the first independent prince of the Jews; but he also is murdered, with two of his sons, at a banquet. His son, John Hyrcanus, succeeds (xiii. 25-xvi.).

The first book has not the same author as the second, nor forms with it and the third a continuous history, but, independently of the other books, narrates the heroic struggle of the Maccabees from its beginning to the death of Simon, the fourth Maccabee. It therefore comprises the period from 175 to 135, a period of forty years. As the second book speaks of earlier events, and the third sets forth a still more remote history, the order of the three ought to be reversed, so that the first should be the last book. From Nehemiah to our First book of Maccabees, there is in the Jewish history an interval of 250 years, of which Josephus supplies only scanty information (*Antiq.* xi.). When Alexander the Great, after the battle of Issus, conquered Phœnicia and Palestine, he treated the Jews honourably. On his death they came under the Egyptian dominion (301-221, A. C.). Then, down till 175, A. C., the Egyptian and the Syrian dominion over them was interchanged,

and the Jews had much to suffer in the wars of the Seleucidæ and the Ptolemies, in which Palestine was often the bone of contention. At last, when Antiochus IV. of Syria attempted to destroy their paternal religion, and to force them to receive the state religion of Rome, and in these measures caused many pious Jews to endure martyrdom, he rekindled the zeal of the Jews for their country and faith, and occasioned the sturdy and noble resistance made by the Maccabees. From Judas, who, for his bravery, was called *Maccabi*, or, in Chaldee, *Maccabai*—that is, “he who uses the hammer” (in fight, iii. 3)—the surname of Maccabees was given to the whole family, then to all their followers, and, finally, to all pious Jews faithful to their religion. Another appellation for them is *Hasideans*—that is, *Pious*. The struggle ended with the independence of the Jews under Simon (xiv. 4, seq., 41, seq.), whose grandson, Aristobulus, assumed the title of king.

The historical character of the first book stands high above that of the second; for although here and there the brevity in the statements is unsatisfactory, and there are some inaccuracies and exaggerations, yet is the book distinguished, before all historical productions of the time, by credibility, exact chronological order, and a gently-flowing historical style. Speeches and prayers are put into the mouths of the heroes. In his labours the author made use of written sources of information (ix. 22, xvi. 23, 24), which, indeed, is rendered probable by the exact chronological details. The era of the Seleucidæ is followed, which begins with April, 311, A.C., when Seleucus conquered Babylon. From this the chronology of the second book frequently departs, to the extent of a year, reckoning the commencement of the era of the Seleucidæ from October, 312, A.C., when for the first time Seleucus made a triumphant entry into Babylon. Oral tradition is also used, as appears from the character of the narrative in many parts, as well as from the nature of the matter, for the author did not live too late to receive oral communications. Foreign history is the author’s weak side, for he makes Alexander divide his kingdom on his death-bed (i. 6), and derives the Spartans from Abraham equally with the Jews (xii. 21).

The book was originally written in Hebrew, as is testified by Jerome, who had seen the Hebrew original, and by its decided Hebraisms and faults of translation. The Hebrew title of the book was (Euseb., *E. II.* vi. 25) “History of the Princes of God’s Children.” The time of its formation falls after the death of John Hyrcanus, for the author, at the close, adverts to the life and deeds of that Maccabean prince (xvi. 23, 24). Now, as John Hyrcanus died 107, A.C., the history cannot have been written previously to that date (comp. xiii. 20).

Section LXXXIII.—THE SECOND BOOK OF THE MACCABEES.

This work begins with two letters addressed to the Egyptian Jews (i., ii.), inviting them to celebrate the purification of the temple, which Judas Maccabeus had undertaken after conquering the Syrians. Then follows (iii.-xv.) an abridgment of a work by Jason of Cyrene, with an introduction and conclusion by our author (ii. 19-32, xv. 37-39), narrating the attempted plunder of the temple under Seleucus Philopator, 176, A. C. (iii.), the religious persecutions under Antiochus IV. (iv., v.), the martyrdom of two women, an old man, and of seven brothers, with their mother (vi., vii.), and, finally, the war of Judas Maccabeus, down to his victory over the Syrian general Nicanor (viii.-xv.).

The book begins the history before the Maccabean age, and carries it down only to 162, A. C., so that it covers a space of but fourteen years, running from iv. 7 parallel with the First book of Maccabees (i.-vii.), but ending much earlier than it. The author decorates the history with many huge wonders and additions, highly-wrought descriptions, and moralising disquisitions. The second book often stands in contradiction with the first, and contains a multitude of historical and chronological errors. The style is oratorical, affected, and ornate, and you feel the Alexandrine coarseness of taste manifested in verbosity and affectation. Among the monstrous wonders is this—that when Heliodorus, the messenger of Seleucus, enters the temple treasury in order to carry off its treasures, he was met by “a horse, with a terrible rider upon him, and adorned with a very fair covering, and he ran fiercely and smote Heliodorus with his fore feet, and it seemed that he that sat upon the horse had complete harness of gold. Moreover, two young men appeared before him, notable in strength, excellent in beauty, and comely in apparel, who scourged him continually, and Heliodorus fell suddenly unto the ground, and was compassed with great darkness, but they that were with him took him up and put him into a litter” (iii. 25-27); also, that at the time when Antiochus undertook a second expedition against Egypt, “through all the city (Jerusalem) for the space of almost forty days there were seen horsemen running in the air, in cloth of gold, and armed with lances, like a band of soldiers, and troops of horsemen in array, encountering one another, with striking of shields and multitude of pikes, and drawing of swords, and casting of darts, and glittering of golden ornaments, and harness of all sorts” (v. 2, 3); moreover, that a celestial protector on horseback, in white clothing, shaking his armour of gold, appeared as leader of the Jews against the Syrians (xi.

8, seq.); finally, that the prophet Jeremiah appeared to the high-priest Onias, and gave to Judas Maccabeus a sword of gold (xv. 12, seq.). The two letters from the Palestinian to the Egyptian Jews were not written by the author of the rest of the book, as they stand in quite a wrong place, for the purification of the temple is not spoken of till x. 1, seq., and the author would be in contradiction with himself; for, according to the first letter, Antiochus perished in Persia (i. 13, seq.), and, according to the account in the book, he returns unhurt from that country (ix. 1, seq.). Chronological errors and contradictions appear in the letters (comp. i. 7, 10, ii. 14, i. 18); clear fables are found in the story about the holy fire (i. 19, seq.), and the concealing of the ark of the Covenant on Sinai (ii. 4, seq.). The letters, too, were prefixed to the book at a later period (ii. 19, seq.).

Of Jason of Cyrene, whose five books our author abridged (ii. 23), nothing more is known, only he must have been a Jew belonging to the school at Alexandria, as is proved by the style and the character of his work, so far as they can be known from these extracts. He certainly was not acquainted with the First book of Maccabees. It is not known whence he drew his information. Some considerable time after 161, A. C. he must have written his work. Our author, who still later made his extract in Greek, was an Alexandrine Jew. In the language of his Prologue and Epilogue (ii. 19-32, xv. 37-39), he shows that the disquisitions and descriptions are in great part his own.

Section LXXXIV.—THE THIRD AND FOURTH BOOKS OF THE MACCABEES.

The Third book of the Maccabees not being found in the Latin translation (Vulgate), is not accounted among the Canonical Books of the Catholic Church; nor was it translated by Luther, and he correctly considered the contents fabulous. It has no right to its name, the Third book of the Maccabees, since it does not touch on the time of the Maccabees, but narrates an event of a far earlier date. In substance, it is as follows:—When in the year 217, A. C., the Egyptian king Ptolemy IV., or Philopator, after an unsuccessful expedition against the Syrians, returned to Egypt through Jerusalem, he, from curiosity, wished to see the Holy of Holies in the temple. In vain the people and his council wished to keep him back; at the moment, however, when he was entering, he fell down speechless, and in consequence

gave up his design. Arrived in Egypt, he resolves to take vengeance on the Jews in that land, and commands that they shall forfeit all their privileges, unless on the spot they are initiated into the mysteries of Bacchus. Only a few obey; he therefore orders all the Jews in Alexandria, with their wives and children, to be driven into the great circus of the city, and there to be trampled to death by drunken elephants. At the prayer, however, of the Jewish priest Eleazar, two angels appear to, and are seen only by, the trembling Jews. The elephants become timorous, go backwards, and crush the Egyptian soldiers placed behind them. The king, alarmed, causes the Jews to be freed from their chains, orders a festival, and gives command that no one should venture to convert a Jew to heathenism. He also permits the Jews to fall on the apostates, and put them to death. This they do.

The whole is intended to illustrate the origin of a Jewish festival in Egypt. History only informs us that Ptolemy IV., after the battle of Raphia (217), oppressed and ill-treated the Jews through ill-humour. The language of the book is Greek, and in the same bombastic Alexandrine style as the second book. It cannot be determined when it was produced—probably not till after Christ, for it is not mentioned before the third century, A. D.

A Fourth book of the Maccabees is mentioned by the Greek Fathers of the Church, but they do not give its contents. The Latin Fathers do not mention it. Perhaps it is nothing else but a small writing, *De Maccabæis seu de Rationis Imperio*, ascribed to Josephus, which is found in some MSS. of the Apocrypha.

Section LXXXV.—THE JEWISH HISTORY IN THE THREE LAST CENTURIES BEFORE CHRIST.

We subjoin the Jewish history of this period to the time of Herod the Great, in order to illustrate and supplement the books of the Maccabees.

The Jews under the Egyptian dominion.—The Third book of the Maccabees goes back to the time when the Jews are yet under the Egyptian king. After Alexander's death, his generals contended for dominion. By the battle of Ipsus (301) the Jews fell under the power of Ptolemy Lagi, the most cultivated of Alexander's soldiers, who became ruler of Egypt. That monarch transplanted a multitude of Jews to Alexandria, in order to people the city, treated them kindly, and gave them civic rights,

free trade, and many privileges, so that they were joined by others of their nation. The Jewish population acquired wealth by commerce, and thus excited the envy of the Macedonian Greek inhabitants. They had a splendid synagogue, their own government, and, in a later day, even a temple at Leontopolis. Their secular governor in Alexandria was called Alabarches (*Ink-prince*), "Magister in Scriptura." Other Jewish settlements were about this time founded in Libya and Cyrene, so that, near the days of Christ, Philo reckons a million of Jews in Africa. Alexandria more and more became the seat of Grecian learning. In this learning the opulent Jews had a share; hence arose the new Jewish religious philosophy, which was formed out of a union of the Jewish religion with the philosophy of Plato. This may be ascertained by reference to Plato and the Book of Wisdom. Of this period the Septuagint is the most remarkable production. The Palestinian Jews under the Egyptian dominion were governed by their own high-priests, and the eighty years (301-222, A. C.) which they passed under the sway of Egypt are among the most peaceful and flourishing of the later Jewish history.

Alternation of Egyptian and Syrian dominion.—From 222-175, A. C., in the wars between the Ptolemies and the Seleucidæ, the Jews were often in a bad condition, since if they were friendly with one power, they brought on themselves the hatred of the other. Antiochus III., king of Syria, conquered Palestine in 218, and the Jews became his subjects; but in the following year, at the battle of Raphia (217), he lost the country, for the Jews were compelled to become subject to the conqueror, Ptolemy IV., surnamed Philopator, for which they were afterwards punished by Antiochus. In this period falls the event narrated in the Third book of the Maccabees. In a new war between Syria and Egypt, the Jews again joined Antiochus, drove the Egyptians out of Zion, and were on that account much favoured by Antiochus, for he supplied them with requisites for sacrifice, improved the temple, and declared the priests free from imposts. When the son of the Egyptian king, Ptolemy V., married the daughter of Antiochus, the princess received Palestine as her marriage portion, and the country thus returned into the hands of Egypt. Soon after, however, it was again Syrian, and Seleucus IV. of Syria caused the temple to be plundered.

Persecutions under the Syrian dominion.—From 175, A. C. Syria was governed by Antiochus IV., called Epiphanes, who, having been educated in Rome, was a superstitious patron of the Roman religion and manners. At the same era there prevailed among the chief Jews a ridiculous imitation of Greek manners. The high-priest Jesus, who changed his name into Jason, stood at the head of the Greek party, and built an amphitheatre in Jerusalem, in which naked Jews combatted

(2 Macc. iv. 12-15). The unworthy fashion proceeded so far that the combatants "made themselves uncircumcised" (1 Macc. i. 15—comp. 1 Cor. vii. 18). Young Jews of the first families were forced to take part in the gymnastic exercises and to wear the cap which was the customary badge (2 Macc. iv. 12). This party gave themselves up to the interests of the Syrian dominion, and led the king to the thought that the rebellious disposition of the Jews lay in their religion, and could be best rooted out if he first destroyed Judaism and established the Roman religion in its stead. Such a purpose well suited the zealotism of Antiochus, and, consequently, in 169, A. C. he issued a command that the temple service should cease, and Jewish children remain uncircumcised. Under penalty of death, men were commanded to sacrifice to the heathen gods, to labour on the Sabbath, to eat swines' flesh and flesh offered in sacrifice, and to burn the books of the law (1 Macc. i. 41-51, 56, 57, 60-64). The temple in Jerusalem was consecrated to Jupiter Olympius, and a large image of that divinity was erected on the brazen altar, before which swine were sacrificed. The temple in Samaria was consecrated to Jupiter Xenios, that is, Jupiter the guardian of the rights of hospitality. The will of the king was carried into effect by force and cruelty, and many faithful worshippers of Jehovah suffered martyrdom (2 Macc. vi. 18-vii. 42).

War of liberation—the Maccabees.—The cruel tyranny thus exerted throughout the land called forth a race of Jewish heroes, who came forward full of enthusiasm to defend the religion of their fathers. Mattathias, a priest, the father of five sons, had gone to the country near Joppa (Modein) in order that he might live there undisturbed in the enjoyment of his religion. The Syrians came with a view to force idolatry on him and the people. He gave a decided refusal, slew the first Jew that offered the unholy sacrifice, and with him the Syrian officer, and called on all to follow him. Many accordingly went with him into the mountains, in the caves of which they found a secure refuge. Here large numbers of his followers perished rather than defend themselves on the Sabbath, until a resolution was come to not to make an assault, but merely to do what was necessary on that sacred day. They made from their mountain stronghold, sallies in different directions, destroyed idol altars, and forcibly circumcised infants. Mattathias died in the first year of the heroic struggle (166, A. C. ; 1 Macc. ii.). At his wish, he was succeeded by his son Judas, with the surname of Maccabi, "the hammerer." Judas successively beat the Syrian generals Apollonius and Seron. Antiochus was so enraged at these victories that he resolved to extirpate the whole nation and to people the country with colonists of another blood. While he proceeded to Persia, in order to

raise money by imposts, he left behind, in Syria, Lysias, with half the army, to fill his place and punish the Jews. Lysias sent his general Gorgias against them, and Gorgias was slain. Next year, Lysias himself lost his life at Emmaus, when Judas conquered Jerusalem, restored the desecrated temple, and obliterated every trace of idolatry (162, A. C.). In commemoration of this event, the feast of dedication was instituted (comp. John x. 22). This festival lasted ten days, and began on the 25th of December (1 Macc. iii., iv.). As, however, the Syrians still held the citadel, Judas fortified the temple against them, and provided it with a garrison. He also made excursions against heathen peoples that were near, especially the Idumeans, who, jealous at the restoration of the temple, fell like common robbers on the Jews. While Judas was victorious in Gilead, and his brother Simon in Galilee, the Jews in Jerusalem attacked Gorgias. They lost the battle. Judas on this hastened back and broke in pieces the heathen altars in Philistia (1 Macc. v.). Meanwhile Antiochus died in Persia, after failing in an attempt to plunder a temple in the province of Elymais. The cause is stated by Polybius to have been a threatening token of future calamity; according to 2 Macc. ix. 5, 9, 18, 28, he was smitten of God with an incurable and invisible plague; but according to 2 Macc. i. 13-16, he was inveigled, stoned, and hewed in pieces, by the priests. At this time the book of Daniel came into existence, having for its general object, to strengthen the pious, to encourage them to martyrdom, and, by the promise of the Messiah's kingdom, to console and elevate them after the tyrant's death. Antiochus was followed by his son, Antiochus V., surnamed Eupator, who, proceeding to Jerusalem with a powerful army, besieged the temple; but, hearing that a certain Philip was coming against him from Persia at the head of his deceased father's troops, he made peace with the Jews and granted them religious liberty (1 Macc. vi.). When, however, Demetrius Soter, flying from Rome, got possession of the Syrian dominion, and many renegade Jews, especially the high-priest Alcimus, whom Judas did not acknowledge, laid complaints before that monarch, there arose a fresh persecution, in which efforts were made to cause Judas to play into the hands of the Syrians. He, however, twice conquered the Syrian general Nicanor (1 Macc. vii.), formed an alliance with the Romans (viii.), but fell in a battle against Bacchides (161, A. C.). Oppressive times for the Jewish patriots ensued. Much weakened, they gathered around Jonathan, Judas's brother, who at first was obliged to limit himself to measures of defence, since Bacchides and the faithless Alcimus ruled in Jerusalem. Meanwhile Jonathan renewed the alliance with the Romans and formed one with the Spartans (1 Macc. xii.). In the conflicts for the throne which were now

fought in Syria, he took the side of Alexander Balas, who had come forward against Demetrius. Jonathan conquered in his behalf, and, as a reward, he was by Alexander made high-priest and governor of Judea (150, A. C.). Demetrius II. opposed Alexander, to whom Jonathan remained faithful, fighting and conquering for him. His patron, however, perished in a war in Egypt. Demetrius II. became king. Yet Jonathan so gained the monarch's favour as to receive from Demetrius confirmation in his governorship, with additional territory in Samaria. The army now fell away from Demetrius, and undertook the cause of a child of Alexander, by name Tryphon. At first Jonathan remained firm in his fidelity to Demetrius. As, however, the latter did not keep his promises, Jonathan went over to the opposite party; by which step he obtained confirmation in his dignity, and his brother Simon was nominated Syrian general in Palestine (1 Macc. ix.-xi.). Jonathan, having fought many successful battles against Demetrius, fell a victim in the hands of Typhon, who was aiming at the throne of Syria. Fearing Jonathan, Typhon treacherously caused him to be arrested in Ptolemais, took the money sent by his brother Simon to ransom him, slew Jonathan, and gave up only his corpse (143, A. C.). Soon he employed corrupt physicians to destroy the young prince. After these horrible deeds it was useless for him to think of coming to an understanding with Simon. The latter, therefore, again allied himself with Demetrius, who appointed him high-priest, and made him the independent prince of Judea; so that for the first time since Nebuchadnezzar the Jews were a free nation (1 Macc. xii., xiii.).

The Jews under their own Maccabean Princes.—Under the government of Simon the people lived in peace and prosperity. Romans and Spartans renewed their alliance with him, and, as a token of gratitude, the people made the united dignity of high-priest and ruler hereditary in his house; a testimonial of which was suspended in the temple (1 Macc. xiv.). Simon fortified the temple anew, especially by building close on the temple, and for its defence, the castle or fort afterwards named Antonia. He conquered Gaza and restored the harbour of Joppa. He exerted, also, the peculiar right of sovereignty in coining money in his own name. Permission for this he had received from the new Syrian king Antiochus, the son of Demetrius (1 Macc. xv. 6). These coins were according to the Greek standard, and made of silver. They consisted of shekels and half-shekels; also of smaller money in copper. On one side they bore a palm-tree, a bunch of grapes, or an almond-blossom; on the other a sacrificial goblet. On the rim was an inscription in ancient Hebrew, presenting the words on one side, *Shekel of Israel*, and on the other, *Holy Jerusalem*. From 142, A. C. was this money

coined. By new changes in Syria, in which Antiochus had opposed Tryphon, Simon was again involved in war with the Syrians, in which his sons Judas and John slew the Syrian generals. Simon, however, with his two sons, came to his end at a banquet in Jericho, through the wickedness of his own son-in-law, Ptolemy, who was governor of that city (135, A. C.). His third son, also, John Hyrcanus, who commanded in the fortress of Gaza, was near falling by the hands of assassins; but, warned in time, he seized the messengers and put them to death (1 Macc. xvi.). Thus far extends the information given in the First book of the Maccabees.

Hyrcanus (135-107, A. C.), who followed his father Simon, was not fortunate in his reign at first, for the Syrians, angry that the attempted assassination had failed, besieged Jerusalem, and compelled Hyrcanus to demolish his fortifications. But as continual civil strifes weakened the Syrians, Hyrcanus again succeeded in making himself independent, and he took out of their hands one city after another. He thus conquered Shechem and destroyed the temple of the Samaritans. The Idumeans, moreover, having yielded to his arms, were subjected to circumcision, and thus they gradually blended with the Jews. Hyrcanus died in 107. He was not merely high-priest and prince, but also a prophet to whom revelation was ascribed. Aristobulus, his eldest son (107-104, A. C.), took the title of king, and afterwards held therewith the pontifical office. He conquered from the Syrians, Iturea on the east of the Jordan, whose inhabitants were incorporated with the Jewish people. He manifested unnatural cruelty in slaying his mother and brothers, in order to secure himself in his power. His successor Alexander Jannæus (104-74, A. C.), employed equally barbarous means for the same end. A conspiracy, originating with the pharisees, broke out among the people at the feast of tabernacles, which led to a long sanguinary civil war. The conflict was brought to a termination only by the utmost severities. By conquests from the Syrians he regained favour with the people, and left his kingdom more extensive than he found it. His wife, Salome or Alexandra (74-65), became reconciled with the pharisees, and in compact with them reigned in peace. On her death there broke out a bloody contest for the succession between her two sons. The elder, a friend of the pharisees, was already high-priest. He appealed to his claims of birth. His name was Hyrcanus II. The younger, a sadducee, a young man beloved by the people for his bravery, called Aristobulus II., conquered his elder brother at Jericho, and got possession of the government. Hyrcanus promised to live as a private man, but being stirred up against his brother by Antipater, a distinguished Idumean, the father of Herod the Great, he sought protection

under the patronage of the Arabian king Aretas. The latter came with an army, defeated Aristobulus, and besieged him in the temple. An appeal was made to the Roman general, Pompey, who took possession of the temple in 63, A. C., on the same day on which Nebuchadnezzar had subdued the city. The walls of Jerusalem were broken down, and the independence of the country was lost. Hyrcanus was appointed high-priest and governor. He was, however, obliged to cede to the Romans a part of the territory as well as to pay them tribute. Aristobulus, with his two sons, was conducted in triumph to Rome.

The last Maccabean Princes under the influence and dominion of the Romans.—The restored Hyrcanus ruled about six years in peace, at the end of which the eldest son of the imprisoned Aristobulus II., named Alexander, appeared in Judea at the head of a party, but was defeated by Gabinius, the Pro-consul of Syria. A year later his father, who had fled from his prison in Rome, experienced the same fate at the hands of Sisenna, the son of Gabinius; on which Alexander appeared in Palestine a second time, and was again overcome (54, A. C.). Gabinius, whom Josephus praises as a patron and defender of the Jews, was deprived of his office for his extortions in Syria. Crassus took his place, who carried avarice still further, and even rifled the treasure of the temple. A brighter day rose on the Jews under Cæsar, who, after the battle of Pharsalia (48, A. C.), went to Syria, and permitted them to re-build the walls of Jerusalem. He restored to Hyrcanus the sovereignty, and made the Idumean Antipater Pro-curator under him. Soon, however, the latter died from poison; but his two sons, Herod and Phasaël, found a new patron in Antony. In the war of the Romans with the Parthians, Antigonus, the youngest son of Aristobulus, aided by the Parthians, succeeded in conquering Jerusalem. The old Hyrcanus and Phasaël fell into his hands, and met with a melancholy fate. He cut off the ears of the former in order to render him incapable of the pontificate, and the latter put an end to his days in prison. Meanwhile, Herod had fled to Rome, and he there so prospered that he was named King of Judea, and consecrated to that dignity in the Capitol (37, A. C.). In two years he succeeded in conquering Jerusalem. Antigonus gave himself up to the Romans, and was beheaded at Antioch. Of the Maccabees there were still in existence only the aged Hyrcanus, his daughter Mariamne, the wife of Herod, and Aristobulus III., the brother-in-law of Herod, and son of the aged Hyrcanus. Herod, with the surname of Great, reigned from 37-3, A. C., making his rule infamous by many sanguinary crimes (Section ev.). In his time was the Saviour born.*

* The birth of Christ is, in our era, fixed, we know not how, four years too

Section LXXXVI.—THE REST OF ESTHER.

In the Greek translation (Septuagint) there are in the book of Esther a number of interposed passages, being additions and details in several parts, which Jerome, in the Vulgate, placed at the end of the book, and Luther in the Apocrypha.

These consist of,—1. An edict of Ahasuerus (i.), according to which all the Jews in that monarch's dominions were, at the instance of Haman, to be destroyed on one day (i.); to be introduced into Esther after iii. 13. 2. A prayer of Mordecai for delivery from this danger (ii. and iii.). 3. A prayer of Esther having the same object (iii.); to be introduced in Esther after iv. 17. 4. A dressing-up of the scene in which Esther appears before the king (iv.); to be introduced into Esther instead of v. 1-2. 5. A second edict of Ahasuerus, in which he recalls the first, and makes known the punishment inflicted on Haman, and commands the observance of the festival of Purim (v., vi.); to be introduced into Esther after viii. 13. 6. A dream of Mordecai, in which he sees beforehand the persecution and deliverance of the Jews (vii.); to be placed in Esther, at the beginning, before i. 7. The explanation of this dream by Mordecai himself (viii.); to be put in Esther, at the end, after x. 3.

That these additions are spurious, scarcely deserves proof: it is, however, made clear from—1. The contradictions they contain to statements in Esther; for, according to viii. 1, Mordecai, in the second year of Ahasuerus, when he has his dream, is an eminent personage serving in the court of the king; but, according to Esther ii. 16, 19, 22, he, in the seventh year of Ahasuerus, appears in the outer court of the royal palace, in consequence of the elevation of Esther, in order to obtain information of her, but in no way as a servant of the king, or as a distinguished courtier; according to vi. 13, 15, Ahasuerus himself commands the observance of the Purim festival; while, according to Esther ix. 20-30,

late, so that Christ was really born four years earlier than we commonly assume. When it is said above that Herod reigned to the year 3, A. C., the truth is, that he reigned till the year 1 after Christ. The error is easily proved thus: According to Luke iii. 1, 23, the Saviour was thirty years old when, in the 15th year of Tiberius, he entered on his public ministry. The 15th year of Tiberius is either 782, U. C., or, since Tiberius was two years associated in the Government, with his step-father Augustus, 780, U. C. Going back thirty years, we come to 750 or 752. The year in which Herod died, under whom Christ was born, was 751, U. C. This then, is the year 1, A. D., and that is 750, U. C., and not 754, U. C., according to the usual assumption. Thus, Rome was built 750, not 754, years before the birth of Christ.—A.

the letter and request to the Jews to keep this festival proceed from Mordecai; according to vi. 8, 9, Haman is a Macedonian, and entertains the intention of transferring the kingdom of the Persians to the Macedonians; but in Esther iii. 1, no mention is made of anything of the kind, for in the time of Ahasuerus (Xerxes, or Artaxerxes,) Macedon was not yet so considerable and so dangerous a kingdom. 2. The style is quite different from that of Esther, being bombastic and Alexandrine. Hence it is to be inferred that these additions are the work of an Alexandrine Jew, to which allusion is made in the transformation of Haman into a Macedonian, since Alexandria was founded and in part peopled by Macedonians, and its Macedonian population were often full of envy and hatred against the Jews settled in the city. The time of the fabrication cannot be determined: only Josephus was acquainted with and employed these passages.

Section LXXXVII.—THE ADDITIONS TO DANIEL.

The Greek translation (Septuagint) contains also three longer additions to the book of Daniel, which, as being dissimilar in kind, Luther separated from that work, and placed them in the Apocrypha. Two of these additions he divided into separate portions, and so obtained five additions under five different appellations. In the Greek the two passages of Bel and of the Dragon form one whole; as well as the Prayer of Azarias and the Song of the Three Children. The History of Susanna and of Daniel form in the Greek the thirteenth chapter of Daniel, and is to be regarded as the first supplement to the prophet, while in some MSS. it stands as the first chapter, as the story falls in the childhood of Daniel. The history of Bel and of the Dragon forms the Second Supplement, as the fourteenth chapter, for the event here narrated falls in the reign of Cyrus. The Prayer of Azarias and the Song of the Three Children stand in the middle of the book, after iii. 23, where, according to its contents, it belongs.

The History of Susanna and Daniel relates how Daniel, while yet a boy, saved the character and the life of the virtuous Susanna, who was accused of adultery by two wicked judges. This he effected by hearing them separately, and so becoming acquainted with the contradictory character of their testimony.

Bel and the Dragon tells us how Daniel disclosed to Cyrus the trickery

of the priests of the idol Bel, who, with their wives and children, instead of the god, devoured the food offered in sacrifice; as their footsteps on ashes strewn by Daniel made manifest: also how Daniel proved that Bel was no god, but an idol, by giving him boiled pitch, fat and hair, which caused him to burst asunder. A popular commotion, however, constrained Cyrus to throw Daniel into the lion's den, in which he was wonderfully supported, and was supplied with food brought through the air by the prophet Habakkuk.

In the Prayer of Azarias and the Song of the Three Children, we are told how Azarias, a friend of Daniel, and one of the three who, at Nebuchadnezzar's command, were cast into a fiery furnace, prayed to God that, while he justly punished the people for their sins, he would pity both the people and themselves, whereon an angel appeared and extinguished the raging flames. Then, as if with one mouth, they all praise God, and call on all God's works and creatures, to laud his name, seeing that he had rescued them from the fire.

The Greek translation, which otherwise in general corresponds with the Hebrew text, in Daniel departs considerably from it, for there we find omissions, additions, and other variations; and besides what has now been adduced, it gives lengthened apocryphal passages. It has in consequence been thought that the translators used a Chaldee text much differing from our Hebrew. This, however, cannot be definitely proved, and we must be satisfied with the assumption that they allowed themselves some freedom, even inserting what appeared to them suitable passages. Our apocryphal passages proceeded from the same spirit whence sprang the book of Daniel itself, and give evidence how fertile at that time legendary tradition was, and how its details were ascribed to historical personages. Of these additions, Luther remarked that he had plucked up these blue bottles (because they did not stand in the Hebrew text of Daniel and Esther), but not destroyed them; for as they contained much good, they might be set in private gardens.

The story of Susanna and of Daniel is clearly designed to exhibit Daniel as prudent and noble in his early days. The narrative of *Bel and the Dragon* falls in the last years of Daniel, and seems to be an imitation of the sixth chapter in the canonical book, where is an account of the casting of Daniel into a lion's den and of his wonderful preservation there. According to the Greek heading, the author of this apocryphal narrative is a certain Habakkuk, son of Joshua; and therein chiefly may lie the reason why the prophet Habakkuk comes forward in the narrative, contrary to the requirements of the time, for that prophet was a younger contemporary of Jeremiah and not of Daniel (Section lxxi.). Both portions were originally written in Greek,

and proceeded not from the Greek translator of Daniel, as appears from the heading of the second portion given above. *The prayer of Azarias and the Song of the Three Children* are by two different writers, and the contents have not the smallest reference to the special condition of the persons in the furnace. Their song is made up of passages taken from the Psalms. The complaint also (38) that there no longer existed a prophet, points decidedly to a time after that of Daniel. Luther accordingly remarks, "The substance of Susanna, of Bel, Habakkuk, and the Dragon, looks like religious fictions, as Judith and Tobit, for the names have a sound of the kind."

Section LXXXVIII.—THE PRAYER OF MANASSES.

According to 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11, the idolatrous king Manasseh (699-644) was carried away captive to Babylon. Here he humbled himself before God, and prayed, and God heard him, and brought him back to Jerusalem, where he became a pious and God-fearing king (12-16). His prayer and its answer were recorded in the national annals (18, 19). This last statement occasioned a later writer to compose "The Prayer of Manasses," and to put it into the king's mouth.

In the prayer, Manasseh acknowledges the divine justice and omnipotence, and throws himself on God's pity and grace, while he confesses his sins, and prays for liberation from their bondage.

The prayer is of late and of Greek origin, for it is composed of forms taken from the Greek Psalter. The Catholic church did not take it into its Canon, and it is wanting also in several manuscripts of the Septuagint. It is not quoted before the third century A.D. Luther translated it from the Vulgate.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Section LXXXIX.—CANONICAL BOOKS.

All the books of the New Testament form together the Canon—that is, the standard of the Christian's faith and conduct (Section viii.). In collecting these books, special care was taken to exclude from the Canon such writings as were considered apocryphal. The authenticity of our canonical books—that is, the certainty that they, in truth, were written by the apostles and their immediate scholars—rests, for the most part, so firmly on external and internal grounds, that all the attempts of doubt and unbelief to represent them as supposititious, and of late origin, not only altogether fail, but must also conduce to make their authenticity more clear and more certain.

The most important external grounds in favour of their having had for authors the apostles and their disciples, are these:—1. As early as the apostolic age, passages out of our canonical books were partly quoted word for word, partly given according to the sense, by the immediate scholars of the apostles, namely, those of Paul and John. Those books were not merely already in existence, but they were used as authentic and recognised writings of the apostles and their disciples. Such disciples and fellow-workers with the apostles, who bear the name of apostolical fathers, were, in the first century, Barnabas of Cyprus, according to tradition its first bishop, and Clemens Romanus, who from 91 to 92, A. D. was bishop of Rome. The former was the patron and companion of Paul in his first missionary tour (Acts ix. 27, xi. 25, 30, xii. 25, xiii. 2, seq.); the latter was a disciple of Paul (Phil. iv. 3). As disciples of John, there are to be mentioned, Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, who died 106 or 115, A. D.; and Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who died 169, A. D.; also Papias, bishop of Hieropolis, in Syria, who lived about that time, and, according to some, was a fellow-disciple with Polycarp under the Apostle John. 2. After the apostolic age, there is a recognition of the apostolic writings, and specially of the Gospels, generally by the teachers of the church: thus Irenæus, the dis-

ciple of Polycarp, who went into Gaul and became bishop of Lyons in 177, expressly declares that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John wrote Gospels; Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, who died in 184, wrote a commentary on the four Gospels, and Clemens of Alexandria (between 211 and 218) repeatedly cites passages out of the Gospels and Epistles. In the same way, Tertullian (220), and Origen (254), and the ecclesiastical historian Eusebius (340), and many other teachers of the church, speak of the books contained in our New Testament, which at this time were universally spread, and, with few exceptions, were universally acknowledged as authentic. 3. Most of the heretics of the second century, who were open opponents of Christianity, recognised the authenticity of the book of the New Testament, which they certainly would not have done had they been aware of any tenable ground against it. The Gnostics, for example, endeavoured to support their false notions by passages taken from the New Testament; and if they pronounced spurious, certain passages in the books which contradicted their doctrine, and contested the respect paid to the writers, yet they did not deny that the books really proceeded from them. These Gnostics are Valentinus, who died 160, A. D., and his pupils, Heracleon, Ptolemy, and Marcus. In the bitterest opponents of Christianity who tried to prove the falseness of Christianity from its original documents, the authenticity of those documents is not called in question. Such is the fact with Celsus, a heathen philosopher (161-180), and Porphyry (304), also a philosopher of the new Platonic school. They show in their writings a great acquaintance with the New Testament originals, and recognise them as genuine works of the apostles, while from their contents they endeavour to prove that partly they communicate nothing new, nothing that Pagan philosophy had not already taught, partly present, untrue, and contradictory doctrines which cannot be believed. Even Lucian, the satirist, who represented Christianity as the fashionable folly of the day, mentions that the Christians possess sacred original books, without expressing a doubt as to their authenticity. As little did other opponents of Christianity among the heathen philosophers deny either the existence or the authenticity of our evangelical originals; and accordingly the averment that we cannot historically prove that the New Testament writings originated with apostles and their scholars, is an empty, idle speech.

The internal grounds for the authenticity of the New Testament books may be summed up in the declaration, that in substance, language, and style, they exactly answer to the age of the apostles and their disciples. For,—1. The authors show themselves to be persons who have long lived in Palestine, and are accurately acquainted with the

history and antiquities of the Jews, as well as with the chronology and geography of the age. 2. Their statements respecting the then existing customs and observances (Matt. xxi. 12, xxv. 14; Luke xxi. 1; John ii. 13, seq.), the legal usages of the Romans (Matt. xvii. 24; Luke xii. 5, 8), views and opinions of the Jews, as well as their statements as to the condition, character, and government of the Roman empire, and of Palestine in particular,—completely agree with the information found in other writers, especially Josephus, the Jewish historian. The small number of passages in which the New Testament is found to vary are partly unimportant, and partly attest the employment of sources of information unknown to other writers, or display a judgment formed on independent, personal, and sufficient grounds. 3. The New Testament writers, in the writings ascribed to them, exhibit themselves exactly such as they really were—that is, as men who (excepting Paul) had no share in the learning and higher culture of the day. Their language, their modes of thought, the character of their narratives, give loud testimony to the fact. The Greek which they speak and write is altogether that of the then existing Jews, the counterpart of which is found in the Septuagint. They write without any ornament of style, without a philosophical development of thought, simply stating what they know, just as men of their position would do. Their own particular views and opinions, e. g. regarding demoniacal possession (Mark i. 23, v. 2, seq.; Luke viii. 27, seq.; Acts viii. 7), sickness as a divinely-inflicted punishment (John ix. 1-3—comp. Luke xiii. 2-5), the earthly dominion of the Messiah, &c. (Acts i. 7; Matt. xix. 27; Luke xxii. 24; Matt. xx. 20—comp. 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3),—are exactly what we should expect from such men in that age and country. Their acquaintance with the Old Testament shines forth in every part, and their method of explanation is the prevailing one, in which the Old Testament was cited according to the Septuagint, only that they frequently show how, through the Saviour's life and fate, a new light had been thrown on some passages. Besides, they pre-suppose in their readers such things, and conceive of them in such a manner, as was natural and proper under the circumstances. 4. They write partly as eye-witnesses, partly as persons who received their information from eye-witnesses. Not only do they expressly declare this (1 John i. 1, 3, 4; John xix. 35; Luke i. 2), but they make it unquestionably apparent in their whole manner of thought and writing. This is seen in the impartiality and confidence with which they speak of the facts, in their freedom from all anxiety as to whether their words might seem untrue, the vivid reality of their descriptions, the circumstantial nature of their narratives, and the absence of all solicitude in regard to time, place, and person, on which a later

writer, wishing to pass for an apostle, would have betrayed the greatest concern.

For these reasons, the writings of the apostles and their scholars,—which came into existence in the first century, were collected together in the middle of the third century, and have been handed down to us in the New Testament,—are incontestably to be regarded as the authentic original records of Christianity; and since the Saviour expressly promised that the Holy Spirit should lead his disciples into all truth (John xvi. 13), we regard them as the trustworthy fountain and inspired guide in relation to everything which is or professes to be Christian.

Section XC.—APOCRYPHAL BOOKS.

Besides our canonical books, there existed in very early times a number of uncanonical writings, in use chiefly among the heretics. We allude specially to what are called Gospels, which we know chiefly from quotations in ancient Fathers of the Church, and which, in part, bear the name of some apostle. So far as we can speak with certainty, they were little else than heretical adulterations of our canonical Gospels, having for their object the establishment of the false doctrines of heretical sects, especially the Gnostics. Accordingly, passages in our Gospels which opposed the heretical notions were omitted, and others were substituted of a nature to give those opinions support; so that we have little reason to deplore the loss of these falsifications. Most important among them was the so-called Gospel of the Hebrews, which was also entitled The Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, the Gospel of Matthew. This very ancient Gospel was written in Hebrew, and employed by the sect of Jewish Christians. It was very like our Gospel according to Matthew, but it was deformed by additions and omissions. Much has been said for and against the theory that our Gospel was formed from this uncanonical writing, and, indeed, is only the Greek version of it. An opposite theory supposes that this uncanonical was formed from our canonical Gospel, for the use of those Jewish Christians who maintained the perpetual obligation of the Mosaic law, and that Jesus was merely the son of Joseph and Mary. The latter theory has, beyond dispute, the most in its favour, since the omissions often refer to such passages as set forth the divinity of the Saviour, so that the object of the omissions is sufficiently clear. Nevertheless, we may conceive that the Gospel of the Hebrews and our Gospel of Matthew were derived from

a common Hebrew original, written by Matthew himself; but in the absence of certain information, we can arrive at no definite conclusion on the point. Similar to this Gospel of the Hebrews was another, that of Peter, which Eusebius decidedly characterises as heretical; also a Gospel of the Egyptians, which was related to Matthew and Luke. The Gnostic sects of the second century had several other gospels mutilated according to Gnostic views. Thus Marcion falsified the Gospel of Luke, and Basilides, like Marcion, a Gnostic, falsified the Gospel of Matthew. Besides, we may mention the Gospel of Nicodemus, of Bartholomew, of James, and of Thomas. The first contains only the hearing of Jesus before Pilate, and the last sufferings of the Redeemer, and was probably written in Greek by a Jewish Christian. The second is nearly akin to our Gospel of Matthew, and may have originated from it. The two others, which treat of the infancy of Jesus, openly seek only to fill up the intervals which are found in our Gospels between the childhood and the public ministry of Christ. They are of no value. Several other apocryphal gospels are mentioned by the ancient doctors of the Church, and are described as manifestly heretical inventions.

Worthy of notice is the apocryphal correspondence which the Saviour is said to have conducted with a prince of Edessa, by name Abgarus, and which Eusebius, who has preserved it (*Hist. Eccl.* i. 12), translated from the Syriac, having received the manuscript from the archives of that city. It is, however, clear that the alleged correspondence is spurious. The occasion for it, according to Eusebius, was as follows:—Abgarus was afflicted with a grievous bodily disorder, which defied all ordinary skill. Having heard of the wonderful cures accomplished by Jesus, he sent a letter soliciting aid from the Saviour. In reply, Jesus promised that one of his disciples should go and heal him. After his resurrection and ascension, Thomas, one of the twelve, sent Thaddeus, one of the seventy disciples, to Edessa, who, among other sick persons, healed the prince, and preached the Gospel to the inhabitants of Edessa. In these last statements, particularly, the apocryphal character of the whole is visible. The letters are made up out of passages taken from our canonical books. The whole wears the appearance of an invention, being correspondent neither to the persons nor to the alleged occasion.*

* The letters, in an English translation, may be seen in Lardner, Works, vi. 596-605. Dowding's edition. London, 1827.

Section XCI.—OF THE ORIGINAL GREEK AND THE FIRST
MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

How the Greek language became known and customary among the Jews, and what peculiarity it had taken in the mouths of Israelites who spoke Greek, has already been explained. A few additional words may make the reader more exactly acquainted with the facts. The Greek which the Jews learnt was not the ancient classic Greek that we find in the works of Grecian writers of the Augustan age in Athens, but it was a degenerate dialect widely diffused by the dominion of Alexander and his successors. This dialect, as it was spoken in Alexandria, where it assumed certain peculiarities, is called the Macedonic-Alexandrine Greek. It underwent another modification under the influence of the Jews, who translated the Old Testament into Greek. This modification was Jewish in its result as well as its origin. The compound dialect, thus composed of four distinct elements—the original Greek, the Macedonic influence, that of Alexandria, and that of the Hebrew Bible and its Hebrew translators—is found in the Septuagint, and consequently is found also in the New Testament. Here, however, it has a peculiar aspect; for as Christianity introduced ideas and required modes of expression not to be found in the Mosaic religion, the writers of the New Testament were obliged to give a new character to the language they employed. Hence there are three chief sources whence the language of the New Testament is derived—1, the Greek of the dialect above characterised; 2, the Hebrew found in peculiarities of structure; and, 3, the Christian in thoughts and substance.

The Apostle Paul was probably the first who, as a Christian writer, made use of this Greek in his letters. How important the employment of this tongue was in the proclamation of the Gospel, appears partly from the fact that all the cultivated world in that day knew and understood it, and partly from another fact, namely, that the Jews who lived scattered abroad in different countries, to whom, first of all, the apostles offered the Gospel, for the most part spoke Greek, or at least employed this language as the language of books. If, then, the Gospel was to be preached beyond the borders of Palestine, it was in this language only that the proclamation could be made; and we cannot here fail to recognise the divine wisdom that, at the time when the Saviour appeared, a channel should have been prepared, by which his teachings could be readily communicated to the whole civilised world.

Unhappily, the original manuscripts, or autographs, of the New Tes-

tament books perished at an early day. They were written, in part, by the apostles with their own hands (comp. Gal. vi. 11; Phil. 19), partly by scribes or amanuenses (Rom. xvi. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18; 2 Thess. iii. 17). The most ancient transcripts or copies, as well as the manuscripts in general which ensued, were formed either by the eye or by the ear; in other words, the writer either copied directly from his original, or he wrote down what was read to him from the original by another. Hence arose many errors—some from the mistakes of the eye, others from the mistakes of the ear. These errors, however, are not so considerable as to place in doubt, or to modify, any doctrine of the New Testament. Sometimes words were purposely changed by the transcribers in order to explain the sense. A word or a note made in the margin may afterwards have been taken into the text; for example, 1 John v. 7—comp. Section cxxix.). But these variations from the original are infrequent or unimportant, and undoubtedly the text of the New Testament has been transmitted to us without falsification, and without material change.

The explanatory words prefixed or annexed to the books of the New Testament were added by readers or copyists in later ages, for at one time they do not suit the mouth or the pen of the author, e. g. the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* (1 Cor. v. 9), the *First Epistle of John*; at another they differ in different manuscripts, e. g. the book which in our Bibles has for title “The Acts of the Apostles,” is also called “The Acts of the Holy Apostles;” “The Evangelist Luke’s Acts of the Apostles,” “The Acts of the Apostles, by the Holy Evangelist Luke;” and, lastly, ecclesiastical Fathers expressly declare that the authors did not set their names at the head of their writings. In the remarks annexed, which at first were only a repetition of the headings, there sometimes occur inaccuracies, arising from traditional information or conjecture on the part of the writer as to the origin of the book, e. g. “Unto the Galatians written from Rome” (Gal. vi. 18); “The First Epistle unto the Thessalonians was written from Athens” (1 Thess. v. 28); see also 1 Cor. xvi. 24; and compare our remarks as to the formation of these letters.

The manuscripts were not, as with the Old Testament, rolls (Section ix.), but unbound books, somewhat resembling our pamphlets, sheets of parchment or of paper. The oldest are of parchment, written in large or capital letters (*Uncials*), and without division of words, without pointing, and without accents; the later manuscripts—those, that is, from the tenth century—have small letters (*Cursive*, or running-hand), and more recently with punctuation (comp. Section vi.). Only few manuscripts contain all the New Testament; most of them consist of

only a part or parts, as the four Evangelists and the Pauline Epistles ; others, again, have nothing more than certain portions or paragraphs, such as were read in public worship. Many, especially those of later date, are written with extraordinary care and skill, for the monks devoted much time and trouble to tasks of the kind. The contractions which occur in them require the reader to be well versed in that kind of Greek writing.

Section XCII.—DIVISION AND ORDER OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Viewed in regard to their contents, the books of the New Testament are divided into three classes :—

Historical Books.—These are the five first writings, composing the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. In their manner they have a certain relationship with the historical books of the Old Testament. The simplicity and naturalness of their narratives, their conciseness and force, their circumstantiality, a certain Jewish point of view and form of thought and expression, are qualities peculiar to them. They give, respecting the life, the person, and the doctrine of the Saviour, as well as of the earliest diffusion of the Gospel, the surest and the only trustworthy information ; we must not, however, overlook the fact, that, while they are historical works, they have also for their aim to prove, from the history, that, in the Redeemer, the deliverer and Saviour whom the Jews expected had been sent of God, and appeared in the world. Matthew, as the oldest Gospel, stands first ; then follow Mark and Luke, probably in the order in which they became known and were recognised ; last of all comes John, as being the least ancient of the four. Connected herewith is the writing called “ The Acts of the Apostles,” composed by Luke as a continuation of his Gospel, and further information regarding the labours of the apostles for the spread of the Gospel.

Books of Instruction.—These in the New Testament are twenty-one Letters : in them we find the sacred and earnest tone of admonition and instruction which prevails in the ancient prophets. In Jeremiah (xxix. 1-23—comp. Baruch i. 10, vi. 4, seq.) an example occurs. There also prevail in these Letters the short pithy sentences of the proverbial wisdom of the ancient Hebrews, only renewed and filled with the deeper moral spirit of Christianity. The concise and pregnant words in the apostolic exhortations present specimens of the kind.

First in this class of writings come the thirteen Pauline Epistles, in the arrangement and order of which the following points were regarded:—First, they placed the nine Letters which were addressed to communities, then the four that were addressed to individuals. In the arrangement of the first class, two things were borne in mind: first, the length of the separate Letters; and, secondly, the importance of the cities or places in which those lived to whom the Letters were sent; therefore, the Epistle to the Romans stands first, as one of the longest, and as written for the Church that was in the capital of the world; then come the two Letters to the Corinthians, for they are much longer than the remainder, and Corinth then was the capital of Achaia; the Epistle to the Galatians follows, as not being inferior to the rest in length, and as having been intended for the Churches in an entire country in Asia Minor; this is succeeded by the Epistle to the Ephesians, since Ephesus was the most considerable city in Asia Minor, and the Letter in length resembles those that have preceded; the Epistle to the Philippians owes its position to the importance of the city of Philippi, which in Macedonia far surpassed Thessalonica in consideration (comp. Acts xvi. 12). The Letter to the Colossians, and the two Letters to the Thessalonians, have their relative positions according to the same rules.

Of the four Epistles addressed to individuals, the three have precedence which refer to spiritual or ecclesiastical matters. In consequence of their object, namely, to exhort and prepare Timothy and Titus to execute fittingly their pastoral charge, they bear the name of Pastoral Letters. Of these, the First Epistle to Timothy stands first, for Timothy was the most important fellow-labourer of Paul. The Letter to Titus follows, as being the shorter. Finally comes that which was written in regard to a private affair, the shortest of all the Letters—the Epistle to Philemon.

As at an early period the Letter to the Hebrews was accounted a work of the Apostle Paul, though doubts were raised as to its authenticity, it was subjoined to the genuine Pauline Epistles. Then ensued the seven other Letters, namely, that of James, the two of Peter, the three of John, and, lastly, that of Jude.

Luther revived the doubts as to the Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and, consequently, placed before it the two of Peter and the three of John, as being apostolic writings; the Epistle of James, however, which, on account of its contents, he did not highly value, and the Epistle of Jude, he placed after that to the Hebrews, whose contents he held in great estimation.

The seven last-named Epistles, which have prefixed to them the names of Apostles, without being addressed to any particular commu-

nity, are called Catholic (or general) Epistles—a name given them as early as the fourth century, because they were intended for Christians generally; though it must be added, that the term, strictly taken, is not suitable to the Second and Third of John, which are addressed to individuals (Cyria and Gaius), and are purely private letters. It is, therefore, probable that this name, which at first was, in consequence of their *general* object, given to several of these Letters, was applied to all Letters not having emanated from Paul, and connected itself with the signification of “generally in use,” or “generally recognised as canonical.”

A Prophetic Book, the Revelation of John, which is allied to the prophecies of the Old Testament, from which it borrows images and expressions in order to give utterance to Christian expectations and hopes in regard to the future; for in primitive Christianity there were prophets who, led by the Spirit, prophesied in the Church (comp. Ephes. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, xiv. 37; Acts xxi. 9-11).

I.—THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

I.—THE FOUR GOSPELS.

Section XCIII.—THEIR MUTUAL RELATION AND THEIR TITLE.

The three first Gospels are not only quite different from the fourth, but stand to each other in a very intimate relationship. They describe chiefly the abode and the labours of the Saviour in Galilee, while the fourth Gospel gives information of the repeated presence of Jesus in Jerusalem. In handling his subject, Matthew appears to have mainly had Jewish readers in view; Mark gives a compressed account, designed for Pagan readers; still more decidedly did Luke write for persons who lived beyond the borders of Palestine, while he makes prominent the universality of the salvation which was by Christ, according to the type given by his teacher, the apostle Paul. In all three Gospels, however, the Saviour appears rather in his human nature, and is set forth as the long-promised Messiah and messenger of God to men. It is different with the fourth Gospel. Here the Saviour is described specially according to his divine nature, and in general the Gospel is much deeper and more spiritual. While in the three first Gospels Christ

chiefly speaks in brief parabolic sentences, in John he speaks in prolonged discourse, full of feeling, depth, and elevation. Yet the image which the three first Evangelists give of Christ in no way conflicts with the representation of his Master supplied by John. The chief features of the person of the Redeemer are altogether accordant in both pictures, and then only do we possess the full sacred image of Jesus, when we learn to know him by the aid of all the writers, and have formed the separate features into one harmonious whole. In some sense, not unsuitably has the portraiture of the Saviour in the first Gospels been compared to the view of Socrates in Xenophon; and that given in the fourth Gospel, to the view of Socrates in Plato.

The internal relationship of the three first Gospels consists in this,—that they all present the most important events in the life of Christ in the same position and under the same developments; for they all three touch only briefly on the period anterior to the Saviour's public ministry; give then the discourses, travels, and miracles of Jesus; narrate his attendance at the festivals; describe his sufferings, crucifixion, interment, and resurrection; and end with his departure from the earth. In this general view we need not take into account the slight deviations that occur in arrangement. They at the same time agree, even in their words, very strikingly, and many attempts at explanation have been made. As specimens of this verbal agreement, we may refer to Matt. ix. 15; Mark ii. 20; Luke v. 35. Matt. xvi. 28; Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27. Matt. xix. 23, 24; Mark x. 23, 25; Luke xvii. 24, 25. Still more surprising is it that only 24 verses belong exclusively to Mark, while all the rest of his matter is found, partly in Matthew, partly in Luke, partly in Matthew and Luke. In order to explain this wonderful agreement, it has been maintained,—1, that the Evangelists used each other's Gospels, so that one copied from the other; 2, that they all drew from a common source, which was either oral tradition or a written document, a primitive Gospel; 3, and that they employed both oral tradition and each other's Gospels. Thorough and comprehensive investigations have led to the pretty general conclusion, that at the basis of all three lies oral tradition, as it prevailed only in the apostolic age (Section ii.), which, even in expression, was stamped with very definite features. Thus it happens that the verbal agreement is found specially in those passages which most easily impress themselves on the memory. It is at the same time probable that Matthew, as the oldest Gospel, was known and used by Luke (Luke i. 1), and that Mark found Matthew and Luke in existence, and had a regard to them in his account. For in Mark the fact is undeniably visible, that he now approaches and follows Luke, and now gives an extract from the one or the other, or from

both. More recent critics regard Mark as the original Gospel, which Luke, and after him Matthew, profited by, adding that Matthew employed Luke's Gospel as well as Mark's. In favour of their view they allege chiefly the simplicity, conciseness and compression of Mark's narrative, the liveliness and vividness of his manner, and the less decided tendency to give accounts of miracles by Jesus. But the last consideration makes it clear why they wish Mark's to be accounted the oldest Gospel; and the originality which they find in Mark, more than in Matthew and Luke, cannot be proved to the satisfaction of an unprejudiced mind.

The title of the Gospels, which runs, "The Gospel according to Matthew," &c., was formerly interpreted to mean that the narratives were not written by Matthew, Mark, &c., but were composed according to, that is, in agreement with, their accounts, which have perished; but all Christian antiquity bears witness that this "according" (*κατά*) truly serves as a designation of the author, as indeed is established by an exact understanding of the expression. For Gospel (*εὐαγγέλιον*, *evangelium*) signifies "good news," "joyful tidings;" and the genitive, which properly belongs to it, is "of Jesus Christ," as in Mark (i. 1), "the Gospel of Jesus Christ;" but the name of the writer of the account could not follow in another genitive, and therefore the words "according to" are used; thus, in full, the phrase is, "the Gospel of Jesus Christ, according to (in the account given by) Matthew."

The four Evangelists were in the ancient Church figuratively set forth under the four shapes which combine to form the figure of the cherubs. The majesty of God was conceived of as enthroned on the wings of the cherub; so the four Gospels were regarded as bearing the majesty of God and Christ. The cherub was made up of a human being, a lion, an ox, and an eagle, and these are the forms which are distributed among the four Evangelists as their figurative designations: so that a man sets forth Matthew; a lion, Mark; an ox, Luke; and an eagle, John.

Section XCIV.—CREDIBILITY OF THE EVANGELICAL NARRATIVES.

As it is a firm fact (Section LXXXIX.) that the apostles and their immediate disciples were the authors of our four Gospels, so thereby is their entire credibility already decided; but since the fidelity of these authors is in part doubted, it is necessary to form a distinct conception

of the reasons which raise their account above all question. These reasons may be briefly and distinctly expressed in the following manner : the sacred authors of our Gospels could, would and must speak the truth.

1. They had the power to speak the truth, for they had the means of knowing the truth. Matthew and John were eye and ear witnesses ; as disciples of the Lord, they had accompanied him everywhere, had for three years experienced the full power of his personal influence, were uninterruptedly present during his public ministry, heard his words, saw his general bearing, and were present in the narrower circle of his private intercourse, and repeatedly with their own eyes saw what wonderful deeds he performed, and what elevation and majesty were manifested in his whole being, heard with their own ears, not only his general teachings, but his statements regarding himself and his relation to the Father, and felt also the operation of his words and life immediately in their own hearts. If any persons could be, they assuredly were in a condition to give a true image of the Saviour in his entire manifestation. The other two Evangelists were immediate scholars of apostles ; Mark having learnt from Peter and Paul, and Luke from Paul. It was, therefore, easy for them to ascertain the pure and exact truth respecting Jesus. That truth they received from their apostolical teachers, and they wrote at a time when there were a multitude of other eye and ear witnesses from whom they could gather trustworthy instruction in regard to particulars in the life of the common Master. And that they sought such instruction, and, when they had carefully obtained the truth, took special pains to make a record of it, appears from the express testimony of Luke himself (i. 2-4). And even if we did not possess the assurance which Luke gives, yet the entire contents of the Gospels, as well as the unmistakable characters of the Evangelists, declare also,—

2. That they had the desire to speak the truth. The simplicity and uprightness of their character, the integrity and love of truth with which they confess their failings and errors, their utter inability to carry through a concerted plan of deceit, the repeated contradictions in time, place, and person, which, in any intentional fraud, they would, before all things, have avoided, loudly declare that they, in their record, acted according to their best knowledge and judgment. Examples of what has been said occur in every part of the Gospels. Thus they relate that the Saviour blamed them (Matt. x. 28, xiv. 31, xvi. 23, xxvi. 40, 52 ; Mark vii. 18, ix. 33, seq., x. 13, seq., 35, seq. ; Luke ix. 41, 54-56 ; John xiv. 9), that they themselves were superstitious (Matt. xxiv. 26 ; Mark vi. 49 ; John ix. 2), self-seeking (Mark x. 28, 35, 37 ; Matt. xix. 27), given to anger (Luke ix. 55 ; John xviii. 10 ; Luke xxii. 49, 50 ;

Mark xiv. 47; Matt. xxvi. 51), and even faithless (Matt. xxvi. 56, 70, 72, 74; Mark xiv. 66; Luke xxii. 55; John xviii. 17, 25, 27); also that they had earthly hopes (Mark x. 37; Luke xxiv. 21—comp. Acts i. 7). Contradictions and deviations in details appear in the call of the apostles (Matt. iv. 18-22; Mark i. 16-20; Luke v. 2-11—comp. John i. 37, seq.), in time and person, as may be seen by comparing Matt. viii. 18-23, with Luke ix. 52-62; for in Matthew the place is Perea, in Luke Samaria; in Matthew the persons are a scribe and one of his disciples, in Luke three unknown individuals: also in Peter's denial, in which, according to Matthew, two damsels and other persons give occasion to the treachery (Matt. xxvi. 69-73); according to Mark, one damsel and other persons (Mark xiv. 66-70); according to Luke, one maid and two other persons (Luke xxii. 56-59); according to John, a maid who kept the door, those who sat at the fire, and a kinsman of Malchus (John xviii. 17-27): in the day and the hour of the Crucifixion: according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, Jesus ate the paschal lamb on the first day of unleavened bread, and, therefore, when the festival had begun (Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 7, seq.), and was crucified at the third hour, that is, nine in the morning (Mark xv. 25); according to John, the Jews had not eaten the Passover (John xviii. 28), and the festival had not begun, for it was the preparation of the Passover (John xix. 14, 31) on which Jesus was crucified; and about the sixth hour, that is mid-day, Jesus was still before Pilate (John xix. 14). That these contradictions are partly of small moment, and partly easy of explanation, is a matter with which here we have nothing to do. But that the Evangelists did not studiously avoid such deviations, clearly proves that each desired to state only that which he knew respecting events. By their statements, their expositions of details, and the connexions in their narratives, they clearly let us know that they each handled and set forth the life and spirit of Christ from their own peculiar point of view. This appears specially in the Gospel of John, who obviously exhibited the image of the Saviour as it existed in his own heart. In ordinary affairs, if we are certain that a person had both the will and the power to say the truth, we are perfectly convinced of the correctness of his testimony. Here, however, appears a third reason, namely, that,—

3. The Evangelists must have spoken the truth. For how would they have appeared to other eye and ear witnesses if they had wished to indulge in untruths and inventions? What opposition must they have experienced, and how would faith in the Redeemer have been hindered, could it have been shown that his history was full of falsehood! It was, then, unavoidable; the apostles must have stood on the truth if they wished to obtain credence. Besides, the Saviour himself had

promised them the spirit of truth, the Holy Ghost. If they were filled therewith, he could not have permitted in them any intentional fraud, any dressing-up of the facts, any fictitious additions. Conscious of this holy and sanctifying spirit, they must unfailingly have restricted themselves to what they knew to be pure, unvarnished truth; otherwise they had not received, and did not possess, that spirit. If in any case we can be convinced of the historical fidelity of a writer, that conviction we may have in regard to the Evangelists: and, accordingly, the triviality is self-condemned which treats the evangelical accounts as a collection of unwarranted legends and myths, and, with rash assumption, declares to be pure fiction whatever appears incredible or does not fall in with pre-formed conceptions or superficial views. It is well to pass in close review the religious culture, the range of ideas, and the point of view of the writers of our Gospels, since the operation of the Holy Spirit did not destroy the whole nature of the human soul, and at one blow change the apostles into superhuman beings exempt from error; but superficiality puts down to the accounts of defective insight all in the Evangelists that in any way runs counter to the every-day or to the so-called natural order of things. The only guarantee against such a course is found in a thorough acquaintance with the Gospels, as well as in that sacred respect for them which flows, and must flow, from a well-founded conviction of their high value and historical trustworthiness.

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

Section XCV.—CONTENTS.

The whole Gospel has been divided into *five parts*: 1. The birth and childhood of the Saviour (i. 11), embracing the descent of Jesus from David and the information conveyed to Joseph in a dream (i.), the visit of the Magi from the East, the flight into Egypt, and the murder of the infants at Bethlehem (ii.). 2. Preparatory events (iii., iv.), as the baptism of Jesus (iii.) and the temptation (iv.). 3. The public ministry of Christ (iv.-xxv.), including the sermon on the mount (v.-vii.), the stilling of the storm (viii.), the call of Matthew (ix.), the names and mission of the apostles (x.), the opinion of Jesus respecting John the Baptist (xi.), the sin against the Holy Ghost (xii.), the para-

bles of the sower, of the tares among the wheat, of the grain of mustard-seed, of the leaven, of the treasure hid in a field, of the pearls, of the fishing-net, of the householder (xiii.), the feeding of the five thousand (xiv., xv.), the confusion of Peter (xvi.), the transfiguration (xvii.), doctrine respecting children (xviii., xix.), the parables of the unjust steward (xxiii.), of the labourers in the vineyard (xxi.), of the marriage garment (xxii.), of the ten virgins, and of the talents (xxv.), the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem and Christ's return to judgment (xxiv.). 4. The history of the Redeemer's sufferings (xxvi., xxvii.), in which we may specify as peculiar to Matthew, the sad end of Judas (xxvii. 3, seq.), the earthquake and the appearance of many dead persons (52, seq.), the sealing and watching of the tomb (xxvii. 62, seq.). 5. The resurrection (xxviii.), in which these things are peculiar to Matthew,—the appearance of Jesus to the two women (1, seq.), the bribery of the military watch (11), the baptismal formula (19).

Section XCVI.—AUTHOR, CHARACTER, AND FORMATION.

Matthew ("God's gift"), previously named Levi, was, until his call to be an apostle, a tax-gatherer on the lake of Galilee (Matt. ix. 1, 9; Mark ii. 14; Luke v. 27). That, in connexion with important events in life, it was customary for the Jews to change their name, appears from the example of Peter and Paul (John i. 42; Acts xiii. 9); of the other circumstances of Matthew's life, we know nothing. Till the third century, the Christian Church added nothing to the evangelical record. Later tradition states, in different manners, the countries in which Matthew performed his apostolic duties; thus they mention, now Macedonia, now Ethiopia, now Arabia, Syria, Media, Parthia, and Persia. It appears from the Gospel itself, that Matthew offered the good news chiefly, if not exclusively, to the Jews, and, in consequence, that he laboured in Palestine and the neighbouring countries. We know not whether he died a natural death or suffered martyrdom. According to ecclesiastical tradition, he lost his life in Ethiopia, being either burnt or beheaded. The Catholic Church fixes the day of his death on the 21st of September; the Greek, on the 16th of November.

The object of the Gospel is to show that Jesus was really the Messiah promised by the prophets and expected by the Jews. Hence it follows that the Gospel was specially intended for Jewish Christians.

The same conclusion is evidenced by the following peculiarities:—

1. It cites from the Old Testament more passages than the other Gospels; which was especially important for Jewish Christians, since from that source only could they be convinced of the Messiahship of Jesus.
2. The Jewish customs are not explained, which presumes readers who would understand them without explanation.
3. It is made prominent that Jesus was sent specially to the Jews (x. 5, 6, xv. 21, seq.—comp. xix. 28), whence the threat that the kingdom of God should be taken from them and be given to the Gentiles (xxi. 43—comp. viii. 11, 12), which at the time when Matthew wrote was done by the efforts of Paul and his fellow-labourers.
3. The Gospel contains, more than the other Evangelists, rebukes pronounced by the Saviour on the Scribes and Pharisees; a fact of importance for Jewish Christians in Palestine, who were in danger of being brought back to Judaism by the influence and persecutions of the ecclesiastical rulers of the country. As a special peculiarity on the part of Matthew, it may be mentioned that in many places he takes a pleasure in bringing similar things together, and gives them as a united whole (comp. the sermon on the mount, v.-vii., the parables, xiii., &c.).

All the historical authorities agree in stating that Matthew originally wrote his Gospel in Hebrew; that is, in Aramaic or Syro-Chaldee, the language of the country at that time. Nevertheless, efforts have recently been made to show that our Gospel was originally written in Greek. The matter cannot be considered as decided. It may be regarded as the more probable opinion that Matthew, at first, wrote in Syro-Chaldee, and that he specially collected the speeches or discourses—Papias calls them *λογια*—“of the Lord.” Hence is explained the fact just stated, namely, that the writer of our Gospel groups similar observations together. In many passages, however, the author of our Gospel does not appear as an eye-witness, but follows the oral tradition of the apostolic age in narrating several events. These may be taken as instances,—the call of the apostles (Matt. iv. 18-22), for Luke (v. 1, seq.) unquestionably gives a more natural picture of the event; the call of Matthew himself (Matt. ix. 9), which, according to Mark (ii. 13, seq.), and Luke (v. 27), took place before the delivery of the sermon on the mount; the presence of two animals at Christ’s triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Matt. xxi. 2), compared with Mark (xi. 2), and Luke (xix. 30); the rising of dead persons at the crucifixion (Matt. xxvii. 52); the diversities in the history of the resurrection (Matt. xxviii.—comp. with Mark xvi. and Luke xxiv.); especially the appearance of Jesus to the two Marys, while with John it is only one Mary to whom the risen Jesus appears (John xx. 1, seq.); the sending of the disciples into Galilee, in

order that they might see the risen Jesus (Matt. xxvi. 32, xxviii. 7, 10), whilst, according to Luke (xxiv. 6, 13), and John (xx. 19), the Saviour appears to them on the day of his resurrection, nay, according to Luke (xxiv. 49), even forbids them to quit Jerusalem until the outpouring of the Holy Spirit; the twofold account of several events, e. g. of the feeding of a great number (xiv., xv.), which appears to be only different forms of the same tradition.

The time of the formation of our Gospel certainly falls before the destruction of Jerusalem, for Matthew places the second advent of Christ soon after or together with that event (Matt. xxiv. 29). He further says that the field purchased with the price of Judas' treachery was "called the field of blood unto this day" (xxviii. 15), whence it appears, that when this was written, Jerusalem had not been destroyed. It is, therefore, pretty generally held that the original of Matthew was written about A. D. 50, and our Greek version about A. D. 60, so that Matthew is the oldest of the four Gospels which have come down to us. Without reason has it been wished to consider the two first chapters as a later addition, on the ground that the later oral tradition appears there; but, according to the most ancient authorities, translations, and manuscripts, these two chapters belong to our Gospel, and there is no valid reason for refusing to ascribe them to the author of it. The writer in these chapters follows the tradition of the apostolic age, in which he lived and wrote.

THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

Section XCVII.—CONTENTS.

Mark describes the labours of the Saviour, and gives fewer speeches, accompanied by most particulars and circumstantial details. His book divides itself into *two parts*: 1. The public ministrations of Jesus (i.-xiii.), parallel with Matthew i.-xxiv. The following is peculiar to Mark: the parable of the growing seed (iv. 26-29), the healing of the deaf and dumb person (vii. 31-37), and the cure of the blind man recorded in viii. 22-26. 2. The sufferings, resurrection and ascension of Jesus (xiv.-xvi.), parallel with Matt. xxvi.-xxviii. Here, peculiar to Mark, is the account of the young man who had a linen cloth about his naked body (xiv. 51).

Section XCVIII.—AUTHOR, CHARACTER, AND FORMATION.

Mark, who was called also John Mark (Acts xii. 12, 25, xv. 37), also merely John (Acts xiii. 5, 13), but most commonly merely Mark (Acts xv. 39; Col. iv. 10; Phil. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11; 1 Pet. v. 13), was a native of Jerusalem, the son of a certain Mary, in whose house the Christians, at the time when James the Elder was martyred, used to assemble, on which account Peter, on leaving his prison, repaired to Mary's abode (Acts xii. 12). Barnabas, the friend and companion of Paul, was the uncle or cousin of this Mark (Col. iv. 10), for which reason both took him with them in their journey from Antioch to Jerusalem (Acts xii. 27). Perhaps he was the young man who, on the apprehension of the Redeemer, appeared in a linen garment (Mark xv. 41), for only in Mark do we find the event mentioned; and as he does not give the name of the young man, or otherwise describe him, he may have been the person himself, especially since, as we have seen, he, with his mother and his uncle, belonged to the Christian Church in Jerusalem. From Antioch he accompanied Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary course, proceeding through Cyprus to the south of Asia Minor, where he left them at Perga in Pamphylia (Acts xiii. 5, xv. 37, 38), on which account Paul was unwilling to take him as a companion on his second missionary journey, and Barnabas travelled to Cyprus with him only (Acts xv. 39). At a later time he was again by the side of Paul when the apostle was in prison in Rome (Col. iv. 10, 11; Phil. 24). In the interval, he appears to have been in the society of Peter, who, in his first letter, calls him his son (1 Pet. v. 13). When Paul was in his second imprisonment, Timothy was to bring Mark to Rome (2 Tim. iv. 11), so that at this time he may have been with Timothy in Ephesus. According to ecclesiastical tradition, he afterwards went to Egypt, founded the Christian Church in Alexandria, and there suffered martyrdom, as is still believed among the Copts.

His Gospel seems to have been specially intended for heathen Christians; for,—1, frequent quotations of the Old Testament are wanting, also the history of the birth of Jesus; 2, the rebukes and passages of narrower application found in Matthew are omitted; 3, Mark, according to an ancient account, wrote his Gospel in Rome, at the request of the Christian Church in that city (Euseb. iii. 14); 4, in reality he had before his eyes Latin readers, since he determined the value of a coin in Roman money (xii. 42), when he estimated the widow's "two mites which make a farthing," *quadrans*. It belongs to the other peculiarities of Mark,

that he narrates several cures performed by the Saviour with great exactitude, and adduces special circumstances of an external handling of the sick (ii. 1-12, vii. 32, viii. 22). It may be remarked in regard to his style, that he frequently repeats favourite expressions, e.g. he uses the word *εὐθείως*, *straightway*, forty times (i. 10, 18, 20, 29, 30, 31, 42, 43, &c.).

According to the universal statement of the ancient Church, Mark wrote his Gospel originally in Greek, and under the influence of Peter. Some term him the interpreter (*ἑρμηνευτής*) of Peter (Euseb. iii. 39; Tertull. Adv. Marc. iv. 5), meaning, probably, that he made known Peter's mind to those who spoke only Greek. According to the testimony of Papias in Eusebius (iii. 39), Mark wrote his Gospel from recollections derived from Peter's words. The contents appear to support this view, as in the sometimes rigid Hebraising diction, such as was natural to Peter, the apostle to the Hebrews; also some things pertaining closely to that apostle are related by Mark more exactly and more circumstantially, e. g. the account of Peter's denial Christ (Mark xiv. 66-72). That Mark knew and used the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, becomes, by comparing his accounts with theirs, more than probable. Respecting the time when it was written, it can be determined only that Mark wrote his Gospel later than Matthew and Luke, yet before the destruction of Jerusalem, since he expected the return of Christ to take place shortly after that event (xiii. 14, 24, seq.). As, moreover, the Petrine and the Pauline views of Christianity are blended together in his Gospel, as might be expected from his intimacy with the two chief apostles, and as this blending could scarcely have taken place while they were alive, we may hence infer that the book was written after their decease. The authenticity of the concluding portion (xvi. 9-20) has been much contested, critics maintaining, from peculiarities of diction, that it was added by a later hand; but were this the case, the addition must have been made very early, since it stood in the Gospel as early as the middle of the second century, and the Gospel could scarcely have terminated with the eighth verse. The assumption seems therefore to want sufficient grounds.

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

Section XCIX.—CONTENTS.

Luke dedicates his Gospel to Theophilus, in order to oppose the true history of the Redeemer to inadmissible narratives concerning him, and describes Jesus as the Saviour of all nations. The book has *five parts*,—1. The birth of John the Baptist, and, still more fully told, the birth and childhood of Jesus (i., ii.). 2. The public ministry of Jesus (iii.-x.), in which there are, peculiar to Luke, the young man of Nain (vii. 11, seq.), the anointing of the Saviour (vii. 37, seq.), the mission of the Seventy (x.). 3. The unsurpassably beautiful parables (x.-xviii.) of the good Samaritan (x.), of the foolish rich man (xii.), of the unproductive fig-tree (xiii.), of the great supper, of the building of a tower, and going to war (xiv.), of the lost sheep, the lost piece of silver, and the lost son (xv.), of the unjust steward, the rich man and Lazarus (xvi.), of the unjust judge and of the pharisee and publican (xviii.). 4. Events shortly before Jesus' sufferings (xviii.-xxi.), of Zaccheus, the ten pieces of money, and Christ's tears over Jerusalem (xix.). 5. The Saviour's passion, death, and resurrection (xxii.-xxiv.), in which several particulars are peculiar to Luke, as the contest for pre-eminence among the disciples, the angel that strengthens Jesus, the look which delivers Peter (xxii.), the sending of Christ to Herod, the weeping women, the two evil-doers on the cross (xxiii.), the two angels in the tomb, the disciples at Emmaus, the eating of the fish and honey (xxiv.).

Section C.—AUTHOR, CHARACTER, AND FORMATION.

Luke, a physician, called by Paul "the beloved" (Col. iv. 14), was by birth a heathen, for Paul distinguishes him from his coadjutors of Hebrew blood (Col. iv. 11-14). Antioch was probably his native place. He had as a proselyte of the Gate professed Judaism before he became a Christian, and as such lived a good while in Judea (comp. Luke i.), "things believed (or accomplished) *among us*." He appears as a com-

panion of Paul in Troas on the apostle's second journey, as is learnt from his employing the pronoun "we" in speaking of events (Acts xvi. 10). On this journey he seems to have remained behind at Philippi, until Paul, after his second abode in Corinth, fetches him away; for in Acts xvi. 40, xvii. 1, in narrating the departure from Philippi, he no longer uses the word "we;" but resumes it in Acts xx. 6, when Paul travels back to Asia from Philippi. He then goes with the apostle to Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 15-18), and accompanies him from Cæsarea to Rome (Acts xxvii. 1—comp. xxviii. 16). Here he is with Paul during his first (Col. iv. 14; Phil. 24) and second imprisonment (2 Tim. iv. 11). There is no later information respecting him, only we must mention that, according to tradition, he, in the eighty-fourth year of his age, lost his life by being hanged on an olive tree.

As Luke was for so many years a companion and fellow-worker of Paul, it may be hence inferred that in his view of Christianity he attached himself to that apostle. This his Gospel fully makes out. He wrote primarily for Theophilus, who probably was an eminent Italian, as may appear from geographical explanations given in regard to other places, but failing in respect to Italy (Acts xxviii. 12, 13, 15—comp. Luke i. 26, iv. 31, xxiii. 51, xxiv. 13). In regard to substance, his Gospel is intended alike for Jews and Pagans, for the Redeemer is described as a universal Saviour; on which account special attention is given to reports of what he said and did in reference to other nations, in order thereby to beat down the national pride of the Jews. Among the peculiarities of Luke are chiefly these: 1. His agreement with Paul, which appears clearly in the account of the Lord's Supper (Luke xxii. 19, 20—comp. 1 Cor. xi. 23-25); also of the appearance of Jesus before his disciples (Luke xxiv. 33—comp. 1 Cor. xv. 5); further, in the honourable mention of the Samaritans (Luke x. 25, xvii. 11), and the choice of the Seventy (Luke x. 1, seq.), both of which incidents imply the universality of the salvation in Christ, just as Paul taught; and, lastly, in the doctrines that it is lawful to eat all things (Luke x. 8—comp. 1 Cor. x. 25), and that the fulfilling of the law does not justify before God, and procure a right to a recompense (Luke xvii. 7-10). The latter is in strict accordance with St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. 2. The enlargement of the evangelical instructions by noble parables, not found in the other Evangelists. 3. The introduction of the speeches of Jesus according to their special occasions, while in Matthew they are rather put together in masses. And, lastly, 4. The noticeable circumstance that, in several utterances of Jesus, the connecting link appears to be lost (Luke viii. 16, xi. 33, xii. 1), which, however, becomes visible on a deeper inspection,—a fact which is no small

proof of the credibility of these statements by Luke, since another would not have purposely made the narrative so difficult to himself and his readers. In comparison with the other Evangelists, Luke writes a purer Greek, and in sentences more carefully rounded. Thus he correctly describes the sea of Galilee as *λίμνη*, "a lake" (Luke v. 1, 2, viii. 22, 23, 33), while the rest term it *θάλασσα*, "sea" (Matt. iv. 18, xv. 29; Mark i. 16, vii. 31; John vi. 1, xxi. 1); when Luke employs the word *θάλασσα*, "sea," he means the ocean (Luke xvii. 2, 6, xxi. 25). Luke moreover, in his geographical observations, lets us see that he did not specially regard Palestinian readers (comp. Luke i. 26, iv. 31, xxiii. 51, xxiv. 13).

Nothing certain can be defined regarding the time when and the place where the book was composed; only it ensues from Mark's having used it, that it must have been written before the second Gospel (Section xciii. and xcviii.). The opinion that it was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, since that event is separated from the second advent of Christ, cannot be proved from the passages adduced (Luke xxi. 9, 12, 24), since in Matthew also such events are connected with the downfall of Jerusalem (Matt. xxiv. 6, seq., 30), but that calamity in Luke always appears as future (Luke xxi. 6, 20, 25, 26), and not a syllable is there implying that the city is already destroyed. On the contrary, as the book of Acts closes (Acts xxviii. 30) with the third year of Paul's imprisonment, the Gospel must have been previously written, since the Acts is but a continuation of the Gospel. It is therefore probable that Luke, about the year A. D. 60, wrote his Gospel in Caesarea, under the aid of the Apostle Paul, who was then a prisoner in that city, and had Luke for a companion (Acts xxvii. 1—comp. xxiii. 23, seq., xxiv. 23).

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

Section CI.—CONTENTS.

The apostle makes it his special aim to set forth in his Gospel the divine elevation of the Saviour, and at the same time to supplement and complete the accounts of the other three Evangelists. His narrative connects itself with the five visits made to Jerusalem by the Redeemer on occasion of festivals (ii., v., vii., x., xii.). The whole is divided into *five chief portions* :—1. The proem (i.) respecting the divine nature of Jesus and the testimony of John the Baptist. 2. The public ministry of the Saviour (ii.-xii.), including the marriage-feast at Cana (ii.), the conversation with Nicodemus (iii.), with the woman of Samaria (iv.), the cure at the pool of Bethesda (v.), the feeding of the five thousand (vi.), the forgiveness of the adulteress (viii.), the restoring of sight (ix.), the discourse on the good shepherd (x.), the raising of Lazarus (xi.), the anointing in Bethany and the entry into Jerusalem (xii.). 3. Events and speeches preceding Christ's passion (xiii.-xvii.), as the washing of his disciples' feet (xiii.), consolatory address and promise of the Holy Spirit (xiv.-xvi.), the sacerdotal prayer (xvii.). 4. Sufferings and death of the Redeemer (xviii., xix.), in which, as peculiar to John, may be specified Christ's question to the band, his appearance before Annas, minute circumstances in his arraignment (xviii.), the scourging, the division of the clothes, the inscription on the Cross, Christ's mother at the Cross, Joseph of Arimathea (xix.). 5. The rising and the appearing of the Saviour (xx., xxi.), stating that Mary first sees Jesus, the disciples on two successive Sundays, Thomas is convinced, Jesus appears at the lake of Galilee, puts the same question to Peter three times (xxi.).

Section CII.—AUTHOR, CHARACTER, AND FORMATION.

John, the son of Zebedee and Salome (Luke v. 10; Matt. xx. 20, xxvii. 56—comp. Mark xv. 40), was the brother of James the elder (Matt. iv. 21). Both, as was their father, were fishermen on the lake of Gennesareth (Mark i. 19; Luke v. 10), and natives of Bethsaida (John i. 44—comp. Matt. iv. 18-21). John had been a disciple of the Baptist, and, as such, become acquainted with the Saviour (John i. 35-40), on which account he, with his brother, straightway followed the call of the Lord on the banks of the lake (Matt. iv. 21). He stood in a very confidential relation with his master. This is seen in the fact, that Jesus often chose out of the band of disciples John, James, and Peter, to be his companions on special occasions, as in the house of Jairus (Luke viii. 51), on the mount of transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1), and in prayer in the garden of Gethsemane (Matt. xxv. 37). It is seen also in the facts, that, at the Last Supper, John lay on Jesus' bosom (John xiii. 23-25), that he followed the Saviour into the palace of the high-priest (John xviii. 15), that he was to take the Saviour's place by the side of his mother (John xix. 37), that at the first news of the resurrection, he, with Peter, hurried to the sepulchre (John xx. 2), as well as in the peculiar designation of himself as "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (John xiii. 23, xix. 26, xxi. 20).

John's character was pre-eminently distinguished by a soft, impressible disposition, deep feeling, and a vividness of perception. Consequently, gentleness and lowliness, confidingness in Christ, and universal love, are the chief features of his soul. These qualities made him capable of entering more deeply into, and forming a better conception of, the essence of the Saviour. Indeed, his whole being had been kindled up by intercourse with Jesus, for in earlier periods he displayed selfishness (Mark x. 35), narrowness of heart (Luke ix. 49), even irascibility and strong passion (Luke ix. 54).

After the Saviour's ascension John remained for some time in Jerusalem (Acts i. 13, iii. 1, iv. 19), and was accounted a pillar of the Church (Gal. ii. 9). Afterwards, but before Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, he went to Ephesus; for he cannot have gone thither sooner, since Paul, according to his main principle not to build on another's foundation (Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 16), would not have sought a sphere of activity in Ephesus; nor does Paul's farewell speech to the elders of the Ephesian Church imply the presence of John (Acts xx. 18). Whether and when he lived in banishment on the island of Patmos, cannot with certainty be determined. According to Irenæus (v. 30), the banish-

ment took place under Domitian (81-96, A.D.); but according to the conjecture of others, as early as Nero (54-68, A.D.): of all the apostles, he alone probably died a natural death. The event took place in John's old age at Ephesus, for he survived till the beginning of the second century. John was the teacher of Bishop Polycarp at Smyrna, who in 169, A.D. died in the eightieth year of his age. In agreement with his spiritual characteristics, this apostle effected more for the support and edification than for the enlargement of the Church.

The aim of John's Gospel is undoubtedly to set forth the spiritual elevation and divine dignity of the Saviour for persons of thought and culture. On account of such persons, accordingly, he omits what belongs to the lower conceptions of the Messiah, and what the Jews believed touching the diabolic origin of demoniac possession. The representation given in the proem, of the divine nature of the Saviour, as the Logos or Word, leads our thoughts to readers who were accustomed to a philosophical view of religion, and were familiar with the idea of the Logos as the wisdom of God. Indeed, generally among the Jews who spoke Greek, and especially in the large and opulent commercial city of Ephesus, there prevailed much cultivation, and doubtless the Apostle John in his Gospel bore in mind the philosophico-religious views which prevailed in Ephesus, and which either directly operated against Christianity or threatened its purity and simplicity. Out of the general history of Jesus, John, in consequence, appears to have chosen and narrated that which was specially fitted to place the divine dignity of the Lord above all doubt, on which account he sets forth the express testimonies given to his elevation (vi. 14, 69, ix. 17, xi. 27). For cultivated Greeks, however, who found the Cross an offence (comp. 1 Cor. i. 23), it is shown how Christ's death was compatible with his divine dignity; nay must, according to the counsels of God, have taken place (iii. 14, 15, x. 18, xii. 23, xvi. 7, xvii. 4). A second historical point of view that the apostle had before him in composing his Gospel, was a reference to the three other Gospels which were then in existence, or rather, as these themselves were not yet in universal use, to their substance, which, as an oral proclamation of Christianity, was spread throughout the Church, and was, therefore, assumed by the apostle as known to his readers. For only on this assumption can it be explained why John omits so much that is important in the life of Christ, e. g. the institution of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper; and narrates so much that is omitted by the other Evangelists, for which as a living eyewitness he possessed very peculiar qualifications. A multitude of important circumstances, wonderful deeds, and weighty words, of the Saviour, would be unknown to us, had they not been preserved by John.

Before all, we owe to him the discourses delivered by Jesus which are not found in the other Gospels; and although these have been energetically assailed on the ground that they exist here only, and that they bear the stamp of John's own mind, yet John was least disqualified to give a perfect, and fully able and disposed to give a true, portrait of his beloved friend and venerated Lord. That John's portrait of Jesus bears the hue of his own spiritual nature, only shows how faithfully he drew from the great original as conceived by himself. With John's eyes, with John's ears, we here see and hear the Saviour; and who will say that thus to know him is not to know him deeply and truly, since the Master's image is reflected most clearly in the living soul of his favourite disciple, and his whole manner of thinking, feeling, and willing, is a true expression of what the Lord himself was, of what the spirit of Jesus had produced, and formed in John's inmost soul.

Among the peculiarities in substance and style of John's Gospel are these:—1. The exactitude and vividness which declare an eye-witness (i. 35, xiii. 34, xviii. 15, xix. 26, xxxv. 20); or suppose the most minute acquaintance with things (i. 31, v. 10, vii. 1, seq., ix. 11, 12). 2. The conversational character of much of what Jesus says, while in the other Evangelists he delivers connected speeches (iii., iv., vi., vii.—comp. Matt. v.-vii.). 3. The darkness and mystery which are found in several of the Saviour's speeches, and which open themselves to the understanding only after deep thought and a close acquaintance with the person and the character of the Redeemer. 4. The simplicity and loftiness which distinguish the whole tone of the narrative, and raise the heart in holy reverence and love to the Saviour; on which account an eagle is the well-chosen symbol of the general tone of this Gospel. 5. That the author never speaks of himself in the first person (comp. i. 14, xiii. 23, xix. 26, 35, xxi. 10).

The Gospel was composed after the three first Gospels. This is the uniform statement of the ancient Church. The opinion in union with what we know of the circumstances of John's life, leads to the pretty sure conclusion that John wrote his Gospel between 70 and 80, A. D. in Asia Minor, and perhaps in Ephesus. The original language is Greek. That it was written beyond the borders of Palestine, appears from the circumstance that John gives more exactly than the other Evangelists the manners and customs of the Jews, also localities (ii. 6, 13, v. 1, 2, vi. 4, vii. 2), and frequently employs the phrase "the Jews," when in the other Gospels the particular classes of the Jews are distinguished (i. 19, v. 15, 16, vi. 41, 52, vii. 11-13). Many objections have been taken to the authenticity of this Gospel. These display great learning and mental acumen, but are insufficient to shake the fact that it was

written by the Apostle John. The truth of the remark is illustrated in the case of the learned theologian Bretschneider, who, in his *Probabilia*, contested its authenticity on the most learned grounds, but who afterwards openly and honourably confessed his error, and acknowledged that the Gospel is authentic. The view also which more recently has been put forward and maintained by the theologians of Tübingen, namely, that the whole work originated after the days of John, rests on so uncertain a basis that it cannot meet with a general or lasting acceptance. The authenticity of two portions of the book, however, has not been put beyond question. These are,—1, the history of the woman taken in adultery (vii. 53-viii. 11); and, 2, the concluding chapter. The first passage is wanting in many good ancient manuscripts and translations, and no trace of it is found in the Greek text before the fourth century. It is also marked by peculiarities of diction. It has, therefore, been assumed that on the authority of tradition it was written in the margin, and thence taken into the text. The concluding chapter is regarded as an addition made by the hand of a friend of John, since the words in xx. 21 form the proper conclusion of the whole, and the language of this passage contains numerous deviations from John's usual style. Others hold the chapter to be an appendix from the apostle's own hand, since it is found in all ancient manuscripts, and the language has many features peculiar to John.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

Section CIII.—CONTENTS.

The book thus designated is properly a continuation of the Gospel written for Theophilus by Luke (i. 1). It relates how the Jews and Heathen were converted to belief in Christ, by the apostles. It consists or *two chief portions*,—1. The first diffusion of the Gospel, especially among the Jews (i.-xii.). Herein is Jerusalem the centre of the events, and Peter the chief agent. 2. The further spread of the Gospel, especially among the heathen (xiii.-xxviii.). In this portion, Paul and his missionary tours are the main subjects.

To the *first part* belong the ascension of Christ and the election of Matthias to the apostleship (i.), the effusion of the Holy Spirit (ii.), the cure of the man with a withered hand, and Peter's sermon in the temple

(iii.), the apostles before the Sanhedrim (iv.), the second and third imprisonment of the apostles, and the counsel of Gamaliel (v.), the choice of the seven deacons (vi.), the stoning of Stephen (vii.), the first persecution of the Church, and the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch (viii.), the conversion of Saul (ix.), the conversion of Cornelius (x.), Christianity in Antioch (xi.), the beheading of James the Elder, and the apprehension and liberation of Peter (xii.).

To the *second part* belong,—1. The first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas from Antioch (xiii., xiv.); they proceed through Cyprus to Asia Minor, and thence return to Antioch. 2. The first council of the apostles at Jerusalem, and their determination respecting the admission of the heathen (xv.). 3. The second missionary tour of Paul (xvi.-xviii.); he proceeds from Asia Minor to Philippi, in Europe (xvi.), goes through Thessalonica and Berea to Athens (xvii.), and thence to Corinth, where he remains a year and a half, and then passes through Ephesus, Cæsarea, and Jerusalem, to Antioch (xviii.). 4. The third missionary journey of Paul (xviii.-xxiii.); he visits Ephesus, where he tarries two years and a quarter: leaving the city owing to a tumult (xix.), he passes through Macedonia to Greece and Corinth. After touching here for three months, he travels through Miletus, where he takes a moving farewell of the elders of the Ephesian Church (xx.), and, going through Cæsarea, repairs to Jerusalem, where he is apprehended (xxi.). After an address to the Jews, interrupted by an uproar of the mob (xxii.), and his hearing before the Sanhedrim, he is sent to Felix at Cæsarea, in consequence of being in danger of assassination (xxiii.). 5. The imprisonment of Paul in Cæsarea (xxiv.-xxvi.), the accusation made by the Jews against Paul, and the apostle's answer; his imprisonment for two years (xxiv.): the new procurator Festus being disposed to surrender him to the Jews, Paul appeals to the emperor at Rome; on this Felix places him before King Agrippa II. (xxv.). 6. The voyage of the apostle to Rome, and his shipwreck (xxvii.). And, finally, 7. His stay on the island of Malta, and his arrival in Rome (xxviii.).

Section CIV.—AUTHOR, CHARACTER, AND FORMATION.

That the same Luke that wrote the Gospel was the author of the Acts of the Apostles, is attested by not only the historical evidence of the ancient Fathers, since only heretical sects rejected the work, and that on dogmatic

grounds, but also by internal qualities. To these belong,—1. The express reference in the beginning (i. 1) to the Gospel as the first part of Luke's work, according to which the Acts is the continuation of the Gospel, or the second part. 2. The obvious interest in the life and operations of the Apostle Paul, as was to be expected in Luke, an intimate companion of the apostle. 3. The decided resemblance and relationship to the Gospel in style and manner, of which these are instances: the Pauline views as to the Gospel's being intended for Jews and heathens (x. 1, seq., 35, xi. 1, seq., xiii. 46, seq., xiv. 1, seq.—comp. Section c.); as to the Jewish law, namely, that since it did not justify before God, it was not obligatory on Pagans (xv. 1, seq.; Luke x. 8); and minute accordance in words, constructions, and general literary peculiarities, of which the instances are very numerous.

Luke could easily have obtained a knowledge of the facts related in the Acts, partly from intercourse with Paul, partly in Jerusalem, whither he repaired in company with Paul (xxi. 17), and near which he was during Paul's long incarceration at Cæsarea (xxvii. 2). The facts contained in the second part he could, to a very great extent, narrate as an eye-witness, for he was one of Paul's companions, and followed the apostle even to Rome (comp. Section c.). If, however, Antioch was Luke's proper residence, and if he remained in the neighbourhood while the apostle suffered imprisonment at Cæsarea (comp. xxvii. 1, 2), he must have had the surest information of what happened to Paul in these two places, as, indeed, his intimate connexion with the apostle does not leave the least doubt that he had the power of giving a most faithful account of him and his ministry.

The aim which Luke, in the composition of the Acts, had before his eyes is no other than to recount for the information of Theophilus the most important facts regarding the operations and fate of the apostles, from the first planting of the Christian Church, till the arrival of Paul in Rome. The work has, therefore, not inappropriately been called the earliest history of the Christian Church. We must not, however, forget that the book contains no complete history of the first diffusion of the Gospel. Besides, the work is without a conclusion. Luke has communicated only what appeared to him as of chief consequence, and so far as he possessed an exact acquaintance therewith. That Luke had not the intention of giving a full history of the rise and spread of Christianity, appears from the following peculiarities of his work:—1. Much is left unnarrated, of which Luke had or might have had satisfactory information. Thus he says nothing in regard to the foundation of the Christian Church in Rome, probably because Theophilus, living in Italy or in Rome, was acquainted with the facts. Nor does he re-

port anything of the diffusion of the Gospel in Alexandria, Edessa, Babylon; nay, besides the two chief apostles, Paul and Peter, he mentions the others only occasionally, though he must have been acquainted with much regarding their labours. Even touching the history of Peter and Paul, of whom he says most, he leaves much unreported, e. g. he makes no report of the residence of Peter in Antioch, where he had a disagreement with Paul (Gal. ii. 11-21); nor of the operations of Peter after the council at Jerusalem; nor of Paul during his abode in Arabia (Gal. i. 17); nor of the rescue of Paul by Aquila and Priscilla (Rom. xvi. 3, 4); nor of many perils referred to by Paul himself (2 Cor. xi. 23-26); nor of the party strifes that existed in Corinth (1 Cor. i. 10-13). 2. Many things are stated briefly and inexactly, as the remarkable event which happened to Paul on his mission to Damascus (ix. 4-6), compared with what Paul himself says thereon (xxvi. 14-18, xxii. 7-10); the introduction of Paul by Barnabas to the apostles at Jerusalem (x. 27), compared with the apostle's own statement (Gal. i. 17-19); the brief account of what prevented Paul from preaching the Gospel further in Asia (xvi. 6), compared with the detailed description given of his dangers and hindrances by Paul's own hand (2 Cor. xi. 25); the account in the Acts (xviii.), which makes Paul to have been once in Corinth before he wrote the two letters to the Corinthians, compared with the expressions of Paul himself, according to which he had then been twice there, and contemplated a third visit (2 Cor. xiii. 1—comp. xii. 14). From these peculiarities the inference has been drawn, that Luke made use of information supplied by others, which was not completely exact, and took the statements as they were, into his history. To this view, however, is opposed the similarity of the style and the diction, which pervades the whole work, and which does not allow the supposition of the insertion of other men's accounts, or else the accounts must first have been re-written, of which there is no evidence. It is, therefore, most natural to explain these peculiarities from the definite aim which Luke had, which was to put together for the information of Theophilus the chief and the most considerable of the events in the ministry and fate of the apostles.

Of other peculiarities in the Acts of the Apostles, it is to be remarked—1. That a chronological order of the events is clearly visible, though it is difficult to arrange the individual facts in accordance with our chronology. The entire work comprises a period of about thirty-three years, extending from the ascension of the Saviour (about 32, A. D.), to the third year of the detention of Paul in Rome (about 65, A. D.) This period clearly divides itself in the book into three portions, of which the first extends from the ascension to the stoning of Stephen (i.-vii.):

in this period the narrative proceeds chronologically. The second period, from Saul's persecution to the death of King Agrippa I. (viii.-xii.): here the events are rather synchronistically narrated. The third portion reaches from the death of Agrippa I. to the third year of the imprisonment of Paul in Rome (xiii.-xxviii.), and the narrative goes forward chronologically. Nevertheless, the dates are not so definite that they can be arranged according to the customary era. Only the death of Herod Agrippa I. may, on the authority of Josephus (*Antiq.*, xix. 5, 8, 2), be fixed in the 44th year A. D.* 2. The style is specially distinguished by clearness, simplicity, and definiteness. The narrative proceeds gently and flowingly: only seldom do small negligences appear.

As to the time and place of the composition of the book, nothing more than probabilities can be given. Only it is certain that it was written after the Gospel, since it offers itself as a continuation of the Gospel. If the Gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem (comp. Section c.), this book also may have preceded that calamity, since the event is nowhere alluded to in it, though in the remark, "Gaza, which is desert" (viii. 26), is an indirect evidence that Jerusalem had not yet fallen, for shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem the Jews themselves laid waste a number of towns and villages, of which Gaza was one (*Hug. Einleitung*, ii. 197). As now nothing is said of the termination of Paul's imprisonment, so is it probable that Luke, during that imprisonment, and therefore just before the overthrow of Jerusalem, wrote the Acts of the Apostles, and in Rome itself. Otherwise, he would naturally have added information regarding the later fate of the apostle. It has been supposed that Luke introduced into the work a long narrative written by Timothy. In proof of this, reference has been made to the fact, that in xvi. 10, the writer suddenly employs the term "we," and so designates himself as a companion of Paul. Now, Timothy was a companion of Paul. The language may then be referred to him. But as the style and manner remain throughout the same, this conjecture is inadmissible, and the most natural explanation is, that Luke, by this "we," introduces himself as a companion of Paul. In the Acts of the Apostles, then, we have from beginning to end the authentic work of Luke, which affords the most valuable aid for the explanation of the circumstances and relations that occur in the apostolical letters, since from Luke's narrative we learn the way and manner in which most of the churches were founded, as well as the elements of which they at first consisted, and the position in which they stood to the apostles, particularly Paul, as their founder.

* On the points here put in issue, consult the Translator's *Biblical Reading Book*, p. 65, seq., and *Chronologie des Apostol. Zeitalters*, Von Wieseler.

Section CV.—THE JEWISH HISTORY DURING THE EVENTS NARRATED IN THE EVANGELISTS AND THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

In order to understand the sacred history set forth in the historical books of the New Testament, the student requires a knowledge of the Jewish history at the time of Christ and his apostles. We therefore subjoin the most important particulars (Josephus, *Antiq., Jewish War*).

1. *The reign of Herod the Great*, of which the greater part falls before the birth of the Saviour, yet is some acquaintance with it of great utility to the biblical student. By the favour of the Romans who, in the year 64, A. C., first took part in Jewish affairs in the person of Pompey, was this cunning and cruel man placed on the throne of Judea, in the year A. C. 37 (Section lxxxv.). In consequence of the unnatural barbarity with which he raged against members of his own family, the Emperor Augustus once said of him, *Malo esse Herodis ūs quam videri*, "I had rather be Herod's swine than his son." He began his reign with the destruction of all save two of the members of the Sanhedrim. He first drowned and then sumptuously buried his own brother-in-law Aristobulus III., whom he had made high-priest. His mother-in-law, the mother of the murdered Aristobulus, was a friend of the Egyptian Cleopatra, who hoped to gain the dominion of Palestine. In consequence she prevailed on her paramour Antony to bring Herod to account. It was done; but the crafty king managed so to corrupt Antony, that he was acquitted, and Cleopatra was obliged to be satisfied with a few cities in Palestine. After the battle of Actium (31, A. C.), Herod, as a dependent on Antony, had everything to fear from Octavian. He had recently counselled Antony to put an end to Cleopatra, and with her treasures to raise a new army. When this advice was disregarded, he resolved to go over to the conqueror. Before he undertook his journey for that purpose, in order, on the event of his death, to secure the crown in his family, he put the government into the hands of his brother, slew his father-in-law, Hyrcanus, now in the eightieth year of his age, and left behind the cruel command, that as soon as news of his own death should arrive, his mother-in-law and his wife should be slain. His reason was, that he wished to destroy the remaining members of the Maccabean family, in order to remove all possibility of any of them coming into power. Setting out on his journey, he met Octavian in the island of Rhodes, where, in the lowliest manner, he humbled himself before the master of the world. Having set forth all that he had done for Antony, and professed his readiness to do the same for Octavian, he, by his craft, gained forgiveness and the confirmation of

his regal dignity. Meanwhile, his wife discovered the murderous instructions which he had left behind. Naturally, she became estranged from her husband, whose sister Salome made use of the consequent trouble, in order to effect Mariamne's ruin. A plan was laid by which Herod was convinced that his wife intended to poison him. The consequence was her execution. Similar was the fate of his mother-in-law, Alexandra, who, during a dangerous sickness endured by Herod, and when his life was now despaired of, got possession of the temple and castle, but by treachery fell into the tyrant's power. When from this time he became more dark in his craft and more barbarous and distrustful, he made himself hateful to the people by introducing heathenish customs. He had built in Jerusalem a theatre and an amphitheatre, and instituted in honour of Augustus, games which were to be celebrated every five years. In consequence a conspiracy was formed against his life. It was discovered. He attempted to increase his security by new fortifications. Among these was Samaria, to which he gave the name of Sebaste, in honour of Augustus, in Greek Σεβαστός. In order to win back the favour of the people, he distributed food and clothing among them; but without lasting results. Hoping to distract his mind tortured by his conscience, he undertook large constructions, building a palace on Mount Zion, adorning many cities, and specially renewing the temple. Of the last undertaking he himself made known the plan to the people in a speech; and as he encountered distrust, he promised to take down the old temple only bit by bit, supplying each in turn by new erections. The work lasted nine years and a half, but, with the courts and adjoining buildings, it was not completed under forty-six years (John ii. 20).

This temple, in which the Saviour himself so often taught, and whose complete destruction he foretold (Matt. xxiv. 1, 2; Mark xiii. 1, 2—comp. Luke xix. 44), was in form as follows:—The whole edifice, with its courts, formed a large square, whose sides were 400 cubits in length. Three sides of this quadrangle were surrounded by a double colonnade, and the fourth, that on the south, had a triple colonnade. To these walks reference is made in the account of the purification of the temple (John ii. 14), for here the traders and money-changers carried on their business. On the east side this portico was called the Poreh of Solomon (John x. 23). All these courts, with what they contained, were comprehended under the general name of The Temple, or the sacred place, τὸ ἱερόν. Five gateways led into the court of the Gentiles, in the north-west of which large space stood the second sanctuary, τὸ δεύτερον ἱερόν, or inner court. This inner court could not be entered by any save Hebrews (Acts xxi. 28, 29). It was separated from the court of the

Gentiles by a platform ten cubits broad. In the eastern part of the second court was the court of the women, a quadrangle from which westwardly there was an ascent up fifteen steps to the inmost court. This inmost court was longer than it was broad, and in it stood the proper temple house, or sanctuary, having within it the holy of holies. It was a splendid edifice of white marble with richly-gilded pillars and doors. It was a hundred cubits long, and a hundred cubits in front; that is, on the east, of the same breadth, but behind, or on the west, its breadth was seventy cubits, so that the foreside, which formed a portico, extended thirty cubits beyond the rest of the building. The court of this edifice was called the Court of the Israelites, and its two divisions, which lay along the sides of the temple, and were separated by iron rails from the other parts, were called the Courts of the Priests. Over the main entrance to the temple was a large golden vine. On the sides of the temple stood, three stories high, suites of apartments, as in Solomon's temple (Section xxx.). The roof was flat, and studded with golden spikes. At the front, above the entrance, was a triangular building or battlement, called "the wing," *πτερύγιον*, "the pinnacle of the temple," in Matt. iv. 5, bearing a wing (hence the name) as an ornament, according to the Egyptian style of architecture. The vessels in this temple were the same as those in the first temple, only the holy of holies was empty.

After Herod had taken measures for the repose of his kingdom, he travelled to Rome in order to fetch his two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, who had been well brought up and instructed in the palace of the emperor. But Herod's sister, Salome, endeavoured to pre-occupy his mind against his sons, who were much beloved by the people. To such an extent were his suspicions worked on, that he put them on their trial before Cæsar. Augustus pronounced their acquittal, and endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation; but, after his return, Herod appointed a younger son, by name Antipater, his successor, and when Alexander and Aristobulus, in order to get beyond the reach of calumny, attempted to make their escape, they were overtaken, and, at their father's command, strangled in Samaria. His younger son, Antipater, having formed, with his uncle, Herod's brother, a conspiracy against his father's life, was, on his return from Rome, executed, a few days before Herod's death. At last the inhuman tyrant died in Jericho of a most painful disorder, worms being engendered in his living body (*morbus pedicularis*), the result of a highly abandoned life. Shortly before he breathed his last, he secretly gave the frightful order to put to death in his last moments a multitude of chief men who had come from Jerusalem to Jericho, in order, as he added, that mourning

and tears might accompany his departure. Happily this murderous injunction was not carried into effect.

These details suffice to make known to the reader the character of Herod, in which the lust of power, distrust, and cruelty, formed a fearful union, which revengefulness and craft, peculiar to himself, made the more revolting and dangerous. In such a person the slaughter of the infants in Bethlehem has nothing surprising, or rather it is perfectly in keeping with his character. It would, on the contrary, be strange had Herod not employed the only means with which he was familiar, namely, violence and blood, in order to ward off the danger which, as he considered, threatened his throne, through the birth of the newly-born Messiah. It is true that Josephus and contemporary historians are silent in regard to the fact; but as Herod had committed so many horrors, not sparing even his own family, this comparatively inconsiderable murder might easily be passed over in the narrative, and that the rather since the number of infants slain in Bethlehem could not have exceeded ten or twelve. The heathen writer, Macrobius, in the fourth century, is the first that expressly mentions the slaughter at Bethlchem.

2. *Palestine under the dominion of Herod's Sons*, until the death of Agrippa I., or from the year 3, A.C., to the year 44, A.D. After Herod's death, his will, with some modifications, was confirmed by Augustus. Accordingly, the country was divided among Herod's three sons, in the following manner:—

Herod Archelaus, as ethnarch, or governor of the people, received the provinces of Judea, Samaria, and Idumea, with the hope of obtaining the title of King. This prince is mentioned in Matt. ii. 22. His fate was, that, hated alike by Jews and Samaritans, he was accused by them before the emperor of Rome, and in the 6th year A.D. was banished to Vienne, in France. His territory was adjoined to the Roman province of Syria, and governed by a Roman procurator. Of these officers, Pontius Pilatus was the fifth, who, in the year 28, A.D., entered on his office, under the Emperor Tiberius. A year after his arrival (A.D. 29), John the Baptist began his ministry, and the next year (A.D. 30) Jesus opened his commission, whom three years afterwards Pilate condemned to death. The procurator was a man who sold justice, plundered the people, and shed innocent blood. In the year 37, A.D. he was deposed and sent into banishment at Vienne.

Herod Antipas received, as tetrarch or governor of a divided country, the province of Galilee and the southern part of Perea on the east side of the Jordan. He was a weak slave to luxury, and to his paramour

Herodias. Herodias was properly the wife of his half brother Philip, who, being disinherited by his father, lived as a private person. Antipas, seduced by criminal love, put away his lawful spouse, the daughter of the Arabian king Aretas, took Herodias from his brother, and made her his wife. Having gone with her to Rome, in order to procure the title of King, he was deprived of power by the Emperor Caligula, and, with Herodias, banished to Lyons, in Gaul. His territory came into the hands of his nephew, Herod Agrippa I., who had previously received the title of King. Of Antipas, frequent mention is made in the New Testament (Matt. xiv. 1; Luke iii. 1, 19, ix. 7), and he is sometimes called King, since the title was commonly given him in courtesy (Matt. xiv. 9; Mark vi. 14). It was he who imprisoned John the Baptist in the fort Macherus, which stood three hours east of the Dead Sea; and afterwards had him beheaded there, because that righteous teacher openly declared that it was unlawful for him to have his brother's wife (Matt. xiv. 3-12). This same Antipas, on hearing of the deeds of Jesus, took him to be John the Baptist risen from the dead (Matt. xiv. 2; Mark vi. 14—comp. Luke ix. 7), and plotted against the Saviour's life (Luke xiii. 31); who called him a fox (Luke xiii. 33). When Antipas was present at the condemnation of our Lord in Jerusalem, and Pilate sent Jesus to him, the Saviour would perform no miracle in his presence, as the prince and his courtiers hoped; nor, indeed, did Jesus give any answer to his questions (Luke xxiii. 6-12).

Herod Philip, with the title of tetrarch, received as his portion the northern part of Perca, of which the separate districts were called Batanaea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis (Matt. xvi. 13; Mark viii. 27; Luke iii. 1). He was mild and just. Being childless, and dying a year after the Saviour's crucifixion (A. D. 34), his territory was added to Syria, so that at this time two-thirds of Palestine were under the exclusive sway of Rome, for Judea had belonged to Syria since the year 6, A. D. Meanwhile, there lived in Rome a prince named Agrippa, grandson of Herod the Great, and son of Aristobulus, whose life Herod had taken away. He was well-disposed, but given to luxury. Brought up in Rome, and immersed in all the licentiousness of the court, he there "wasted his substance in riotous living." At the command of Tiberius he was suddenly apprehended and thrown into chains, on the statement of a slave, who reported that he had expressed a wish for the speedy death of the emperor. When that monarch was no more, Caligula set him at liberty, and gave him the territory of his deceased uncle, Philip, with the regal title. He accordingly reigned as

Herod Agrippa I. (37-44, A. D.), who had the good fortune to unite

under his dominion all the lands of his grandfather: for when his uncle Antipas, in his envy, had repaired to Rome in order to procure the same title of King, and was in consequence banished to France, Agrippa I. received that prince's territories in addition to his own, and having encouraged Claudius to assume the purple, he was rewarded by that emperor with the gift of Judea and Samaria, so that he now ruled as king over all Palestine. The Jews were, on the whole, prosperous under his reign, though he was altogether given to Roman usages and manners. His power lasted only three years, for he died in A. D. 44, of the same disgusting disease as his grandfather (Acts xii. 23), after he had, in the same year, persecuted the Christians, slain James the Elder, and incarcerated the Apostle Peter (Acts xii. 1-4). Just previously to his death he had been saluted as a divinity by the Pagans in the theatre (Acts xii. 19-23).

Section CVI.—CONTINUATION OF THE HISTORY.

3. *Palestine under the Roman Governors or Procurators*, until the outbreak of the last Jewish war (44-66, A. D.). After the death of Agrippa I. the whole of Palestine became dependent on Rome, and was governed by Roman procurators under the Roman proconsuls of Syria; for the Emperor Claudius (41-54, A. D.) found it hazardous to entrust the government of his father's territory to the son of the deceased Agrippa, who was very young. The latter, in consequence, received merely the small province of Chaleis, in Syria, which had belonged to his uncle; yet with the hope of entering at a later period into possession of his father's dominions. For one-and-twenty years the Jews now groaned under the injustice and oppression of the Roman procurators, until, their patience at last being exhausted, they rose in a general insurrection in the year 66, A. D. The most tyrannical governors were — 1. *Felix* (53-60), who kept the Apostle Paul for two years imprisoned in Cæsarea, and before whom Paul had to plead his cause (Acts xxiii. 33-xxiv. 27): his wife, Drusilla, the sister of Agrippa II., was an open apostate from the religion of her country. 2. *Festus* (60-63), who, after hearing Paul in the presence of Agrippa II., sent the apostle to Rome (Acts xxv. 26-xxvii.). 3. *Albinus* (63-65). And, 4. *Gessius Florus* (from 65, A. D.), under whom the rising came to an open war: for the public peace was destroyed by enmity to the Romans, by false prophets, and zealots, who stirred up the people, and

by bands of robbers, who shared their plunder with the procurators. In the same year in which Festus became procurator,

Agrippa II. was appointed tetrarch in Perea, over the territories formerly governed by Philip. Agrippa did but contribute to the general disquiet. Dwelling in Jerusalem, he appointed and deposed the high-priests, and occasioned many disturbances in the sacerdotal order. Hired banditti came to play a prominent part. Even in Rome itself the Jews were troublesome; on which account they were expelled from the city by Claudius (Acts xviii. 2). This Agrippa, moreover, lived incestuously with his sister, Bernice, who had been previously married to her uncle, Herod of Chalcis. At the beginning of their sway, both came to Cæsarea in order to greet the procurator Festus (Acts xxv. 13), on which occasion Paul was placed before them (Acts xxv. 23, seq.). This prince survived the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the year 90 died at Rome, the last member of the family of Herod.

General View of Herod's Family.

I. **HEROD THE GREAT**, Son of the Idumean Antipater, after the expulsion of the Maccabees, reigned as king over the whole land of Judea (37-3, A. C.). By his five wives he had seven sons. These were—

1. *Alexander* } children of Mariamne, the daughter of Hyrcanus the Mac-
2. *Aristobulus* } cabee; both were strangled in Samaria.
3. *Antipater*, who was put to death shortly before his father's decease.
4. *Philip*, not the tetrarch, but a rich private person, the first husband of Herodias.
5. *Archelaus*, who ruled over Judea, and, in A. D. 6, was } Full brothers by
6. *Antipas*, who possessed Galilee, and, with Herodias, } Malthace.
- was, A. D. 39, banished into France
7. *Philip*, the tetrarch of Perea, who died A. D. 34.

Aristobulus (number 2) had a son, namely,

II. **AGRIPPA I.**, who became king of all Palestine, and died in the year 44, A. D. His brother and sister were,

Herod, king of Chalcis, the first husband of Bernice: he died 47, A. D.; and

Herodias, the wife first of Philip and then of Antipas.

Agrippa I. had a son, who became,

III. **AGRIPPA II.**, who received the tetrarchy of Philip, and in the year 90 died in Rome. His sisters were,

Bernice, the wife of her uncle, Herod of Chalcis, and afterwards mistress of her brother, Agrippa II.

Drusilla, wife of the procurator Felix.

4. *History of the last War, till the Destruction of Jerusalem, from 66-70, A. D.* After the fire of rebellion had long smouldered in the ashes, it at last broke out into flames (A. D. 66). The immediate occa-

sion was a dispute between the Jews and Syrians respecting the right of Roman citizenship, which was decided to the disadvantage of the Jews. The procurator Gessius Florus diligently fomented the rising, because he feared an accusation before the emperor; in an insurrection, however, the people would appear deserving of punishment. Accordingly, going to Jerusalem, he plundered, burnt and murdered continually; nay, he crucified some Jews who were Roman citizens. Agrippa II., who was in Jerusalem, endeavoured to act as mediator, and entreated the people to make oblations to the image of the emperor, as was required. He was answered with volleys of stones. The Jews now besieged the Romans, who were shut up in the Castle of Antonia, took the place, and slew the garrison. At the head of the Jews stood a certain Menahem, who assumed the title of King: he was soon afterwards put to death in the temple by a personal enemy named Eleazar. The insurrection now spread throughout the land. Everywhere the Romans were assailed; they were not slow in returning the attack. All the towns were filled with corpses; some were in flames. Then Cestius Gallus, the proconsul of Syria, came with an army, in order to put out the conflagration. He appeared before Jerusalem, committed error after error, and when he tried to carry it by storm, he was beaten back. On his retreat, being surrounded and attacked, he came off with difficulty. The success raised the spirits of the Jews, the rising was formally organised, and the land was divided into four provinces, each having a governor of its own. The historian Josephus, who, as a contemporary, and in part an eye-witness, has described this war, was the governor of Galilee. Josephus, born in Jerusalem 37, A. D., was of a sacerdotal family; he received a learned education, and was first an Essene, and then a Pharisee. Besides the vernacular Syro-Chaldee, he was acquainted with the ancient Hebrew; he was also versed in Greek literature and eloquence. In his first residence in Rome, where, probably, he acquired his knowledge of Greek, he had access to the court of Nero. After his return he was made governor of Galilee. As a prisoner of Vespasian, he took, in honour of that emperor, the surname of Flavius (Sueton., *Vita Vesp.* v.), and spent his latter days in Rome, where he died, A. D. 93. He wrote twenty books, entitled, *The Antiquities of the Jews*, in which he endeavoured to remove the odium attaching to his nation in the eyes of Greeks and Romans; also seven books on *The Jewish War*, which, in the year 75, A. D., he presented to Vespasian; also three books *Against Apion*, a learned Alexandrian, who had thrown contempt on the Jews; finally, a sketch of his own *Life*, and a small treatise *On the Maccabees*.

Vespasian, who has just been mentioned, and who afterwards assumed

the purple (A. D. 70), was invested by the Emperor Nero with military command in Syria, while his son Titus was sent into Egypt in order to conduct into Palestine the Roman legions that were there. Vespasian, coming down from the north into Galilee with an army of sixty thousand men, spread alarm on all sides. Jotapa, after a brave defence, fell through treachery. In this stronghold Josephus was made prisoner. He was conducted in chains into the Roman camp, but was mildly treated, for he prophesied that Vespasian would be emperor of Rome. The Romans then made themselves masters of Samaria, Cæsarea, and Joppa. Crossing the Jordan, they attacked the small fortress Gamala, which was defended with exemplary courage. All now fled to the capital, where profligacy and wretchedness increased every day. Bands of robbers, called Zealots, had fixed themselves in Jerusalem. At their head was Eleazar, who had got possession of the temple. The other Jews, inflamed by the high-priest Ananus, besieged those Zealots in the temple. They invited the Idumeans to give them aid, and, as Ananus refused to admit them into the city, the Zealots, during a night disturbed by earthquake and tempest, forced open the gates, when Ananus lost his life in a sanguinary conflict. The suffering inhabitants sought assistance against the Zealots in Simon of Gerasa, who had taken up a position before the city with a band of robbers. After a severe fight, Simon drove the Zealots back into the temple, and took possession of the whole city. The unhappy citizens were handled in the most horrible manner by both parties, and all Jerusalem resembled a huge robbers' cave. Meanwhile, Vespasian had received news from Rome. Nero, abandoned by his dependents, had put an end to himself, and the Emperor Galba was slain. This information induced him to protract the undertaking against Jerusalem, and to wait at Cæsarea for further events in the capital of the world. Then came the intelligence that Vitellius had been proclaimed emperor. This occasioned universal dissatisfaction in the Roman army, whose chiefs designated Vespasian for that honour. The general, in consequence, hastened to Rome, in order to assume the dignity, and left his son Titus behind at the head of the troops. Meanwhile, a third party had arisen in Jerusalem. Eleazar, the chief of the Zealots, becoming jealous of John of Giscala, who had previously been a robber chief, separated, with his followers, from him. Accompanied by his band, he seized the highest battlement of the temple, and was there besieged by John. John, occupying the outer courts and the declivities of the temple, was, in his turn, besieged by Simon, who held the city. These three were night and day in conflict with each other. As now Titus continually delayed, the opinion prevailed that he did not feel himself sufficiently strong to take the city.

Accordingly, at the ensuing Easter, the Jews, as if in peace, streamed into Jerusalem. When, then, the city, destitute of supplies of provisions, contained a million of Jews, Titus suddenly assaulted the place at the Passover, narrowing the base of his operations. At first, the factions, uniting, made vigorous sallies, especially on the side of Olivet; but disunion soon returned. John secured possession of the temple, when he and Simon became paramount in the city. On the north was the Roman camp. The most terrible famine began. Bloody massacre among the factions, hunger, and pestilence, filled the city with corruption and stench. Josephus having in vain called on the leaders to surrender, Titus, on the 17th of May, forced his way into the new city, which stood at the north, beneath his camp. The defenders drew back into the old city. After five days, the Romans made their way into the lower city (Aera), and Titus now again waited for famine to compel the surrender. The famine was dreadful: fathers tore their morsels out of children's mouths, children did the same to fathers; all the ties of blood and of nature were loosened. The famishing ate shoes, girdles, the leather straps of the shields; nay, one mother killed her infant, and roasted it to satisfy her hunger. It was useless to think of removing out of sight the thousands of bodies that infested the city and contaminated the air. They lay in the streets, in the public places, on the roofs, and in the houses. Yet murder did not stop. The Zealots, with incredible eagerness, went on strangling, and employed the most excruciating pains in order to extort confession from those who were thought to have concealed food or treasure. Death had dropped his black wings over the city, and reaped a harvest such as he never reaped before. Wailing and despair, horror and woe, were universal. Their fathers had said, "His blood be upon us and upon our children" (Matt. xxvii. 25). Terribly now was the imprecation fulfilled; fulfilled, too, were those awful words of the Saviour, "The days are coming in the which they shall say, Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck. Then shall they say to the mountains, Fall on us, and to the hills, Cover us" (Luke xxiii. 29, 30). Even the Romans were filled with amazement, and Titus, lifting up his hands to heaven, called God to witness that he was not answerable for that unutterable distress (Joseph. v.-vii.; Euseb. iii. 6, 7). Thousands fled into the camp of the Romans, preferring death by the enemy's hand to death by famine. Sparing their lives, Titus gave them food, and then sold them into slavery. On the 5th of July the Castle of Antonia had fallen, when Titus made preparations for storming the temple. It was his wish that the edifice should be spared, but in the operations it was set on fire by his soldiers in order to prepare the way for the storming;

and, wonderful to relate, the tenth Roman legion, who had pressed on the Jews with the greatest fury, having suffered a defeat at their hands, stood in the besieging forces on the same spot on the Mount of Olives where the Saviour once, in going down its sides, stopped, and, weeping over the city as he contemplated it, said, "The days shall come that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and they shall not leave one stone upon another, because thou knowest not the time of thy visitation" (Luke xix. 37, seq.—comp. Mark xiii. 1-3; Luke xxi. 20-24). In vain did Titus give an express command to save the temple; it perished in the flames (Matt. xxiv. 1, 2; Mark xiii. 1, 2). The Zealots made their escape thence to Mount Zion, which was not conquered and destroyed till the 2nd of September. All who bore arms, and most of those who did not, were pitilessly massacred. Above a million of Jews perished. Of the rest, some were sold to Greek slave-merchants, others were sent into the Egyptian mines, and others were preserved for the gladiatorial games in Rome. Those whose personal appearance was most striking were reserved for the triumph. Among these were John and Simon, the latter of whom, some days after the conquest, came like an apparition from some subterranean hiding-place. The city was levelled with the soil. The walls, except an inconsiderable portion on the west, were broken down. Titus and Vespasian enjoyed the honours of a triumph in Rome; their triumphal chariot was followed by seven hundred Jews. Among the booty borne before the victors were the golden lamp, the table of unleavened bread, and a manuscript roll of the law. To the present day stands the arch of triumph, which was erected in honour of Titus and his mournful victory over the Jewish nation.

Sixty-two years later, under the Emperor Hadrian, who restored the temple and established in Jerusalem a Roman colony (*Ælia Capitolina*), the Jews, having become numerous, attempted a rebellion. A daring man, Simeon, with the surname of Bar Cochba (*son of a star*), gave himself out for the Messiah, collected a large Jewish army, and conquered Jerusalem (134). The Romans, however, again captured the city. Thus failed the last effort made by the nation to recover its nationality. Bar Cochba fell in flight, the land was laid waste, and the Jews ceased to be a people. Scattered over the face of the earth, they are without a home, a temple, and a worship; and as in them the word of God (Hos. iii. 4, 5; Deut. xxviii. 29) is fulfilled, so do they, century after century, afford an example of God's retributory providence, until, as it is promised, they shall find salvation and peace in the Saviour of the world, whom they rejected, and whom at some time they will own, when also

the fulness of the Gentiles will be converted to Jehovah (Rom. xi. 25, 26).

The destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and the dissolution of the Jewish state, were events of the greatest consequence for the diffusion of the Gospel. Christianity now went forth out of its narrow connexion with Judaism. Jerusalem ceased to be the central point of the Christian Church. The Christians could no longer be regarded as a sect of Jews. As a separate and new religion, Christianity found acceptance with millions who were seeking comfort and peace; and as Rome was the seat of the most distinguished Christian communities, and the Gospel was carried by Jews as they spread abroad in society, so did the number of believers rapidly increase, and the influence of Christianity multiply and spread on every hand; illustrating the words, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out" (Rom. xi. 33).

Section CVII.—THE JEWISH SECTS IN THE TIME OF CHRIST.

The Pharisees and the Sadducees appear in the New Testament as the chief enemies of the Redeemer, who frequently replies to their entrapping questions, blames their teachings, and generally refers to their modes of thought and manner of life in so marked a way that his words cannot be well understood unless the reader possesses an accurate acquaintance with the characteristics of those philosophic sects.

A third school, which existed in Palestine in the time of Christ, namely, the Essenes, is not mentioned in the New Testament: but as even Jesus himself has been taken for a member of that body, the most important facts concerning it must be here set forth.

The Pharisees.—The name signifies "separated," "sectaries." By this designation they were distinguished specially from the Sadducees, their political and religious opponents. They held certain doctrines, which they were little, or not at all, able to prove from the Scriptures. On that account they had recourse to tradition, which they held to be handed down to them from Moses, and to which they ascribed the same authority as to the Scripture (Matt. xv. 2, 6, 9; Mark vii. 3). When they could not thus perfectly justify their views,

they assumed a double sense in Scripture—one in the letter and one of a higher kind, full of mystery, which they found by allegorical interpretation. Of their doctrines, these deserve to be specified: 1. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body (Acts xxiii. 8, xxiv. 15). They conceived that the souls of the departed abode in a certain subterranean place, where the good were separated from the bad. This place they termed *Sheol* or *Hades*. It was divided by a great gulf into Paradise, or the abode of the good, and Gehenna, or the abode of the bad. The bad must ever remain in Gehenna; but the good had the power of returning to earth. Accordingly, Herod Antipas took our Saviour for John the Baptist restored to the life of this world (Matt. xiv. 1, 2; Mark vi. 14; Luke ix. 7). At the advent of the Messiah, however, all the dead were, they believed, to come back to their earthly life, when the good would take part in the Messiah's kingdom on earth. Their adversaries, the Sadducees, ridiculed this their doctrine of the resurrection of the body, as appears from the difficulty they propounded to Jesus regarding the woman that had seven husbands (Matt. xxii. 23-28; Mark xii. 18-23; Luke xx. 27-33—comp. Acts xxiii. 8; xxiv. 15). The Saviour made reference to this notion of the Pharisees in the parable of the rich man (Luke xvi. 23, 26, 27), as it was with them that he had to do (14), and gives them eternal truth in the covering of their own perishable conceptions. In the same way, when he sat at table in the house of one of their chiefs, he spoke to him of retribution after death (Luke xiv. 1, 12, 14). The Apostle Paul, who, in his early days, was a Pharisee, gave expression to this notion in his two letters to the Thessalonians, and in his first letter to the Corinthians (1 Thess. iv. 15-17, v. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 23, 52, 55); but, under the guidance of the divine spirit, he gave up the opinion, and teaches that happiness with God and Christ in heaven immediately follow death (2 Cor. v. 1, 8; Philip. i. 21, 23; 2 Tim. i. 10, iv. 7, 8, 18). 2. The doctrine of angels and spirits (Acts xxiii. 8), having a certain order and rank, over whom were seven archangels—(comp. Dan. iv. 14, viii. 16, ix. 21, x. 5, xii. 1; Tobit vi. 15, viii. 2, 3, xii. 15). 3. The doctrine of predestination; in holding which they attempted to prove that human freedom was not destroyed. With these opinions they connected a very dangerous moral system, which must have undermined all true morality: for they taught—4. The merit of external righteousness, in which they held fast to the letter of the law, and added to the law a multitude of hair-splitting definitions. They satisfied themselves with outward good works, and placed all merit therein. They enjoined constant washings and purifications (Matt. xv. 1, 2, 20; Luke xi. 38), strict fasts (Matt. vi. 16, ix. 14),

wordy prayers (Matt. vi. 5-7, 23, 14), in the synagogues and the streets (Matt. xxiii. 5, 6), frequent alms-giving (Matt. vi. 1, 2), rigid observance of the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 2; Luke vi. 7), in which they clung to the minutest externalities (Matt. xxiii. 4, 23-26, 29; Luke xi. 39, seq., 46); but wholly neglected the spirit of the law (Matt. xxiii. 23, 24; Luke xi. 42). Honour with men was their special desire (Matt. vi. 1, 2, xxiii. 7, 8; Luke xi. 43, 44), on which account they were often termed hypocrites by the Saviour (Matt. xxiii. 13, 14, 15). They also taught—5. Immoral doctrines, e. g. as in the evading of the force of oaths (Matt. xxiii. 16), and denying the sinfulness of wicked desires (Matt. v. 20).

They stood high in the estimation of the people, for they knew the art of acquiring popular favour by fair appearances and strict adherence to the law. They were accounted the genuine supports of true Judaism, and, as they entertained political aims, they had great social influence, in which they far surpassed the Sadducees. In secret, however, they gave themselves up to their desires and passions, seeking only to preserve the outward appearance of holiness (Matt. xxiii. 27, 28; Luke xi. 44). Some, however, among them uprightly strove to fulfil the law, and were rigid to themselves, as appears from the example of the Apostle Paul (Acts xxvi. 5; Philip. iii. 5, 6; Gal. i. 13, 14).

At the time of Christ, they were divided into two schools,—1, that of Hillel, which was in favour with the people, and was distinguished for its parables delivered in teaching; and 2, that of Shammai, a scholar of Hillel, of whom he became the rival. There was between them a difference of view and doctrine regarding divorce. Moses allowed a man to put away his wife on finding some uncleanness in her (Deut. xxiv. 1). This permission the school of Hillel extended to anything which the husband might find displeasing in his wife; while the school of Shammai restricted the words to actual unfaithfulness (Matt. v. 31, 32, xix. 3-9). On the point, Jesus decided that only adultery justified divorce. The doctrines of the Pharisees, collected together, formed the Talmud, which became the creed of later ages. Most of the Jews of the present day belong to the pharisaic school, and call themselves Rabbanites; only a few, bearing the name of Karaites, follow the Sadducees. The name of the latter indicates such as acknowledge the authority of Scripture only (*Scriptuarii*). The latter live in the east and in Southern Russia.

The Sadducees.—The name denotes *men who are right in belief*, or just men, though some derive the word from a certain person named Zadok. The doctrine of the Sadducees was in many points the reverse of that of the Pharisees. They rejected tradition, and held exclusively

to the canonical books of the Scripture. The Fathers of the Church were of opinion that they received none but the five books of Moses—an opinion which is in no way supported by Matthew (xxii. 29). Their chief doctrines were—1. There is after death no immortality nor retribution. Josephus says of them, “They deny both a life and a recompense in Hades” (comp. Acts xxiii. 6-8). Hence their derisive question to the Saviour concerning the resurrection of the dead (Matt. xxii. 24; Mark xii. 19; Luke xx. 27). 2. There is neither angel nor spirit (Acts xxiii. 8), whence came the strife in the Sanhedrim when Paul appealed to the Pharisees, and for once extracted from them a momentary support (9). 3. The human will has unlimited freedom. They accordingly denied all operation of the spirit of God in human actions, and so opposed the pharisaic doctrine of predestination. Their moral teachings were decidedly superior to those of the Pharisees. Their main position was, that,—4. Virtue must not seek a reward. Men ought, they said, to serve God and keep his commands irrespectively of hope and fear. In their manner of life many were rigid; others, on the contrary, gave themselves up to sensual pleasures, entirely disowning the wants of the soul. As they shunned public offices, they had little opportunity to gain favour with the people, but they always attached themselves to the ruling party.

The Essenes.—These, whose name has been explained to signify *pious*, or *holy*, or *consecrated*, or *healers*, formed a kind of secret order, which had its chief seat near the Dead Sea. This sect probably arose at the time of the religious persecutions under Antiochus, when many pious Jews withdrew into seclusion. They were distinguished for their acquaintance with nature and the art of healing, had sacred books which they kept to themselves, and took pride in their occult knowledge respecting the higher world of spirits. They practised a community of goods, ate in common, and endeavoured to live a blameless life. On his reception into the brotherhood, each bound himself by oath to the strictest silence, specially undertaking not to disclose the names of the angels and the sacred books (comp. Col. ii. 18). The Essenes did not frequent the temple, though they conscientiously sent their dues thither. They taught that there is a Providence, and that the soul is immortal, but they did not believe in the continuance of the body after death: their idea was, that in death the soul was freed from the body as from a prison. The country of the good lay beyond the ocean, and was molested by neither rain, snow, nor heat; but the wicked went to a dark, winterly place, full of ceaseless punishments (Joseph., *Jewish War*, ii. 8, 11; *Antiq.*, xviii. 1, 5). In their moral philosophy, they set forth, as the three cardinal virtues, love to God, love to men, and

love for virtue. They observed strict moderation, avoided all luxury, refused oaths and warlike service, and lived one with another in brotherly relations. The fraternity filled up its ranks by unconstrained accessions, and by children, which were educated for the community. They were averse to marriage, and in the higher classes of the order remained bachelors. A stricter sect of the Essenes, named *Therapeutæ*—that is, *physicians*, or *worshippers*—had their seat in the desert, near Alexandria. They lived formally as hermits, and came together only on each sabbath-day for the purposes of devotion. On the seventh sabbath, which was a high festival with them, they spent the night in solemn songs and processions, the last hymn of which greeted the rising sun. Whoever joined them renounced society altogether, and retired for ever into solitude. They were rigorous in fasting, never took food before sunset, and wholly abstained from flesh and wine.

II.—THE DOCTRINAL BOOKS, OR THE TWENTY-ONE APOSTOLICAL LETTERS.

Section CVIII.—OCCASION AND CHARACTER IN GENERAL.

The apostles who founded the new Christian communities in the different lands of the east and the west, stood in connexion with them as faithful stewards of the divine mysteries, and both by writing and by word of mouth strove to water the seed of the Gospel, to protect it against injurious and destructive influences, and to promote its growth in every way in the power of the Holy Spirit. For these purposes, they not only repeatedly travelled to the Churches that they had founded, and sought by their personal presence and influence to strengthen the members in the faith of Christ, but they also wrote letters to them, or to their presidents or bishops, when some special occasion, or the impulse of their own hearts, prompted them to the office.

The occasion for such communications was given partly by the circumstances of the Churches with which they became acquainted, partly by questions respecting this or that state of things, partly by members of one Church visiting another, partly by the special relation in which an apostle stood to a Church or to its spiritual overseer. The circumstances of the youthful communities were called forth by either internal

or external causes, and demanded the undivided attention, the full sympathy, and all the holy power of the apostle, lest his labour should prove in vain, and its fruit be destroyed. In general, the Churches consisted of in part heathen, in part Jewish, Christians; and as the one or the other deemed themselves better, wiser, or more excellent, so were the communities threatened with disunion, schism, or dissolution. The Epistle to the Romans gives evidence of this in the clearest manner. In other Churches, there arose not only diversities of opinion, but even parties that disagreed touching the conception and representation of Christian truth and the authority of an apostle; as, for instance, in the Church at Corinth. In other places, evangelical truth was in peril, being oppressed by false doctrine, or distorted by additions; thus, in the Churches of Galatia the Gospel was assailed by Jewish falsities, which represented the observance of the Jewish law as necessary to happiness. In Ephesus and Colossæ, Christian truth had to make a stand against a secret wisdom and a pretended acquaintance with the world of spirits. In other communities, the Gospel was perverted so as to excite solicitude, and to justify an indolent mode of life, as in Thessalonica, where such a misuse was made of the doctrine of the second coming of Christ. Into other places false opinions intruded themselves, which denied the very grounds of the Christian faith, as appears from the First Epistle of John (iv. 1, 2), or derided Christian expectations, as is clear from the Second Epistle of Peter (iii. 3, 4). Generally, the false teachers were morally corrupt men, who threatened to undermine the morality of the Churches. Besides, it happened that, here and there, with pure intentions, some teachings of the apostles were misunderstood, and the correction of misconceptions became a pressing necessity; as, according to the Epistle to the Thessalonians, the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and, according to the Epistle of James, the doctrine of justification by faith. Everywhere there occurred in the youthful Churches sins and vices, such as had been customary among Jews and heathens, which were occasioned partly by the force of habit, partly by social intercourse. Earnest rebuke and warning could not, therefore, be allowed to fail. In some places in which progress was made in Christian holiness there was a danger lest the members should think of themselves too highly. In such a case, the most friendly and affectionate admonition was needful, as may be seen in the letter to the Philippians. In other places, the spirit of Christ had so little penetrated into the several relations of life, that the right feeling did not prevail between fathers and children, masters and servants, husbands and wives. In consequence, reference had to be made to these neglects, as is done in the letter to the Colossians (iii.), and to the Ephesians (v., vi.), and

in the First Epistle of Peter (ii., iii.). The internal life of the Churches, the ordering of divine service, irregularities connected therewith, the election of elders and overseers, demanded instruction from apostles, as we find in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (xi. 12, 14), and in the three catholic epistles. Frequently, the Churches themselves applied for advice to the apostles, as they were in doubt touching many things: thus did the Corinthians (1 Cor. vii., seq.); nay, Paul testifies that he had daily the care of all the Churches (2 Cor. xi. 28). The relations, too, in which Christians stood to heathen magistrates, and the duty of obedience towards them, the constantly-occurring attacks and persecutions from the Jews and heathens, and the comforting and strengthening of the oppressed which were needful in these sufferings, supplied to the apostles fresh occasions for writing, as we see in the First Epistle of Peter (ii. 12, seq.—comp. Rom. xiii.). The apostles had, moreover, to take means for collecting pecuniary aid on behalf of needy brethren, particularly those in Jerusalem, on which matter they sometimes felt themselves required to write to a Church (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 2; 2 Cor. viii. 9); nor did there fail to be personal reasons for communicating with Churches or individuals, such as the condition of Paul when a prisoner in Rome (see Philem., and 2 Tim. iv.), and the sending back of Onesimus (Philem.). When all these particulars are viewed together, the apostles will appear to have had occasions sufficient for addressing the Churches by letter.

The apostles obtained a knowledge of the circumstances of the several Churches, either by messengers expressly sent for the purpose, or by letters and Christian brethren from those communities who made application to them, or, again, by individuals who, travelling from place to place, communicated the information which they possessed. Thus Paul sent Timothy from Athens to Thessalonica, and received from him in Corinth, where they met, information respecting the Thessalonian Church (1 Thess. iii. 1, 2, 6—comp. Acts xviii. 5). Paul afterwards sent Timothy with Erastus from Ephesus to Macedonia, and requested him to visit Corinth also (Acts xix. 22; 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10, 11). From the same place he sent Titus (2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 5, 6), and received from both in Macedonia, where they came to him, information respecting the Corinthian Church (comp. 2 Cor. i. 1, vii. 6, 7). Again, he sent Titus to prepare for a collection of alms (2 Cor. viii. 6, 16, 17). The Corinthian Church itself had previously made a written application to the apostle (1 Cor. vii. 1); nay, had sent three messengers to him at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 17), from whom the apostle gained an exact acquaintance with the state of the community. In the same way, through Epaphroditus, whom the Philippians had sent to him with a supply of

money, he received information respecting the Church at Philippi (Phil. ii. 25, iv. 18), as already he had twice had such aid from them, and, at the same time, information respecting their condition (Phil. iv. 10, 16). From the teacher, Epaphras of Colossæ, news was given him in Rome regarding the Churches at Colossæ and Ephesus (Col. i. 7, iv. 12, 13); and that he received intelligence also from others who travelled from place to place, appears from the instance of Chloe, by some of whose household he was first made acquainted with the divisions in the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. i. 11).

The character of the apostolic letters is seen from the occasions of their being written. They are all designed for instruction and exhortation, consequently parts which are not strictly of this description are comparatively of less prominence and less importance. In most of them the instruction has internal connexions. Those of Paul generally, in the first place, convey the needful instruction, to which, in the second part, is added corresponding exhortation: on the contrary, the seven catholic epistles are chiefly hortatory in their tone, and refer rather to Christian life and conduct. These letters, however, are of special value to us, because they leave untouched scarcely any point of Christian belief and the Christian life, which, in consequence, are illustrated, developed, and established, while all, though occasioned by the needs of those to whom the letters were addressed, is done in the power of the Holy Spirit, which animated the apostles and led them into all truth. Between certain letters there exists a great similarity, arising from the occasion or the subject's being alike: thus the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians are related to each other, since both handle the doctrine that faith, not the works of the law, justified sinners before God. In the same manner, the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians resemble each other, for they both teach that in Jesus all the treasures of wisdom are hidden, so that there was no need of another—a secret wisdom; also the exhortations, as well as the Christian relations in life, all filled and pervaded by the spirit of the Gospel, are found in each alike. The First Epistle to Timothy, and that to Titus, are very nearly related, since they both contain directions for a right discharge of the episcopal duties. The Epistles to the Corinthians lay open deep views into the life of the Christian Church in the time of the apostles. The letters to the Thessalonians treat of the expected re-appearance of Christ. The Epistle to the Philippians displays to us the deep love of the apostle towards that community. In the second letter to Timothy we behold the joy of the apostle in the prospect of death: and in that to Philemon, the skill with which Paul treated an incident in ordinary life. Among the catholic epistles, the Second of Peter, and that of

Jude, are very similar, since the false teachers and godless men against whom they give warning, resembled each other. The three Epistles of John breathe the loving spirit of their author. That of James puts the reader on his guard against sins of various kinds, and rectifies the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith. The Second Epistle of Peter exhibits the blessed hope of Christians, and exhorts them to live a holy life. The Epistle to the Hebrews finally sets forth the advantage of Christianity over Judaism, exhibiting the Saviour as the only true and eternal high-priest.

In order, then, to understand the apostolic letters, it is requisite to possess an acquaintance with the circumstances, the occasions, and the object in each case. Thus only can we learn what the writers meant in the words they employ, what particular relations they had before their eye, and what sense those who received the letters attached to the several parts and to the whole. Not till these things are well known can we apply to our times what these letters contain; nay, then only that comes forth which is applicable to all times, for it is in no other way that we can find the everlasting truth which the Holy Ghost spoke by the mouths of the apostles. If, however, the latter is kept chiefly before the mind, and the former is sought either not at all, or superficially, misunderstandings, perversions and false notions are unavoidable; nay, much remains which cannot be understood, and arbitrariness and pre-conceived dogmatical tendencies gain unrestricted predominance, and find in the Scripture things, and make applications of them, which never entered into the mind of the apostles.

Section CIX.—FORMATION, SENDING AND RECEPTION OF THE EPISTLES.

That the apostles did not always write their letters with their own hands, but employed amanuenses, is seen from the example of Paul, who wrote with his own hand only the letters to the Galatians (vi. 11), and that to Philemon (19). For the other letters, he availed himself of the aid of a Christian brother to whom he dictated the words, merely adding with his own hand the greeting at the end, in order thereby to certify the authenticity of the epistle as proceeding from himself (1 Cor. xvi. 21; Rom. xvi. 24; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Eph. vi. 23, 24; Phil. iv. 23). He makes express reference to this indication

(2 Thess. iii. 17), since letters had been circulated as his which had not come from him (2 Thess. ii. 2). Tertius was his amanuensis for the letter to the Romans (Rom. xvi. 22). That Sosthenes was the scribe of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, may be inferred from 1 Cor. i. 1, compared with 1 Cor. xvi. 21. Peter, in his first letter, may have had Mark for his amanuensis, for Mark was with him (1 Pet. v. 13), and from the express testimony of Papias, in Eusebius, Mark was the interpreter of Peter (Euseb., iii. 39, v. 8).

The letters were sent by travelling Christians who received them in charge from the apostles, or by persons who were purposely sent in order to carry them. Thus the epistle to the Romans was conveyed by Phœbe, who was a deaconess of the Church, in the port Cenchrea (Rom. xvi. 1). A Christian brother named Tychicus, took from Rome, into Asia Minor, these three letters of Paul, namely, that to the Ephesians, that to the Colossians, and that to Philemon (Ephes. vi. 23, 24; Col. iv. 7, 8, 9; Philem. 10, 12). Epaphroditus, travelling from Rome, took with him the epistle to the Philippians (Phil. ii. 25-29—comp. iv. 18). Titus had the care of the Second Epistle to the Church at Corinth, to which he was sent by Paul (2 Cor. viii. 6, 16-24), and it is highly probable that the First Epistle to the Corinthians was carried to Corinth by those three messengers who came to Paul at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18).

The universal prevalence in the apostolic age, of the Roman dominion, much facilitated this epistolary intercourse, since thus all countries were made accessible. In Rome, which was the centre of the empire, there was a constant coming and going of travellers, who connected together the remotest parts. Thus, Christians, who visited or left the capital, kept Paul, during his imprisonment, constantly acquainted with the condition of distant Churches, and enabled him to make his influence felt in their concerns. Such is the state of things which is implied in the epistles.

The letters sent by the apostles were read in the presence of all the members of the Church, as was proper, in order that all might know their contents, and recognise their authority. Should there be any danger of this not being done, it was expressly requested, as by Paul (1 Thess. v. 27). The letters were also sent to neighbouring Churches, in order that they might be partakers in the instruction, advice, and joy. Thus Paul directs that his letter to the Colossians should be communicated to the Church at Laodicea, at the same time requesting that the now lost epistle to the Laodiceans should be made known to the Church in Colossæ (Col. iv. 16). That the Churches should make copies of the letters sent to them, is only natural, and their preservation

we owe to that loving care with which efforts were made to procure transcripts of the originals.

THE THIRTEEN EPISTLES OF PAUL.

An acquaintance with the life and character of Paul is, before all things, needful, if we would correctly understand his letters. Accordingly we shall first speak of these two points.

Section CX.—THE LIFE OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.

Paul's Life before his Conversion. — This specially chosen servant of God, who effected, for the diffusion of the Gospel, more than any other, and to whom we Europeans are specially indebted for our knowledge of Christianity, was a native of Tarsus, in Cilicia (Acts ix. 11, xxii. 3), where his father was a Roman citizen (Acts xxii. 28). The latter, a Jew of the tribe of Benjamin (Rom. xi. 1; Phil. iii. 5), and also a Pharisee (Acts xxiii. 6), had his son circumcised, as the law required, eight days after his birth (Phil. iii. 5), and, at an early period, took him to Jerusalem (Acts. xxvi. 4), in order to have him instructed in the law, and brought up for a Scribe and Pharisee, as he himself was. Possibly the marriage of a daughter to some one in Jerusalem may have facilitated the execution of this plan (Acts xxiii. 16). He caused his son to be brought up in Jerusalem, and to be instructed in the law of the fathers and the doctrines of the pharisaic school (Acts xxii. 3—comp. v. 34). The young Saul (“desired”), who, following the custom of Jews that lived among the Greeks and Romans, took, after his conversion, the Roman name of Paul, soon surpassed his equals in a learned acquaintance with Judaism (Gal. i. 14), yet, according to a Jewish custom, learned a trade, namely, that of tent-making (Acts xviii. 3), in which he was taught to make light portable tents, of cloth, linen, leather, &c., designed for shepherds and travellers. At the same time he rigidly observed the requirements of the pharisaic school (Acts xxvi. 5; Phil. iii. 6), and his rigorous mode of life was not unobserved in Jerusalem (Acts xxvi. 4, 5). A mind like Paul’s must have been much moved by the new sect; for such he considered Christians, since they not only rejected the traditions of the elders, but threatened the whole pharisaic system with ruin by their stern rebukes of their

external observances. Paul therefore was glad to sanction with his presence the earliest stoning of Christian martyrs (Acts vii. 57, viii. 1, xxii. 20). His fiery soul now carried on the persecution of Christians in Jerusalem under the conviction that conscience required such a course (Acts xxvi. 9), for which he received a formal commission from the high-priest (Acts xxvi. 10). Saul persecuted the Christians with such rage (11), that he not only threw men and women into prison (Acts xxii. 4), but sought out Christians in Jewish synagogues, and compelled them to revile Christ (Acts xxvi. 11). Beyond Jerusalem, too, he pursued the same course (Acts xxvi. 10). To such an extent did he prove himself a zealous promoter of Judaism, that he was sent by the high-priest on a mission to Damascus in order to suppress the infant cause of Christ in that city (Acts ix. 1, xxii. 5, xxvi. 12; 1 Tim. i. 13; Phil. iii. 6).

Paul's Conversion and Residence in Damascus.—He was on the road to Damascus when that wonderful event befel him which effected a complete revolution in himself and in his history (Acts ix. 3, seq., xxii. 6, seq., xxvi. 13, seq.). Without sight he entered Damascus, and remained so three days, until healed by a Christian named Ananias, on which he was immediately baptised (Acts ix.). Remaining in the city some days, he preached Jesus in the Jewish synagogue, to the no small surprise of the Jews, who knew for what purpose he had quitted Jerusalem (Acts ix. 21). Afterwards he went into Arabia, where he tarried for some time, whence he came back to Damascus (Gal. i. 17), where he laboured for the furtherance of the Gospel (Acts ix. 23), until the Jews began to plot against his life, and induced the officer who governed the city, as the representative of the Arabian king, Aretas, to keep watch day and night, in order to prevent the apostle's escape. He was, however, set at large by his Christian brethren, who got him out of a window, and let him down the walls in a basket (Acts ix. 24, 25; 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33). Thence he proceeded to Jerusalem, whither, after an absence of three years, he returned as a Christian and a herald of the Gospel (Acts ix. 26; Gal. i. 18).

Paul's first Residence in Jerusalem after his Conversion.—Paul, on arriving in Jerusalem, was an object of fear to the Christian brethren, as they knew him only as their persecutor (Acts ix. 26), until Barnabas, who had been a Levite in Cyprus, and was converted by the apostles in Jerusalem (Acts iv. 36, 37), introduced him to Peter, whom he principally wished to know (Acts ix. 27; Gal. i. 18), and with whom he found James the Less (Gal. i. 19). No other apostles, however, were seen by Paul on this visit to Jerusalem, which extended over only fifteen days (Gal. i. 18, 19). As meanwhile he preached the Gospel,

and in doing so fell into a dispute with the Jewish Christians, he was no longer sure of his life (Acts ix. 28, 29), and was advised by Christian friends to depart. To this advice he was the more inclined because, while in a trance in the temple, he saw the Redeemer, who urged him to quit Jerusalem, in order that he might offer his rejected instruction to the willing ears of the heathen (Acts xxii. 17-21). Conducted by Christian brethren, he therefore proceeded to Cæsarea, whence he proceeded to his native Tarsus, and so travelled through Syria and Cilicia, preaching the Gospel (Acts ix. 30; Gal. i. 21, 23).

Paul's Residence in Antioch.—As, meanwhile, Barnabas was sent from Jerusalem to Antioch (Acts xi. 22), and preached the Gospel there with much success (24), so he wished for a fellow-labourer, and in that view invited Paul from Tarsus (25), on which both taught in Antioch during a year. The converts, of whom the number was large, here first received the name of Christians (26). On occasion of a dearth of food, Paul and Barnabas were sent by the Church of Antioch with pecuniary aid to the needy brethren in Judea, where, however, they did not remain. On their return to Antioch, they associated with themselves John Mark, a relative of Barnabas (Acts xi. 30, xii. 25; Col. iv. 10). After they, with other Christian teachers, had laboured for a time in Antioch (Acts xiii. 1), they were solemnly sent on a great missionary tour by the Church at Antioch, which thereby became the mother of all the Churches founded in heathen countries (Acts xiii. 2).

Paul's first Missionary Journey.—With Barnabas, Paul accordingly entered on his missionary labours. He was accompanied by John Mark, before mentioned, who, however, appears to have been chiefly attached to Barnabas (comp. Acts xv. 37-39). They passed through Seleucia, where the Orontes, on which Antioch also stood, flows into the Mediterranean. Thence they crossed to the island of Cyprus (Acts xiii. 4), on the east side of which they landed, and first proclaimed the Gospel in the Jewish synagogue in Salamis (5). They then went westwardly through the island to Paphos, where the worship of Venus was popular. Here the Roman governor, Sergius Paulus, seeing the miracle performed by the apostle on the sorcerer Bar-Jesus (Elymas), became a convert to Christianity (6-12). Leaving the island, they passed into Asia Minor, and visited first the city of Perga, in Pamphylia, a province which lay opposite to Cyprus. Here they were left by their companion, John Mark (13). From this place they travelled northwardly into Pisidia; and in Antioch, in that province, preached Christianity, first to the Jews and then to the heathen, so that it became known throughout the region (14-49). Driven away by a persecution raised by the Jews (50), they turned their steps eastwardly, and, entering the province of

Lycaonia, they remained some time in Iconium, its capital, and in word and deed laboured for the propagation of the Gospel (Acts xiii. 51; xiv. 1-3). As, however, they became aware of an intention to mistreat them, they fled to Lystra, a city lying in a north-western direction. Here Paul cured a cripple; in consequence, he and Barnabas were taken for gods (Acts xiv. 6-13). When, however, Jews from Antioch and Iconium had come thither, Paul was stoned so that he was left for dead (19); the next day, nevertheless, he with Barnabas set out for Derbe. This wonderful deliverance the apostle ascribed to divine assistance (2 Tim. iii. 11). When they had made many converts in Derbe and the vicinity (Acts xiv. 21—comp. 6), they returned through Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, cities of Asia Minor, to Perga, organising and confirming the Churches (10-24). They then took ship in Attalia, a sea-port near Perga, and, going back to Antioch, in Syria, gave to the Church in that city a report of the conversions they had made among the heathens (25-27).

We may here describe more exactly the manner in which Paul published the Gospel on this missionary tour, and on those which he afterwards undertook. In general, wherever he arrived as a herald of the Gospel, he directed his attention primarily to the Jews, who offered him a favourable soil on which to labour, as in their synagogues and public worship they were accustomed to read the law and the prophets. The apostle's familiarity with the Scriptures, and his skill in applying their language to the Saviour, and in proving from their contents his divine mission, never failed to make a due influence, being supported by his ardent enthusiasm; and accordingly he succeeded in making many converts among the members of his own nation. The majority of them, however, set themselves in hostility to him, which they carried so far as to break out in open persecution; for the thought of a suffering Messiah—of a Messiah that had died on a cross—was so offensive to them, that they held him who preached the doctrine as the worst enemy to their religion and their religious hopes. In this condition of things, it was a favourable circumstance that, owing partly to their dissatisfaction with the heathen sacrificial worship, which no longer supplied their religious wants, and partly to a certain propensity to foreign superstition now widely prevalent in the heathen world, many Pagans had turned towards Judaism, and frequented the Sabbath worship. These were called Proselytes of the Gate. In this way, the proclamation of the Gospel was heard by those heathens who took part in the divine service of the Jews, and who, in their turn, made it known to their fellow-citizens. When, then, Paul was rejected by the majority of the Jews, he turned to the heathen, who brought to the hearing of the Gospel more

open and more willing hearts. Not blinded by Jewish prejudices, nor repelled by those offensive qualities which they found in Judaism, since the free Christianity that Paul taught had broken and cast away the oppressive chains of the Jewish law, the heathen, in great numbers, regarded the Gospel with favour, and, receiving its welcome doctrines, formed the greater portion of the Churches founded by the apostle, which consisted of persons of both Hebrew and Pagan extraction. It deserves special notice, that Paul, who had been so rigid an observer of the Jewish law, should have been the first to expound a free Christianity, and to liberate the Gospel from its intimate connexion with Judaism.

Paul's Journey to the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem.—After their first missionary tour, Paul and Barnabas abode a long time in Antioch (Acts xiv. 28), labouring in and with the Church for the diffusion of the Gospel, till at length Jewish Christians came thither from Judea, and required that circumcision should be performed on all heathen converts. Against this effort Paul and Barnabas employed all their power. As the two parties could not come to an agreement, it was arranged that an appeal should be made to the apostles and elders in Jerusalem (Acts xv. 1-35). Under divine guidance, Paul determined to join the embassy, and thus, fourteen years after his first visit, as a Christian, to the metropolis, he was led to repair to Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 1, 2), taking Titus with him, and proceeding through Phœnicia and Samaria. In the assembly which ensued, great exertions on behalf of the observance of the whole Jewish law were made by converts who had been Jews and Pharisees, and who expressly demanded that Titus should be circumcised. Paul gave the most decided opposition to this demand. A violent strife arose (Acts xv. 7; Gal. ii. 5), in which Peter spoke for the admission of heathen converts without exacting from them obedience to the law. To a similar effect James gave his word. After Paul and Barnabas had set forth the success of their ministrations among the heathen which had been accepted of God, their proposal of receiving Pagans into the Church on the observance of four things, by which they, in their conduct, sundered themselves from Paganism, found universal acceptance. The apostles, John, Peter, and James, thereupon gave to both Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, and were satisfied that they should go to the heathen, while they themselves offered the Gospel to the Jews (Gal. ii. 9). The determination of the apostles and of the whole Church was communicated to the Christian community at Antioch, and two Christian brethren, Judas and Silas, were commissioned, in conjunction with Paul and Barnabas, to lay the facts before that Church. This being done, Silas

remained in Antioch (Acts xv. 34). Paul and Barnabas, with many others, continued to preach the Gospel in that city; when Peter's arrival there gave occasion to the dispute as to the binding character of the Jewish law. At first Peter ate with converts from heathenism, but when Judaising teachers came thither he abjured their society. His example was followed by many others, including Barnabas. Then Paul set himself in decided opposition to Peter, reproached him with his conduct, and maintained earnestly and successfully that Christianity was independent of the Jewish law (Gal. ii. 11-21).

Section CXI.—THE SAME CONTINUED.

Paul's second Missionary Tour.—After some time Paul and Barnabas resolved in Antioch to undertake another missionary journey, specially with a view of visiting the communities that they had recently founded. Barnabas wished that John Mark should accompany them. This was opposed by Paul, because on the first journey he had quitted them at Perga (Acts xv. 36-38). The two, therefore, separated. Barnabas, with Mark, proceeded to Cyprus. Paul, attended by Silas, before-mentioned, went through Syria and Cilicia, visiting and strengthening the Churches (39-41). He then reached Lycaonia, and again visited Derbe and Lystra, where, as in other places, he made known the apostolic decree respecting converts from Paganism. In Lystra he found, among the Christian brethren, a young man named Timothy, whom, having on account of the Jews had him circumcised, he took with him (Acts xvi. 1-5). Hence he travelled into Phrygia, and afterwards proceeded north-eastwardly into Galatia (Acts xvi. 6), where, in bodily suffering, he preached the Gospel and was exceedingly well received (Gal. iv. 13, 14). In opposition to his plan, which would have taken him in an easterly direction, he proceeded thence into the north-west province of Asia Minor, namely, Mysia, and, impelled by the spirit of God, he went to Troas, where publicly he was joined by Luke (Acts xvi. 7, 8, 10). Here in Troas, on the Ægean Sea, which divides Asia from Europe, he had a vision in the night which determined him to enter Europe, and preach the Gospel in Macedonia. Paul, therefore, proceeded into Macedonia, touching at Samothracia, and landing at Neapolis. He thence betook himself to Philippi, the chief city of those parts (Acts xvi. 9-12). He there found hospitality in the house of

Lydia, a dealer in purple linen, whom he had converted. Having however exorcised a young girl, and so deprived her owners of a source of gain, Paul, with Silas, was cast into prison. He converted the keeper, and obtained his liberty in virtue of his rights as a Roman citizen (Acts xvi. 13-40). He then travelled in a south-westerly direction, through Amphipolis and Apollonia, two cities of Macedon, and came to Thessalonica, a great commercial city of the same country, on the Thermaic gulf, where he dwelt with a certain Jason, and for three weeks preached the Gospel. Here he twice received aid from the Philippian Church (Phil. iv. 15, 16). Meanwhile a tumult, raised by the poor, in which his entertainer was taken before the Roman magistrates, caused him to leave the city in the night (Acts xvii. 1-10). He turned southwards to the Macedonian town Berea, which he was compelled to quit by an outbreak, occasioned by Jews from Thessalonica. His companions, Timothy and Silas, remained behind in the place. Paul himself proceeded to Athens, the ancient centre of Greek art and science. There he preached on Mars' hill (the Areopagus), and by speaking of the resurrection called forth mockery and scorn. Yet many were won over to the Gospel, among whom were Dionysius, a member of the court of Areopagus, and a female by name Damaris (Acts xvii. 16-34). On two occasions Paul was desirous of returning to Thessalonica, as he heard that the Christians in that place were undergoing severe persecutions (1 Thess. ii. 18, iii. 1); and when Timothy came to him from Berea, he sent him from Athens to Thessalonica, that he might strengthen the Church in that place (1 Thess. iii. 1, 2). From Athens, Paul travelled to the rich and luxurious commercial city, Corinth, on the isthmus, where he took up his abode with Aquila and Priscilla, of Jewish extraction, who had been expelled from Rome, and for a year and a half he laboured in that place for the diffusion of the Gospel. Timothy, who returned thither to the apostle, from Thessalonica, and brought Silas with him (1 Thess. iii. 6; Acts xviii. 5), co-operated with Paul and Silas in the proclamation of Christianity (2 Cor. i. 19), so that they established there a numerous Church. Paul, who there also received assistance from the Macedonian Churches (2 Cor. xi. 8, 9), wrote, in Corinth, the two epistles to the Thessalonians. He soon, however, had disgrace and persecution to endure, and the Jews took him before the Roman proconsul Gallio, who refused to entertain the complaint, as a matter touching the Jewish religion (Acts xviii. 1-17). He then travelled, with his host and his host's wife, through the sea-port Cenchrea, on the Saronic gulf, to Asia, after, on account of a vow, having had his head shaved, and so he came to Ephesus, where he left his two companions, remaining there himself only a short time,

as he wished to be in Jerusalem at the approaching festival. Accordingly he took the direct route through Cæsarea to Jerusalem, whence, ere long, he went to Antioch, from which place he had started in his tour (Acts xviii. 18-22).

Paul's third Missionary Journey.—Not long after his return to Antioch, Paul entered on the third excursion which he made for preaching Christ Jesus. This third tour lasted longer than the other two, nor at its end did the apostle find himself in Antioch. Quitting that city, he visited first the Churches in Galatia, passed through Phrygia (Acts xviii. 23), and, as he had promised (Acts xviii. 21), went to the great commercial city, Ephesus, lying on the Ægean Sea (xix. 1), where he tarried above two years and a quarter, labouring for the establishment and diffusion of the Gospel. There he wrote a letter to the Corinthians, which we no longer possess (1 Cor. v. 9), and sent Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22), directing the former to pay a visit to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17). When, however, he heard of the divisions in that Church (1 Cor. i. 11), and messengers came to him from Corinth with a letter (1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18), he wrote the first letter to the Corinthians which is in our Canon (1 Cor. i. 1), and soon sent Titus to Corinth (2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 5-7), whilst he himself held to the design of quickly going thither through Macedonia (1 Cor. iv. 19, xvi. 5). The news which he received from Galatia caused him to write the Epistle to the Galatians, either there or shortly after his departure. A disturbance, produced by Demetrius, a silversmith, which involved danger to Paul's life, drove him from Ephesus (Acts xix. 24-40, xx. 1; 2 Cor. i. 8-10). Passing through Troas, where he was disappointed in not meeting with Titus (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13), he went to Macedonia, where he visited and confirmed the Churches he had founded (Acts xx. 1, 2), and received Timothy and Titus, who now came back from Corinth (2 Cor. i. 1, vii. 6). From the intelligence he hence gained he now wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (2 Cor. viii. 6, 18, 22, ix. 4), which he entrusted to Titus and two other Christian brethren, who were travelling to Corinth to collect alms. Paul himself remained in Macedonia, and travelled in publishing the Gospel as far as Illyrium, on the Adriatic Sea (Rom. xv. 19, 23). At length he reached Greece and Corinth, and remained there three months (Acts xx. 2, 3). He then completed the collection of alms begun by Titus, and intended for necessitous Christians in Jerusalem (Rom. xv. 26), wrote the letter to the Romans (Rom. xvi. 1, 2), and cherished the plan of going first to Jerusalem, then to Rome, and then to Spain (Rom. xv. 24), which plan had been formed by him in Ephesus (Acts xix. 12), and was entertained by him in Macedonia (2 Cor. x. 16). In the spring he

left Corinth for Jerusalem, choosing the way by land through Macedonia (Acts xx. 3), and after Easter he went from Philippi to Troas (Acts xx. 3, 5). There he remained seven days, and restored a young man to life (Acts xx. 7-12). From Troas he went on foot to Assos, south of Troas, in the Ægean Sea, when, going on board ship (Acts xx. 13), he sailed to Mitylene, Lesbos, Chios and Samos, and then landing on the Asiatic coast, he repaired to Miletus on the south of Ephesus (Acts xx. 14, 15), where he took leave of the Ephesian bishops and elders (17-38). Resuming his voyage, he passed by Coos and Rhodes to Patara, in Lycia (Acts xxi. 1), whence, in a ship bound for Tyre, he went into Syria. At Tyre he remained seven days; the brethren then warned him not to go to Jerusalem (2-6); but though he was himself well aware of the danger which threatened him there (Rom. xv. 31), yet he continued his journey, for he wished to carry to the poor the alms that had been contributed. He therefore proceeded by ship from Tyre to Ptolemais, where he abode one day, and then reached Cæsarea, where he abode several days. The Christians at Cæsarea entreated him to abandon the intention of going to Jerusalem. Agabus, a prophet, coming from the capital, symbolically signified to him the fate which awaited him there. It was in vain. Paul arrived in Jerusalem at Whitsuntide (Acts xx. 16), accompanied by certain disciples from Cæsarea, by whom he was introduced to "one Mnason, of Cyprus, an old disciple," with whom he took up his abode (Acts xxi. 8-16).

Paul made Prisoner in Jerusalem.—By the advice of the Christian brethren, especially the elders, who assembled at the house of James, Paul took special caution, in order not to be an object of suspicion or hatred to the Jews (Acts xxi. 18-21); but seven days after his arrival he was seen in the temple by some Jews from Asia Minor, who, seizing him, raised a disturbance. Paul hurried out of the temple, and was in danger of losing his life; he was, however, rescued by Claudius Lysias (comp. Acts xxiii. 26), the chief Roman officer, who caused him to be led, bound, up into the Castle of Antonia (Acts xxi. 20-40). From a scourging with which he was threatened, he was saved by his being a citizen of Rome (Acts xxii. 1-29). The next day he was brought before the Sanhedrim, where, by declaring himself in favour of a resurrection of the dead, which doctrine was held by the Pharisees, he occasioned a division in the assembly, and gained the Pharisees to his side. Saved from this danger, he was threatened with assassination, which he escaped by being sent by night to Cæsarea, to the Roman procurator Felix (Acts xxii. 30-xxiii. 35).

Paul in Prison in Cæsarea.—After Paul had lain in prison five days

in Cæsarea, the high-priest, with some elders, appeared there before the procurator; and a Roman pleader, named Tertullus, who had been brought with them, accused Paul, in the presence of Felix, of the disturbance, and of profaning the temple. Paul pleaded his own cause. Felix postponed the matter till the arrival of Lysias, his superior, and for two years kept Paul in custody, hoping to obtain a bribe for setting him at liberty. In a conversation which he and his Jewish wife Drusilla had with Paul respecting faith in Christ, both were shaken by the words of the apostle, but did not seek another interview with him (Acts xxiv. 1-27). Portius Festus, who at the end of two years succeeded Felix, wished, in order to gratify the Jews, to deliver Paul up to them for his trial, on which the apostle felt himself obliged to appeal to the emperor at Rome, whither accordingly he was sent after he had appeared before King Agrippa II. and his wife Bernice (Acts xxv. 1-xxvii. 1).

Paul's Voyage to Rome.—A Roman centurion, Julius, took charge of the prisoners, among whom was Paul (comp. Acts xxvii. 37), and, embarking in a ship of Adramyttium, in Mysia, sailed from Cæsarea to Sidon. In company with Paul was Luke, a physician, author of the Acts of the Apostles (Acts xxvii. 1—comp. Col. iv. 14), and Aristarchus of Thessalonica (Acts xxvii. 2); probably Timothy also was with the apostle (see Section cxxiii.). From Sidon they sailed on the north of Cyprus, along the coast of Cilicia and Pamphylia, till they reached the sea-port Myra, in Lycia, where the centurion, with his prisoners, went on board an Alexandrian ship, which was sailing to Italy. They then advanced to the south-western point of Asia Minor as far as Cnidus, and crossed south-westwardly to Crete, when, apparently, they sailed along the northern shore* until they reached a harbour near Iasea. Then there arose a storm, which drove the vessel from Crete to the small island Claudia, towards the African sand-banks, the Syrtes. For several days they were in the greatest danger; on the fourteenth, they feared to be cast on rocks, and were prevented from deserting the ship only by the address of Paul. Seeing land in the morning, they attempted to make the shore in safety, but were wrecked: no lives were lost. The land was the island of Malta, whose inhabitants received the crew in a friendly manner. Paul, unhurt, shook off a viper which fastened on his hand; the fact filled the inhabitants with wonder. He also healed the father of Publius, the governor of the island. This and other cures brought Paul into great repute, so that when, after three months, he left the island, he was “honoured with many honours.” Going on

* The southern was more probably the shore along which they sailed. See an excellent work on this voyage, namely, *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, by James Smith, Esq. London: Longman and Co. 1848.

board a ship of Alexandria, he landed at Syracuse, in Sicily, where he tarried three days. Proceeding thence to Rhegium, in the Straits of Messina, he came to Puteoli, north of Naples, where he remained with Christian brethren seven days. The news of his coming reached Rome, whence brethren went in order to meet him, and in their company he reached the capital of the world (Acts xxvii.-xxviii. 15).

Paul's first Imprisonment in Rome.—It was spring when Paul was handed over by the centurion to the commander of the prætorian guard (Acts xxviii. 11—comp. xxvii. 9). The officer allowed the apostle to dwell in his own residence, appointing a soldier to be constantly at his side (Acts xxviii. 16). As now he was able freely to publish the Gospel, so was his imprisonment at Rome, which lasted at least two years, highly promotive of the interests of the Gospel. Three days after his arrival, Paul called together the chief Jews, and laid before them the cause of his presence in Rome. On an appointed day he also solemnly preached the Gospel to them. Some were, some were not, convinced (Acts xxviii. 17-31). By his bonds, for he bore a chain (Acts xxviii. 20; Ephes. vi. 20), other Christian teachers were encouraged to be zealous in proclaiming the Gospel (Phil. i. 14-17). The danger of being put to death, which at first threatened him, passed away. He taught and converted many; among others, Onesimus, a slave, who had run away from Colossæ. He kept up a constant correspondence with the Churches he had established, and wrote the Epistles to the Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon; also that to the Philippians. Nor did a hope of being set at liberty fail him (Phil. i. 25, 26; ii. 24; Philem. 22). This boon he obtained, if we may credit the testimony of ecclesiastical history, which finds confirmation in the relations implied in the Second Epistle to Timothy.

Interval between Paul's first and second Imprisonment at Rome.—After his liberation, Paul went again to Asia Minor, and set Timothy over the Church at Ephesus; he then proceeded to Macedonia, and there wrote his First Epistle to Timothy (1 Tim. i. 3). He visited the island of Crete, where he published the Gospel, founded Churches, and left Titus as bishop (Tit. i. 5). Not long afterwards, he wrote his letter to Titus, and invited him to Nicopolis, probably in Epirus, where he intended to pass the winter (Tit. iii. 12). Shortly before his second imprisonment, he was again in Troas, in the house of a certain Carpus (2 Tim. iv. 13), visited Miletus, where he had left his companion, Trophimus of Ephesus, sick, and apparently passing through Ephesus, where he took leave of Timothy (2 Tim. i. 4), and received much annoyance from "Alexander the coppersmith" (2 Tim. iv. 14, 15), he travelled to Corinth, where Erastus, who had hitherto accompanied him,

was, as a public officer of the city (Rom. xvi. 23), left behind (2 Tim. iv. 20). He fell, how and where we know not, into the hands of the Romans, and thus again became a prisoner in their capital.

Paul's second Imprisonment in Rome.—The apostle's condition in his second imprisonment in Rome showed him that his end was not distant (2 Tim. ii. 11, iv. 6-8): regarded and treated as an evil-doer, he was abandoned by all (2 Tim. ii. 9, iv. 10, 16). There were with him several Christian brethren, e. g. Titus, Tychicus, a certain Demas, and Crescens; but these were, in part, sent by him on missions, in part had deserted him, and gone away through love of the world (2 Tim. iv. 10). Only Luke remained with him (2 Tim. iv. 11). His first hearing led not to his condemnation, for he was enabled to make a powerful defence (2 Tim. iv. 16, 17), but he saw that his martyrdom was at hand (18), and therefore begged Timothy to come to him before winter (9, 21), and to bring Mark with him (11). This took place, and Timothy, in consequence, fell into prison (Heb. xiii. 23). According to the testimony of ecclesiastical history, the apostle was beheaded in Rome with a sword.

Section GXII.—THE CHARACTER OF PAUL.

We have no intention of presenting here a full, and in every respect complete, picture of the character of the Apostle Paul, but a short notice of his transcendently great qualities is necessary for the right understanding of his epistles.

Paul, before his conversion, presents himself to the student as a young man educated according to rigid principles (Acts xxii. 3) in the views of his fellow-citizens, and for his light, pious (2 Tim. i. 3—comp. Acts xxvi. 4, 5), zealous for the religion of his ancestors (Gal. i. 14), and in his own being full of warm passions. After his conversion, he is found to have renounced Jewish narrowness of heart, to have lost his passionateness, being devoted body and mind to the service of the Gospel, and finding his highest happiness in love and fidelity towards the Redeemer. All the qualities of his character seem refined and sanctified. This entire change of soul was the fruit of the faith to which he had been led, and which had become in him the fountain whence streamed forth his affections, his deeds, and his words. That celestial appearance to him on the road to Damascus beat down the fiery zeal which had hitherto filled his youthful soul. Doubts now arose in his mind as to

the propriety of his previous course and the truth of his previous convictions. His progress from disbelief to belief in the Saviour, who had so obviously revealed himself to Paul, was, in the warm, precipitous soul of the young man, not so tardy and difficult as might otherwise have been expected; but that this revolution in him did not take place without a severe inward struggle, appears from the fact, that he passed three days after the wonderful event without meat and drink (Acts ix. 9). Without consulting flesh and blood, and without receiving instructions from man (Gal. i. 16, 12), he independently formed his Christian convictions and views, aided by the constant co-operation of the Redeemer (Acts xxii. 17-21; 2 Cor. xii. 2-4), so that he was able to declare that he had not received the Gospel from men, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal. i. 12). The zeal which had ignorantly flowed in favour of Judaism now came forth with equal ardour and true enlightenment, as well as lofty purity, on behalf of Christianity; and, after his conversion, he appears in Damascus a warm and enthusiastic herald of the Gospel (Acts ix. 20). The Spirit of God, however, by which he was actuated, led him to deeper and deeper acquaintance with the Divine (1 Cor. ii. 10, 13), and furnished him with the power to "speak with tongues" (1 Cor. xiv. 18), to heal the sick, and to perform miracles (Acts xiii. 11, xiv. 3, 10, xxviii. 8, 9; 2 Cor. xii. 11, 12), in such a degree, that he appears on all occasions speaking and acting as a special instrument in the service of the Lord. His early education, which had made him familiar with the writings of the learned, with the Rabbinical method of exposition, and the philosophical view of Judaism, gave him special ability and skill in his victorious opposition against the errors of his former associates, and in his convincing exhibition and defence of Christian truth. The Saviour himself made revelations to him, though we know not exactly when and how (1 Cor. xi. 23—comp. xiv. 37, xv. 8; Acts xxii. 17-21), and so equipped him for his apostolical duties, that, full of confidence and joy, he was able and willing to live, to suffer, and to die, in attestation of the certainty and blessedness of the Gospel which he preached to the world.

The belief which produced so much in the apostle may be thus briefly described: The apostle had the living conviction that, from eternity, God had resolved, by the mission and death of his Son, to redeem all men, who are alike sinners (Eph. i. 9, iii. 9, 11; Col. i. 26, 27; Rom. xvi. 25). This plan, hidden from the foundation of the world, God accomplished in the fulness of time, when he sent his Son (Gal. iv. 4, 5; 1 Tim. i. 15). That Son suffered and died on the cross for the redemption of all men from their sins, so that they are thereby sure of forgiveness and bliss with God (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14, 22; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Gal.

iii. 13 ; 2 Cor. v. 15, 19) ; for he who believes in this redeeming death is thereby justified before God—that is, received into his favour, and is sure of salvation (Rom. iii. 22, 24, 25, v. 1, 2). This secret God has disclosed to the apostles by his spirit, in order that it may be preached in all the world (1 Cor. ii. 10—comp. Gal. i. 11, 12 ; Eph. i. 9, 10, iii. 8-11 ; Col. i. 25, 26). These are the few features of his belief, which in his letters he has expounded, established, and applied, and in which he first found peace for his soul ; for since, as a sincere Pharisee, he had no satisfaction in what he did in order to fulfil the law, inasmuch as he deeply felt that he did not, and could not, fulfil the law, so there arose in him a disunion, which he describes as a wretched condition (Rom. vii.), and in which his better nature was in ceaseless conflict with the sinfulness which, contrary to his will, drove him into sin. In the belief, however, of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, and in the consequent forgiveness of his sins by God, he experienced the peace which the world gives not—peace with God (Rom. v. 1 ; Phil. iv. 7—comp. John xiv. 27), and what the law could not do was done by love towards God, for it impelled him, from a free and joyous principle, to work out his salvation, so that, in a thorough change of soul, old things had passed away, all things became new, and he himself was born again—was a new creature (2 Cor. v. 17 ; Tit. iii. 5). This his own experience had shown him the power of his belief, and he now embraced it with the unshared power of his soul, and devoted his whole existence to the service of the Gospel, which had brought him peace. So firm was he in his convictions, that he is able to declare, “ If an angel from heaven preached another Gospel, let him be accursed ” (Gal. i. 8, 9). The joy of his faith was so great, that he could look to a martyr’s death with pleasure (Phil. ii. 17). Such was its strength, that it compelled utterance (2 Cor. iv. 13), made him equal to anything (2 Cor. i. 5), constrained him to labour for the Gospel (2 Cor. v. 14), kept him erect in all weakness (2 Cor. xiii. 4), directed his eye from the visible and temporary to the Invisible and the Eternal (2 Cor. iv. 18), and filled him with joyful confidence against the day of Christ (2 Cor. i. 14) and the bliss of heaven (Phil. i. 19 ; 2 Tim. i. 12, iv. 8). This his faith has its roots in the apostle’s deep convictions of the elevation and power of the Redeemer, as the Son of God, the image of the Invisible God (Col. i. 15), Lord over all (Acts x. 36), both the dead and the living (Rom. xiv. 9), by whom all was made (Col. i. 16, 17), before whose judgment-seat all men must appear (2 Cor. v. 10), in and by whom all the dead will be restored to life (1 Cor. xv. 22 ; 2 Cor. iv. 14). Hence he rightly derives from him the heavenly power which he feels (Phil. iv. 13), and builds on him the certainty of his future happiness (2 Tim. i. 12, ii.

11-13; 1 Tim. i. 15). This faith fills and penetrates his whole soul; is constantly the object of his thoughts, his emotions, and his will; gives to his labours their direction and aim, and gives to his heart joy and gladness. Accordingly, in a sense peculiar to himself, he can say, "To me, to live is Christ, and to die is gain" (Phil. i. 21); "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20).

Such faith had for its fruit holy love, which was of such depth, power, and purity, that, measured by the standard which Paul himself has given (1 Cor. xiii.), it could be known only in its celestial greatness. In relation to God and the Saviour, this love displayed itself in the most complete surrender to the service of God and his Son, and in faithfulness unto death. Called by God to be the apostle to the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 13, xv. 16; 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11; Gal. i. 16; Eph. iii. 8), he offered up to the service which was so dear to him, all—time, strength, health, life (Rom. xv. 17). His labours for the spread of the Gospel, his care for the establishment of Churches, his efforts for the salvation of individuals, are ceaseless (Acts xx. 31). He undertakes the most difficult and distant journies; he preaches indefatigably (Acts xx. 7, xxviii. 23); he seeks places where Christ's name is not yet known (Rom. xv. 20); he writes or dictates letters to the several communities; he commissions and sends out messengers (Eph. vi. 21, 22); he bears in mind the wants of all the Churches, and endeavours to give them aid (2 Cor. xi. 28); he collects contributions for poor Christian brethren (Rom. xv. 25, 26); he is occupied night and day (Acts xx. 31) in exhortations and entreaties;—in a word, he is unwearied in the multifarious duties of his office (2 Cor. iv. 1, 16). And this his extraordinary activity is unselfish, for he takes neither gold nor silver for his trouble (Acts xx. 33), and labours for his subsistence with his own hands (Acts xx. 34; 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8). His self-denial and contentment have made him another man. It is easy for him to forego what others seek earnestly (Phil. iv. 11, 12, 18); the world is crucified to him, and he to the world (Gal. vi. 14); reputation and life are of no account with him, provided the Gospel is proclaimed (Phil. i. 18, 20); he has given up all for Christ (Phil. iii. 7, 8), has made himself a slave to every one, becomes "all things to all men," in order to win souls (1 Cor. ix. 19, 22); therefore he is not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ (Rom. i. 16), nor of the sufferings which he endures for it (2 Tim. i. 12). He is capable of the greatest sacrifices, and shows a steadiness and fidelity in the service of the Redeemer which go far beyond all usual measures; he is ready not only to be bound but to die for Christ (Acts xxi. 13); therefore he allows himself in Jerusalem to be beaten, chained, and cast into prison (Acts xxi. 27), endures disgrace and mistreatment

of all kinds (2 Cor. vi. 4-10), bears fastings, watchings, cold, and nakedness; is five times scourged, three times whipped, once stoned, suffers three shipwrecks, is in danger from the Jews, from the heathen, from false brethren, in towns and in the desert, and at the same time has the charge of nearly the whole Christian cause (2 Cor. vi. 4-10, xi. 23, seq.). Yet is he infirm in health (2 Cor. xvii. 7), and sometimes endures severe bodily pains (Gal. iv. 13, 14). He has on his frame signs of the severe handling he has undergone (Gal. vi. 17). Though bearing his chain in Rome, he preaches the Gospel (Eph. vi. 20), and delivers souls (Philem. 10); yea, seals his fidelity in the service of Christ with a bloody death. Such a love is possible to him only, since Christ is his life (Phil. i. 21), for his love to his Master expresses itself in the full renunciation of himself, and in the surrender to Jesus, of his body, mind, and soul.

This love, which sprang from the apostle's faith, was, with all its heavenly power, directed towards men, so that we see in him at the same time a self-denying, all-sacrificing, love of the brethren. The holy affection declares itself in the inmost sympathy, and participation in joys and sorrows, towards the recently-founded Christian communities (1 Thess. iii. 1, 5, 7-9; 2 Cor. ii. 24, vii. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 21; Phil. i. 7), even towards those which Paul had not seen (Rom. i. 9; Col. ii. 1, 2, iv. 16), also individual Christians (Phil. ii. 27; Philem. 7, 12-19); nay, it sheds tears over the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction (Phil. iii. 18, 19). His love attests its power in deed and truth by active services, which, throughout his life, Paul performs for the Churches, as well as their members, and even for those who are not Christians. How many sick and infirm persons does he heal (Acts xxviii. 8, 9; xx. 9-12); how, in imitation of the Redeemer, is his whole life devoted to beneficence, in the highest sense of the word, by the salvation of souls. How active is he day and night, for that end (Acts xx. 31). He is ready to offer up his life (1 Thess. ii. 8; Phil. ii. 17; 2 Cor. vii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 10), repeatedly exposes himself to the danger of death (2 Cor. xi. 23, seq.), and in order to bear aid to the needy, he, in spite of the warnings of brethren (Acts xxi. 4, 11, 12), in spite of his own presentiment (Acts xx. 22-25; Rom. xv. 25, 31), goes thither where chains and death await him; and in cases in which his desires and his efforts cannot prevail to secure men's salvation and happiness, there his love reveals itself in heartfelt intercessions to God. Thus he prays for his former brethren in the faith (Rom. x. 1), and is even ready to surrender his own salvation on their behalf (Rom. ix. 1-3). Thus he prays for the Churches at Thessalonica (1 Thess. i. 2), at Colossæ (Col. i. 3), at Ephesus (Eph. i. 16),

at Philippi (Phil. i. 4, 9), for Timothy (2 Tim. i. 3); nay, he ceaselessly bears them in his heart before God (Phil. i. 7). Now, true love makes men mild and gentle; therefore these qualities of his character, mildness and gentleness, appear in the noblest light, wherever they have not to yield to the severer qualities of the same faithful affection. As a father to his children, does he speak to the Corinthians (1 Cor. iv. 14, 15; 2 Cor. vi. 13—comp. 1 Thess. ii. 11). As a nurse, as a mother, he shows himself to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. ii. 7, 8). He is not a lord over men's faith, but the helper of their joy (2 Cor. i. 24—comp. 1 Cor. vii. 35); he only gives his advice where he might utter a command (2 Cor. viii. 8, 10; Philem. 8, 9). As a worker together with the disciples (2 Cor. vi. 1), he begs and entreats them to be reconciled to God (2 Cor. v. 20). And how forgiving his love towards those who were faithless to him at his first hearing in Rome! "I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge" (2 Tim. iv. 16). With this paternal mildness, he also manifests earnestness and strength, as soon as circumstances require them. He threatens the Corinthians (2 Cor. xiii. 1, 2), he calls the Galatians foolish (Gal. iii. 1, 3), he directs that the fornicator should be expelled from the Church (1 Cor. v. 2-5), he himself excommunicates two persons (1 Tim. i. 20). Far, however, from all harshness, he advises that they should be received back, if proofs of a changed mind are given (2 Cor. ii. 5-11). True love is grateful; it is not ashamed to accept gifts of love, because it feels, in its own rich feelings, that it would do good to others, and is not too poor for gratitude. Hence the apostle's love shows itself in gratitude. He often accepts assistance (2 Cor. xi. 8, 9), and allows his heart to speak simply thereupon (Phil. iv. 10, seq.), and wishes the highest recompense for his benefactors (2 Tim. i. 16, 18). Love, which proceeds from faith, is universal in its embrace. Such was Paul's love, thus resembling the love of God. It comprises not only the Churches, whom he never forgets (Col. ii. 1, 2, iv. 16), but all men needing salvation. Hence he is impelled to preach the Gospel to those who have not heard it, in order that they may be saved (Rom. xv. 20, 21), he acknowledges himself a debtor to all men (Rom. i. 14), and is the first to prove that the Gospel is designed for the heathen (Acts xv. 1, 2, 12; Gal. ii. 4, 5, 11, seq.), for he has the full conviction that it is the will of God that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. ii. 4). Thus is his love proved to be genuine, the same in kind as that of Jesus.

Love towards God and Christ strongly leads men to purity of heart, and so begets in them true self-love, as its own fruit. Hence a solicitude for his own salvation. Shall he who has preached to others be a

castaway (1 Cor. ix. 27)? Paul, avoiding all offence to others (2 Cor. vi. 3), sedulously, and without ceasing, labours for his own perfection (Phil. iii. 12, 14). Accordingly, he is so pure in his walk, so noble in his thoughts, so transparent in his dealings, that, with confidence, he refers to his own example (1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1; Phil. iii. 17, iv. 9); yea, can call others to bear witness to his manner of life (1 Thess. ii. 10). His conscience is pure, so that he has its support and reliance. Thus he appeals to its voice before the Sanhedrim (Acts xxiii. 1), before Felix (xxiv. 16), against the Corinthians (2 Cor. i. 12); and this he can do because of its purity (2 Tim. i. 3), and consequent power (Rom. ix. 1). This striving for holiness, this purity of conscience, has its highest worth through the lowliness of his mind. Hence, though conscious of no unrighteousness, he does not consider himself, on that account, just before God (1 Cor. iv. 4). God, in his grace, is properly the author of what he has effected (1 Cor. xv. 10), for his sufficiency is of God (2 Cor. iii. 5, iv. 7), from whose mercy comes his faithfulness in his office (1 Cor. vii. 25), and success in his labours (1 Cor. iii. 5-8—comp. 2 Cor. vi. 4). Having reference to his former persecution of the Gospel, he calls himself the chief of sinners (1 Tim. i. 15), the least of the apostles (Eph. iii. 8), a premature birth, not worthy to be called an apostle (1 Cor. xv. 8-10). He is timidly sensible of his weakness (1 Cor. ii. 3), whence he exhorts others to work out their salvation with fear and trembling (Phil. ii. 12, 13).

But the crown of Christian perfection to which that love leads which comes from faith, is genuine piety of heart, by which we refer all to God, live constantly in fellowship with him, hold to him in all circumstances, and are happy only in and by him. This is the piety that we find in Paul. Living, ceaseless thought of God fills his soul, as is seen in all his life, and in every page of his writings. His whole heart is full of God, he lives and breathes in him. His office is a gift of God's grace (Rom. xv. 15; Eph. iii. 7), which called him thereunto from his mother's womb (Gal. i. 15), which assigned to him the duty of preaching reconciliation (2 Cor. v. 18—comp. Tit. i. 3), which made him sufficient to discharge the functions (2 Cor. iii. 6), which commanded light to shine forth in his heart (2 Cor. iv. 6), and all this through Christ (Rom. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 12; Gal. i. 1). In everything he acknowledges the hand of God, for from him, and through him, and to him, are all things (Rom. xi. 36). God, by him and Barnabas, does wonders and signs (Acts xv. 12); by God's aid does he stand before Agrippa and Festus (Acts xxvi. 22); God has supported and rescued him in all trouble (2 Cor. i. 3, 4; 2 Tim. iii. 11), has at all

times given him the victory (2 Cor. ii. 14). God has comforted him by the arrival of Titus from Corinth (2 Cor. vii. 6). Since, however, he sees in God the Father, the Fountain of all grace and blessing (comp. Eph. ii. 4; 2 Cor. i. 3, 4; 1 Tim. iv. 10), so is his heart full of thankfulness and praise towards God, which break out frequently in the words "God be thanked" (Rom. i. 8, vi. 17, vii. 25; 1 Cor. i. 4, 14, xiv. 18, xv. 57; 2 Cor. ii. 14, viii. 16, ix. 15; Phil. i. 3; Col. i. 3). He is ceaseless in giving thanks: he thanks God for the Thessalonians (1 Thess. i. 2, 3), for the Corinthians (1 Cor. i. 4, seq.), for the Romans (Rom. i. 8), for the Colossians (Col. i. 3), for the Ephesians (Eph. i. 16), for the Philippians (Phil. i. 3-5), for Timothy (2 Tim. i. 3), for Philemon (Philem. 4). Even in the dangers of the sea he forgets not to give God thanks (Acts xxvii. 35). From so constant and lively a sense of God's goodness, and his endless love, from which he is sure nothing can separate him (Rom. viii. 32, seq.), arises a trust in God that nothing can shake. To this he gives utterance (Rom. viii. 28; 2 Cor. i. 9, 10), this he shows in deed (Acts xxvii. 22, seq.; Phil. i. 20, 25, ii. 24; 1 Tim. iv. 10), this he requires in others (1 Tim. vi. 17), this forsakes him not even in death (2 Tim. iv. 18). And what a surrender to the divine will does he connect therewith! In his very great troubles, not a word of discontent. He regards the sufferings of his body as discipline (Gal. iv. 13, 14), as wholesome warning, to prevent his being unduly elated (2 Cor. xii. 7). Resigned to the divine will, he bids farewell of the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Acts xx. 25, 32), leaves it to the will of God whether or not his great desire to see the Roman Christians should be fulfilled (Rom. i. 10, xv. 31). The surest token of piety, however, is prayer; for if the soul lives in inmost fellowship with God, it speaks to him, seeks help and strength from him,—in a word, prays. How the apostle was accustomed to pray, how, in a rich degree, he experienced the power of prayer, is seen in the fact that prayer is his refuge. In the prison at Philippi (Acts xvi. 25), on his quitting the elders at Miletus (xx. 36), in his wish to visit Rome (Rom. i. 10), also for his former fellow-believers (Rom. x. 1), for the Corinthians (2 Cor. xiii. 7), for all the Churches (Eph. i. 16, iii. 14, 16; Phil. i. 3, 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; Philem. 4), does he express his Christian love in prayer to the Almighty. Hence his urgency to lead others to the footstool of divine grace (Col. iv. 2, 3; Phil. iv. 6; 2 Thess. iii. 1; Rom. xv. 30, 31; Eph. vi. 18, 19). His prayer came from the heart, and was an exercise of love and confidence; for in Christ Jesus his Lord he had boldness and access with confidence by faith (Eph. iii. 12).

Section CXIII.—CONTINUATION.

As faith filled and sanctified the entire soul of the apostle, so did it elevate and refine all the natural qualities of his mind and heart. Richly endowed by nature, he learnt to use and hallow his powers in the service of God and Christ. With a deep and lively sensibility which often found vent in tears (Acts xx. 8, seq., xxi. 13; 2 Cor. ii. 4; Phil. iii. 18), or in the utterance of ardent emotions (Acts xvi. 37, xxii. 25, xxiii. 2, 3, 5, 24, 26, 27), and made him susceptible of high suggestions and divine disclosures (Acts xvi. 9, 10, xviii. 9, seq., xxii. 17, 18, xxvii. 23; 2 Cor. xii. 2-4), he showed a clearness of perception which specially fitted him for the exercise of his holy calling. The same quality of mind enabled him to form a conception and an estimate of the erroneous doctrines and disorders which were constantly arising in the Church, and to select means suitable for their suppression. For instance, the errors respecting the speedy return of Christ, and the consequent idle and disorderly life which prevailed in the Church at Thessalonica; the Judaizing tendency which developed itself in the Galatian Church; the divisions which broke out in the Corinthian community, with the correspondent evils; the disunion which appeared in Rome between the Jewish and heathen Christians; the philosophical element grounded on a supposed hidden wisdom and communion with the world of spirits, which blended with the views of the Christians in Ephesus and Colossæ; the errors which he so clearly described to the Philippians, to Timothy, and to Titus. In the same category may be put the directions that he gives to Timothy and Titus, respecting the duties of a bishop, which show how clearly and correctly he comprehended the entire relation in which they stood to the communities entrusted to their care. What value he attached to clearness of perception is seen in what he says to the Corinthians about speaking with tongues (1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19). With such a quality of intellect in union with genuine trust in God, it was possible for him to exhibit a presence of mind that excites astonishment. Of this presence of mind his history affords striking examples. We remind the reader of his conduct before the Sanhedrim in Jerusalem, where Pharisees and Sadducees were assembled (Acts xxiii. 6, seq.), of his demeanour when he became aware of the plot formed by the Jews against his life (Acts xxiii. 16, 17), of his appeal to Cæsar (Acts xxv. 10), of his bearing when in danger on the sea (Acts xxvii. 22, seq.), or when bitten by the viper in Malta (Acts xxviii. 5). Accordingly, rapidity and decision are also cha-

racteristics of his mind. He never hesitates nor wavers as to what to do. He looks round for no one by whose advice he may be guided. In Damascus he is baptised as soon as he recovers his sight, and forthwith preaches the crucified Jesus (Acts ix. 18, 19; Gal. i. 12, 16, 17). In Troas, his resolution to go into Macedonia is formed on the spot, as soon as he recognises the divine intimation (Acts xvi. 9, 10). And how peculiar to him is the right employment of the occasion! In Lystra, when he and Barnabas were taken for gods, he seized the opportunity to preach the only true and living God (Acts xiv. 15). In Philippi he avails himself of the earthquake and the trembling solicitude of the gaoler and his family, to convert them to Christianity (Acts xvi. 26). In Athens the inscription, "To the Unknown God," leads him to proclaim the Lord who made heaven and earth (Acts xvii. 23, 24). Certainly to this skill in seizing and profiting by the moment, may we ascribe the powerful impressiveness and rapid result of his preaching. Especially conducive to this issue was that peculiarity of mind which enabled him to become all things to all men (1 Cor. ix. 22). There were displayed his Christian prudence and wisdom in teaching. How many exemplifications appear in his writings! In order to avoid giving offence to the Jews, he causes Timothy to be circumcised before he takes him as a companion (Acts xvi. 3); to remove the possibility of any suspicion in the collection made by him for the poor in Jerusalem, he associates with himself a Christian brother (2 Cor. viii. 18-21); in order, in Rome, to take precautions against false rumours as to the cause of his being in custody, he calls together the chief Jews, and communicates to them the true cause (Acts xxviii. 17); to prevent offence, while he maintains freedom from the Jewish law, he advises mixed communities to observe a careful demeanour towards those who were weak in the faith, and warns Christians of heathen blood against the use of flesh offered in sacrifice to idols (1 Cor. x. 23, seq.; Rom. xiv.-xv. 2). His wisdom in teaching is a pattern for all ages. To the weak he gives weak, to the strong, strong nutriment (1 Cor. iii. 2). To every peculiarity he knows how to adapt himself (1 Cor. ix. 19-22). How prudently does he act in the doctrinal disputes in Corinth, and removes from himself every appearance of self-seeking (1 Cor. iii. 4-9), how adroitly does he refer to Apollos and himself that which properly belongs to the Corinthians, and must abate their pride (1 Cor. iv. 6), how skilfully does he allude to the folly of the Corinthians, and at the same time give them the true view of the matter (1 Cor. iii. 4-9), how wisely does he win the hearts of the Corinthians to make a liberal contribution for the poor (2 Cor. viii. 8), what ability does he manifest in the use of examples and comparisons

according as they are most intelligible to his hearers! Thus to the Greeks he speaks in figures derived from the Grecian games (1 Cor. ix. 24-26; Phil. iii. 12-14); to the Romans, under the image of an olive-tree (Rom. xi. 17), he represents the whole Christian Church in the beautiful comparison of a human body and its members (1 Cor. xii. 12-27; Eph. iv. 15, 16; Col. ii. 19); and well describes the Christian Church as a letter of Christ, published by his preaching (2 Cor. iii. 3). He cleverly employs also utterances of heathen poets to give point and force to his words; in Athens the words of Aratus, "We are his (God's) offspring" (Acts xvii. 28), and to Titus the words of Epimenides (Tit. i. 12).

"The Cretans are always liars, evil hearts, slow bellies,"

With not less skill does he apply irony in cases where persons and things may be thereby well characterised: as in regard to his opponents in Corinth (2 Cor. x. 1), to the Corinthians (2 Cor. xi. 19, 20), himself (2 Cor. xii. 13). Of his masterly use and application of the Old Testament, every page of his writings gives examples, though sometimes his allegorical interpretation and dialectical arguments have weight only for the Jews of old (Gal. iii. 6, iv. 22-31; Eph. iv. 8-10 — comp. Ps. lxxviii. 19). As, however, he guided himself with a strict reference to persons and things, his opponents took occasion, but without sufficient grounds, to charge him with fickleness (2 Cor. i. 15-18). Indeed, he showed the greatest firmness and persistence in what he judged right, or accounted essential in doctrine. We refer only to what he writes to the Corinthians (1 Cor. iii. 11), what he does in Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 4, 5), his conduct with Peter in Antioch (Gal. ii. 11-13), the representation he makes to the Galatians (Gal. ii. 8, 9). And this unshaken firmness is seen in the affairs of ordinary life, as soon as, according to the best of his judgment, he has formed a determination. Nothing can turn him aside—neither prayers, tears, fear (Acts xviii. 20, xxi. 13, 14). Hence he asserts that his yea and his nay are sure and reliable (2 Cor. i. 15-18); and with this firmness he connects an openness and straightforwardness which also are characteristic. He does not attempt to cover his former life when he was a defamer and persecutor of Christians (Gal. i. 13, 14; Phil. iii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 13), sets himself in direct hostility to Peter (Gal. ii. 11, seq.), preaches the Gospel apart from secondary considerations (1 Thess. ii. 5, 6), refers for a judgment on his fidelity to the Corinthians themselves (2 Cor. i. 13—comp. 2 Cor. ii. 17, iv. 2; Gal. i. 10), tells them simply what he has against them (comp. 2 Cor. vi. 11), speaks without the least flattery before Felix and Festus (Acts xxiv. 10, seq., xxv. 8, seq.),

also before Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 2, seq.), so that the one thinks he is mad, the other that he wishes to make a convert. This is moral courage, such as can ensue only from the love for truth, and the inspiration of heart given by love to God and Christ. Hence also his elevation above every human judgment (1 Cor. iv. 3, 4), and that Christian heroism which stands not in any mere fearlessness in danger, nor in any blind confidence in a man's own powers, but in a preparedness to work, to suffer, to be sacrificed in obedience to the will of God for the highest good of his rational creatures. Paul's heroism shows itself in the boldness with which he speaks and acts. Refer to his conduct after his conversion in Damascus (Acts ix. 20, seq.; 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33), in Jerusalem (Acts ix. 28), in Athens (xvii. 16, seq.), in Corinth (xviii. 6), in Ephesus (xix. 30), before Felix and Drusilla (xxiv. 24, seq.), in Rome (xxviii. 26-28); refer to the fearlessness with which he rebukes all ungodly conduct, and boldly faces his enemies (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 19, 20, ix. 3; 2 Cor. iii. 12, x. 3-6). So the fortitude and joy with which he bears pains of body and mind in the exercise of his office (2 Cor. xi. 23-27) is a sure token of his true heroism. For although he can truly say that he dies daily (1 Cor. xv. 30-32), he yet declares that he was not distressed nor in despair (2 Cor. iv. 8, 9). He even takes pleasure in infirmities, and in distresses for Christ's sake, "for when I am weak, then am I strong" (2 Cor. xii. 10—comp. iv. 16; Col. i. 24), and hence, even in prison, can exhort others to be courageous (Eph. iii. 13), and is content, seeing that "the word of God is not bound" (2 Tim. ii. 9). And if anything can attest his heroism, it is the joy with which he is willing to resign, even his life, if his holy aim, the diffusion of the Gospel, can be thereby promoted (comp. Phil. i. 18-20). Hence, in the last of his epistles, his Christian heroism finds expression in the joyful feeling with which he anticipates his impending martyrdom (2 Tim. iv. 6-8, 18).

Having thus set forth the prominent excellences of the apostle's character, we have now to speak of what was weak and earthly in him, for we must not present only one side of the man who uttered the words, "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. iii. 23). Before his conversion, there appears in Paul much that was weak and earthly; but where, we ask, was afterwards that passionateness under which he originally acted? Had it altogether disappeared, banished by faith and love? In its place arose a holy zeal—yea, a holy anger—when he was opposed by anything untrue and unrighteous. This also was qualified by love, so that it became a gentle flame. On occasions, this flame broke forth, but it soon retired in obedience to faith and love. Instances are seen twice in Antioch (Acts xv. 1, 2, 39), and often in the

letter to the Galatians (Gal. i. 8, 9, v. 12). If we remember that the occasion of such displays was an injustice—often a very great injustice—we cannot account them blots in Paul's character, though they show an earthly element which must make him more estimable in our eyes, as proving that he was one of our race. Similar is the relation with his self-regard and self-commendation, which appears here and there in his letters (1 Cor. iii. 10, iv. 16, xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 23-29, vi. 4-10, xi. 5; 2 Thess. iii. 7-9; Phil. iii. 17, iv. 9), and which adversaries threw in his teeth (2 Cor. x. 12). If we bear in mind what occasions to speak of himself were naturally given him in his relations to the Churches he had established—nay, how indispensable it sometimes was, since his enemies undervalued and reviled him; and if we also observe how, nevertheless, he spoke with moderation of the love of truth, and how also his entire devotement to the Gospel gave him a right to refer his accusers to the facts of his life,—then what is objectionable is reduced to the smallest quantity, which remains to be ascribed to his being human. For since he knew the right estimate of self, and in humility did not assert as his own what God's grace had done by him (1 Cor. xv. 10; 2 Cor. x. 18); nay, characterising it as folly, when, on account of his foes, he is led to speak of himself (2 Cor. xi. 1, seq.—comp. 2 Cor. xii. 6),—so no unprejudiced person will account his self-regard as a fault. It is another question, whether he who was at first a Pharisee was at one blow set free from all his Jewish prejudices. An impartial estimate of his character will not justify this conclusion. The Spirit of God, which led the apostle into all truth (John xvi. 13), did not, contrary to the nature of the human soul, of a sudden constrain him, but gradually conducted him to know and to proclaim the truth as it is in Jesus. And, at first, there is seen here and there a view which came from Judaism, and which, by degrees, issued in Christian truth. We allude to the expectation of the speedy return of Christ, as it is expressed in the letter to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. iv. 13, v. 3), the associated idea of the resurrection of the dead on this earth, which he accounted so near that he himself hoped not to die (1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 51), which notions in time vanished, so that they appear not in his later epistles; and, lastly, the shaving of his head, in consequence of a vow (Acts xviii. 18). However inconsiderable this circumstance is, it shows clearly that he did not all at once pass from Judaism to a full and pure Christian knowledge.

If now we wish to pronounce a general judgment on the character of the apostle, we must represent him as a man in whom the riches of divine knowledge, the depth of holy feeling, and the power of an unyielding will, were united so as to form a whole, which, pervaded by the

spirit of God, bore in the firmest faith the most perfect love, and in the loftiest hopes the impress of a heavenly consecration, and gives the observer the idea that he is standing before the image of one whose universal excellence merits wonder, joy, and love, attests the present operation of the Master's hand, and calls to mind the great ideal of the Saviour himself which every Christian bears in his heart.

In person, Paul had nothing, at first sight, striking. Of a small and weak frame, his appearance was humble : this quality he was reproached with by his enemies in Corinth (2 Cor. x. 1, 10). Some painful bodily disorder, which he calls "a thorn in the flesh," "an angel of Satan" (2 Cor. xii. 7), afflicted his health, and troubled him in the discharge of his duties (Gal. iv. 13, 14 ; 1 Cor. ii. 3). In his ministry he had also to endure bodily inflictions, for he was stoned (Acts xiv. 19), beaten (Acts xxi. 31, 32 ; 2 Cor. xi. 23, 24, vi. 4-10), whipped (2 Cor. xi. 25), and tried in a variety of ways (2 Cor. xi. 23-29), so that his health was deteriorated, and his body bore marks of his sufferings (Gal. vi. 17). When he spoke, however, the inspiration of his soul shone forth from his eyes and enriched his voice, as appears from the effects of his preaching (Gal. iv. 14, 15). A striking proof of the power of his eloquence was given at Lystra, where he was taken for Mercury (Acts xiv. 12), while Barnabas was held to be Jupiter (Zeus).

Section CXIV.—PECULIARITIES OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

In the contents as well as in the style of the thirteen letters of Paul that have come down to us, the personal qualities of the writer appear so manifestly, and they have therefrom received a stamp so wholly peculiar to him, as to distinguish them essentially from the other apostolic epistles.

In the first place, we must notice their commencement and termination, since therein they are all alike, and differ from the remaining letters of the New Testament. According to the epistolary custom of the ancient world, the apostle universally sets his name—first, as the author of the letter, commonly with a longer or shorter addition, which describes his apostolic office ; and then subjoins the name of the person or community for whom the epistle is intended. Between the two, certain words not usually expressed in Greek or Latin are in English left out, and have to be supplied at least by the mind—such as "says" or "sends greeting." Then comes the apostolic benediction, as "Grace be with you, and peace from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." This

form in the three pastoral letters is enlarged by the insertion of the word "mercy" between grace and peace. In all the letters, the conclusion, written by the apostle's own hand, is also a wish of peace, and runs—"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you," or "The Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit." Only in the second letter to the Corinthians is it prolonged as "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all" (2 Cor. xiii. 14).

In regard to the contents of the several epistles, we have to remark, that in all of them clearly appear the two great fundamental thoughts which filled the whole soul of the apostle,—1, Christianity is designed for all, and Christianity is the universal religion; and, 2, justification before God, and everlasting happiness, are obtained only through faith in the atoning death of the Redeemer. The epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians treat the latter thought most thoroughly: the first is specially prominent in the letters to the Colossians and Ephesians. Of repeated occurrence are the antitheses flesh and spirit, law and gospel, life and death; for by the works of the law (this is the leading idea of the apostle—the very soul of his Christian belief) can man never deserve happiness before God. By one great work—that is, his sacrificial death on the cross—Christ has secured to man the felicity which God graciously gives. Thereto, however, belongs faith; for only those who believe are justified, and justification has for its fruit, peace with God and endless life. The opposite condition is death, whither the law leads when men endeavour to gain happiness by the works of the law; for the flesh—that is, our sensuous nature—takes from the law, occasion to do that which is forbidden. The law, in consequence, is only a schoolmaster, or disciplinarian, until Christ, and by the law comes the knowledge of sin. As Christians, we are free from that schoolmaster—are no longer under the yoke of the law, but are children of God—are led by the spirit of God, whose will we do, not any longer through fear, but from love, and so become rich in the fruits of righteousness—that is, in good works, well pleasing to God. This is that spiritual life which even here makes men unspeakably happy, and raises them above all the sufferings of time, since it carries in itself the certainty of endless happiness.

In the style of these letters, which, in a very special manner, is a true reflection of the apostle's characteristic qualities, there are seen his lively feeling, his rapid fancy, the clearness of his perception, and the decision of his will, his firmness, and his enthusiasm. We may specify the following qualities of his style:—1. A natural, heartfelt eloquence. Failing an artificial elaboration of style, in which Paul is surpassed by James

and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, there streams from his full and inspired heart such an abundance of ideas, such an overflow of emotions, such a strength of conviction in natural and unsought-for expressions, that his words seize and move every unprejudiced reader. The feeling of the importance and holiness of his subject thoroughly pervades Paul, and speaks impressively, since he is himself impressed most deeply.—2. Great liveliness, and a consequent irregularity. His lively emotions frequently urge him to employ declamations, brief questions, addresses, transpositions, climaxes, pleonasms, antitheses; and the overflow of his thoughts, arising from his lively emotions, occasions parentheses, digressions, and irregular or broken sentences.—3. The accumulation of prepositions. In order to express an idea in several relations, and so to make it more definite and intelligible, Paul employs together several prepositions in declaring one and the same thing (Rom. i. 17, iii. 22, xi. 36; Col. i. 16, 17), or forms words that, in the Greek, are compounded of two prepositions, as *ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ*, “exceeding abundantly” (Eph. iii. 20), and *ὑπερπερίσσευσεν*, “did much more abound” (Rom. v. 20).—4. Frequent difficulties for the understanding. In general, the apostle writes very perspicuously, but passages are found in his writings in which the sense does not at first appear, or remains doubtful, so as to give occasion to diverse interpretations. The reason of this lies in the before-mentioned liveliness of feeling, which does not always bind itself to the ordinary modes of expression. Another reason is this: that the apostle makes use of words and expressions which were readily understood by the first readers of his letters, being conformed to their manner of thinking, but which the changes of many centuries have rendered obscure. To this class belongs the variety of meaning in many words and expressions whose sense is uncertain when it cannot be fixed from the connexion; moreover, the reference to very definite personal relations and circumstances which are no longer known to us, but which the receivers of the letters were familiar with; also regard to Jewish theology, and its doctrines and methods of proof, which the apostle often uses with dialectic skill, places at the foundation of the views he develops, and interweaves them therein;—all which was in the highest degree suitable and convincing for the Christians of that time, but have little force and bring little conviction to our minds (Gal. iii. 16, iv. 22-31; Eph. iv. 8-10—comp. Ps. lxxviii. 19).—5. The peculiarity of the apostle in not developing his ideas with logical strictness, in consequence of which different views may be formed of the same object. This difficulty was felt in the apostolic times (2 Pet. iii. 16); hence it is of great consequence to enter thoroughly into the mind and spirit of Paul, to become familiar with his style, and especially to

be accurately acquainted with the relations and circumstances under which he wrote, in order thus to acquire the means for rightly understanding his writings. The arrangement of his thoughts is everywhere natural, and suitable to the circumstances, which, even in the letters that are a less free effusion of the heart, discloses a pre-formed, definite plan, according to which they were composed. This is observable in the letter to the Romans, and in the letter to the Galatians.

Section CXV.—PAULINE EPISTLES—ORDER OF TIME.

That, besides the letters that have come down to us, Paul wrote several others, appears from his express statements, whence we learn that he wrote to the Corinthians and the Laodiceans two letters that exist no longer (1 Cor. v. 9; Col. iv. 16), or may with great probability be inferred from the ceaseless activity of many years spent in the apostolic office: for he was the founder of so many communities, took so much concern to confirm them in Christian truth and virtue, was so often asked for, and so often gave, his advice, while in private matters he also wrote letters, as is seen in the letter to Philemon, that he can hardly have failed to write more letters than those which have reached us. From the words in Phil. iii. 1, compared with iv. 15, 16, it may be inferred that the letter we have is not the only one that he wrote to that Church. The fact that we possess no more than thirteen may be accounted for on the supposition that less importance was attached to some others, as relating probably to personal affairs; for many were unwilling that the Epistle to Philemon should be in the Canon, since it treats of merely private interests, while only epistles of great moment would, in those early times, be multiplied and saved from the destruction which in the times of persecution awaited both originals and transcripts. No one under these circumstances will be surprised that in some cases years intervene between Paul's epistles, and that some others composed in the intervals may have wholly perished. The following is the order of time in which these thirteen letters may be arranged. There were written,—

I.—BEFORE PAUL'S FIRST IMPRISONMENT IN ROME.

- 1 & 2. *The Two Epistles to the Thessalonians*, in Corinth, during the first abode of the apostle in that city, about 52 or 53, A. D.
3. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, in Ephesus, about 57 or 58, A. D.

4. *The Epistle to the Galatians*, either in Ephesus or shortly after the departure of the apostle from that place, in Macedonia or Achaia; the former is the more likely; and, therefore, about 57 or 58, A. D.
5. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, in Macedonia, about half a-year later than the first; and, therefore, in the second moiety of the year 57 or 58, A. D.
6. *The Epistle to the Romans*, written in Corinth, during the apostle's second residence there, about 58, A. D.

II.—DURING THE FIRST IMPRISONMENT IN ROME.

7. *The Epistle to the Ephesians*
 8. *The Epistle to the Colossians*
 9. *The Epistle to Philemon*
- } in Rome, about the year 60 or 61, A. D.
10. *The Epistle to the Philippians*, in Rome, towards the end of the first imprisonment, about 63, A. D.

III.—AFTER THE FIRST IMPRISONMENT IN ROME.

11. *The First Epistle to Timothy*, in Macedonia, about 65, A. D.
12. *The Epistle to Titus*, about 65, A. D.

IV.—DURING THE SECOND IMPRISONMENT IN ROME.

13. *The Second Epistle to Timothy*, in Rome, about 66, A. D.

It may here be remarked that some celebrated theologians consider the alleged second imprisonment of Paul in Rome insusceptible of proof, since it is not mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, nor indicated in the Pauline Epistles. They have, in consequence, endeavoured to illustrate the two letters to Timothy from the facts supplied in the Acts of the Apostles; and, therefore, on the ground of only one imprisonment in Rome: but they have hence fallen into manifold contradictions and unlikelihoods, so that De Wette declared that, "historically the epistles were inconceivable." It is not to be denied that the assumption of a second imprisonment rests only on the information reported by Eusebius (*Hist. Ecc.*, ii. 22), on the authority of tradition, which was followed by other ecclesiastical writers. But since Eusebius was the first historical writer in the Church, he must naturally have taken much from oral tradition, which is not, on that account, to be cast aside as worthless. On the assumption, however, of a second imprisonment, nearly all, and certainly the most considerable, difficulties disappear, and the pastoral epistles become historically conceivable.

THE NINE EPISTLES OF PAUL TO WHOLE COMMUNITIES.

Section CXVI.—THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

The letter to the Romans contains two chief portions,—one of instruction (i.-xi.), and one of exhortation (xii.-xv.), with an appendix (xvi.). After the greeting and the introduction, the apostle shows that the heathen without law, and the Jews with the law, stand as sinners before God, having no claim to eternal salvation. Justification before God, and therewith endless bliss, comes only through belief in the Redeemer and his atoning death (i.-iii.). This is the theme which the apostle handles, while he shows how Abraham and David found justification by faith (iv.); further, what fruits this justification before God produces (v.); how, moreover, a holy life must be connected therewith (vi.); wherewith the Jewish law is no longer binding (vii.); but the spirit of God leads and impels Christians (viii.); and finally, how a part of the Jews do not acknowledge the grace of God in Christ; and, therefore, the heathen are invited, but all Jews in the end must be converted (ix.-xi.). With this there are, in the second part, connected moral exhortations of various kinds (xii.), especially to obedience towards heathen magistrates (xiii.), and to forbearance in regard to such as are weak in the faith, particularly in the eating of food offered to idols (xiv., xv.). The termination consists of greetings, and the recommendation of a certain Phebe, a Christian who is travelling to Rome (xvi.).

The Church in Rome and the Composition of the Epistle.—We have no definite information respecting the foundation of the first Christian community in Rome. It is, however, probable that Jewish Christians who were witnesses of the miraculous working of the Holy Spirit, at Pentecost, in Jerusalem, and had been converted by the impressive speech of Peter (Acts ii. 10, 41), carried to the capital of the world the first news of the Gospel. By the various intercourse kept up between Rome and its dependencies, by which the numerous Jews in that city remained in connexion with their fellow-believers in Palestine, Asia Minor, and Egypt, information respecting Christianity would gradually more and more be carried to Rome (comp. Acts xxviii. 21). By these means Aquila and Priscilla, expelled from the capital by Claudius, had, in Rome, obtained an acquaintance with the Gospel before they settled in Corinth. In the latter place they were thoroughly

instructed by Paul in Christianity (Acts xviii. 2, seq.). They travelled with him to Ephesus, where they remained for a time, but returned to Rome (Acts xviii. 18, 19—comp. Rom. xvi. 3). As before, in Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 19), so in Rome, they willingly allowed their house to be used as a place of meeting, and doubtless contributed largely to the further spread of Christianity in the capital (Rom. xvi. 3-5). Besides these two, several persons had come to Rome, who in part owed their Christian knowledge to Paul (Rom. xvi. 5, seq.), and so it happened that in Rome that apostle's views found special acceptance. The Church formed and enlarged itself in consequence, not only by Jewish Christians, but by heathen Christians, and conformably to the mind of Paul (Rom. i. 5, 6). The Church as mediately formed by him, and as being in the centre of civilisation, awakened deep interest in the apostle, who obtained exact information as to its condition, perhaps through Aquila and Priscilla, as well as his own kinsmen (Rom. xv. 7). For many years, he had therefore a desire to see its members (xv. 23), and often he determined to go to Rome and preach the Gospel there (i. 11-16), but was continually prevented (xv. 22). At last he proposed to himself to go to Spain, and on his road to make some stay in Rome (xv. 24). When now he was for the second time (or third, 2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1) in Corinth, the journey to Rome of a deaconess of the Church at Cenchrea, in Corinth, who was highly esteemed by Paul, gave him an opportunity of sending by her a letter to the Church in Rome (Rom. xvi. 1, 2). The apostle, therefore, according to his custom, dictated the Epistle to the Romans to a Christian brother named Tertius (Rom. xvi. 22), and entrusted it to the care of Phebe. This took place in the year 57 or 58, A. D. From the letter itself we learn more concerning the state of the Roman Church.

That community had not been exempt from many sufferings and persecutions brought on its members by the enemies of the Gospel, especially heathens (Rom. viii. 17, seq., xii. 12, seq.). But their faith, firm and joyous, was favourably known in all the world (i. 8), exerting its influence in the heart and life; for their Christian love had shown itself variously (xv. 14), their obedience to the Gospel was generally known (xvi. 19), their Christian knowledge was great (xv. 14), so as to occasion joy in the apostle (xvi. 19), who could look to personal intercourse with them as a means of spiritual refreshment (xv. 24, 32). Yet were there several things among them that occasioned solicitude. Some, by false doctrine, caused divisions (xvi. 17), and misled men's minds by flattery and fine words, seeking merely their own gratification (xvi. 18). There were also heathen Christians who had not wholly renounced their Pagan vices (ii. 1, 3, xiii. 13, 14). The heathen Chris-

tians looked contemptuously on the Jewish Christians, for they themselves had before been despised by the Jews, and were still held in small account as free-thinkers (Rom. xi.). On the other hand, the Jewish Christians were slavishly addicted to the Mosaic law (xiv. 5, 6), and acted contrary to conscience when they ate of unclean food (20). Hence arose mutual alienation (xv. 5, 6), especially as the Jewish Christians, proud of the Mosaic law, wished to teach it to others (ii. 17-29), and despised the heathen Christians in their darkness (ix.). They also clung to the illusion that they could be justified before God by observing the Mosaic law (iii. 23, 28). Hence the Jewish as well as the heathen Christians thought too highly of their own views and their own worth (xii. 3), and contemned each other (x. 12). Neither lived so purely and virtuously as became Christians (vi. 4, seq.—comp. ii. 21, seq., xii. 1), they did works of darkness (xiii. 12), and showed (viii. 5-7, xii. 16) that the spirit of Christ did not govern their lives (viii. 12-14). A low opinion of the heathen magistrates had grown up among them, which might be owing to the rebellious spirit of the Jews. Information to this effect was in possession of the apostle when, at Corinth, he wrote his Epistle to the Romans.

The object of that letter was, therefore, to prevent the threatening rupture in the Church, and to establish unity on the right ground of the Gospel. In order to effect his purpose, Paul shows how neither Judaism nor heathenism, neither disobedience nor obedience to the law, justifies men before God; but heathens without, and Jews with, the law, are, in his sight, alike sinners, destitute of any claim to salvation. Justification comes solely from faith in Christ (iii. 22). This, in consequence, is his theme, which he exhibits in its application to both classes of Christians, in order that, one in this true faith, they may bear with each other in love (xv. 1), and not be hostile to each other, on account of the observance or non-observance of the Mosaic law. Herewith the apostle urges the duty of the strict observance of the Christian requirement of a holy mind and a holy life, and also commends willing obedience towards the government.*

This letter, composed by the apostle according to a well-considered plan, specially exhibits Paul's idea of Christianity and the high and all-important doctrine of justification by faith. This fundamental principle

* The authenticity of chapters xv. and xvi. has been questioned by Dr. Baur, in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift* (1836, iii. 59), while, at an earlier period, these chapters, chiefly in consequence of the triple conclusion (xv. 33, xvi. 20, 24), were considered to be additions. In opposition, Kling (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1837, ii. 309-327) has so successfully vindicated the authenticity of these chapters, that their Pauline origin cannot be doubted.—A.

of Paul's teaching, which is here calmly, and in the letter to the Galatians polemically, set forth, appeared to him as the deep ground on which Christianity proved itself to be the universal religion: for since Judaism with its outward sanctification could not change and renew the heart, and so was unable to effect the salvation of men; and since heathenism, with its alienation from God and its vices, had still less power for that result,—the apostle recognised, as the only means for the purpose, the Gospel which had been given of God (viii. 32). Justification then, that is, the forgiveness of sins, and, as a consequence, peace with God and eternal happiness, is given to men solely through faith in Christ as the Son of God, whom the Father, from love to man, has given up to death. When this faith dwells in their hearts, men feel themselves to be children of God, and, from love to their Heavenly Father, who first loved them, begin a new and holy life in which they are led by the Spirit of God. Hence for those who are and those who are not Jews, that is, for all men, Christianity is the only way of peace, holiness, and eternal life. We thus see how deeply and truly the apostle had conceived the essence of the Gospel and set forth its soul, namely, faith, and with what reason great value has been ascribed to the Epistle to the Romans as the very kernel of apostolic truth. On this rock Luther commenced his mighty battle, victoriously setting justification by faith in opposition to the Romish doctrine of works.

When the apostle sent this epistle by Phebe to Rome, that is, about 58, A.D., the Apostle Peter could not previously have been there; for the writer intimates that he would not build on another person's foundation (xv. 20), nor does there appear in the whole letter the slightest circumstance that supposes the acquaintance of the Church with Peter. Yet the Catholic Church maintains that Peter was in Rome in the second year of the Emperor Claudius; that is, about 44, A.D., when he founded the Church of Christ in that city (Baronius, *Ann.*, ad ann. 44, c. 25, p. 352). The Acts of the Apostles, however, know nothing of such a visit on the part of Peter, but represent him as present in Jerusalem at the time (Acts xii. 4). He also took part in the council held there (xv. 7). If, then, Peter ever was in Rome, which from ecclesiastical history appears likely, it must have been at a later time.

About three years after writing this letter, Paul was taken as a prisoner to Rome. At Puteoli, not far from Naples, he found Christian brethren (Acts xxviii. 13, 14), and from Rome itself fellow-disciples came to meet him on his way (15). Arrived in Rome, he was permitted to hire a house (16, 30), though he was in the custody of a Roman soldier, to whom, according to custom, he was bound by a long light chain fastened on the arm (xxvi. 16—comp. Phil. i. 7, 13, 14; Eph.

vi. 20). Luke and Aristarchus, who had come with, remained near him (Acts xxvii. 2—comp. xxviii. 16; Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24). During his detention here, for at least two years, he was active in promoting the Gospel. He preached even in chains (Phil. i. 7); and as many became aware of his imprisonment (13), and many Christians were encouraged by his presence and his joyous fortitude to preach the Gospel more zealously, so others, on the other hand, preached the Gospel out of envy towards the respect in which the apostle stood (14-17). Christian truth, however, was the more widely spread in Rome, so that it found disciples even in the palace of Nero (i. 13, iv. 22). Among Paul's converts was a slave named Onesimus, who had run away from his master, Philemon, resident in Colossæ (Philem. 10). During his imprisonment the apostle received many tokens of affection (Phil. i. 17), especially from the Philippians (ii. 25, iv. 18); but Epaphroditus, by whom they had sent their present, lay sick, in danger of his life; he afterwards recovered (ii. 27-30). The three letters to the Colossians, the Ephesians, and Philemon, written here by Paul, were conveyed by Tychicus, sent by the apostle to Asia Minor, and by the converted slave Onesimus (Eph. vi. 21, 22; Col. iv. 7-9; Philem. 11, 12, 17). Epaphroditus, when restored to health, was the bearer of the letter to the Philippians, written after those just mentioned (Phil. ii. 27-30). Other Christian brethren were with the apostle, namely, Mark, a kinsman of Barnabas (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24), Epaphras, the Christian teacher of the Colossians (Col. iv. 12; Philem. 23—comp. Col. i. 7, 8), and Timothy (Col. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; Philem. 1).

After this first imprisonment in Rome, from which, according to his own expectation (Phil. i. 25-27, ii. 24; Philem. 22), and according to the statement of Eusebius and Jerome, nor less in agreement with the relations in the second letter to Timothy, the apostle was set at liberty, he a second time became a prisoner in Rome. Then he saw his death at hand (2 Tim. iv. 6-8), had only Luke with him (11), and desired the arrival of Timothy (9). The whole condition of the apostle is more melancholy. But the Gospel was making progress in Rome (2 Tim. ii. 9), and Paul received marks of practical sympathy, especially from Onesiphorus (i. 16-18); yet at his first hearing he was deserted by all (iv. 16). He defended himself with spirit, and once more escaped (17); but the thought of his martyrdom was in his heart (6, 8), and he knew that it was at hand; hence he wished that Timothy should come to him soon, "before winter" (iv. 21). Not long afterwards, he suffered martyrdom in Rome, about 67, A. D., when the Emperor Nero was in Greece, and his favourites, Helios and Poyeletos, were vice-regents. Since he could not, as a Roman citizen, be crucified, he was decapitated.

Thus far extends our information respecting the Roman Church in the apostolical age, and of the relations borne to it by the Apostle Paul.

Section CXVII.—THE TWO EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

The First Epistle.—The apostle writes against the existence of parties in the Church at Corinth (i.-iv.), and blames immorality (v.), and law-suits before heathen tribunals (vi.). He proceeds to answer many inquiries made by the Corinthians respecting unwedded life (vii.), and the use of flesh offered to idols (viii.), speaks of his disinterestedness and his labours as an apostle (ix.), and gives a caution against idolatry (x.); he then lays down regulations respecting divine worship and the celebration of the Lord's Supper (xi.), discourses of gifts and speaking with tongues (xii., xiv.), shows the value of Christian love (xiii.), and at last treats of the resurrection of the dead (xv.). The conclusion contains directions regarding a collection of alms, with general remarks and greetings.

The Second Epistle.—The apostle justifies himself against the accusations of his enemies in Corinth, and shows the superiority of the Gospel over Judaism (i.-v.); then he exhorts Christians to live a holy life (vi.), and praises the better-disposed for their obedience (vii.). After requesting a liberal contribution (viii., ix.), he again defends his apostolic authority (x.-xiii.), and in doing so mentions his manifold sufferings (xi.).

The Church at Corinth and the Composition of the Epistles.—Corinth, the opulent commercial city on the isthmus of the same name, lying between two seas, with the port Cenchrea in the east on the Ægean Sea, and the port Lechæum in the west on the Ionian Sea, was the capital of the Roman province of Achaia, and, in the days of Paul, the seat of Grecian learning and culture. As a consequence of its wealth and luxury, the morals of its inhabitants were depraved (1 Cor. vi. 9-11). The ancient city was (A. C. 146) destroyed by Mummius, with its rich and beautiful works of art. The new city, restored by Julius Cæsar, rose rapidly, and by its commerce and general intercourse was the point of connexion between the west and the east of the Roman empire—that is, between Europe and Asia.

On his second missionary travels, Paul went thither from Athens,

and during a residence of more than a year and a half (Acts xviii. 11, 18) founded in the place a numerous Church. He took up his abode with Aquila and Priscilla, who had been banished from Rome, and by means of his trade as a tent-maker, common to his entertainers and himself, he earned his means of subsistence (1-3); he also received assistance from the Macedonian Churches (2 Cor. xi. 8, 9). At first, he preached in the synagogues on the sabbath-day, endeavouring to win over to the Gospel, Jews and Proselytes of the Gate (Acts xviii. 4); but when he found fellow-workers in Timothy and Silas, who came from Macedonia, he more boldly preached the crucified Jesus (5). The Jews opposed and reviled him (6), for the cross was an offence to the Jews, who required miraculous signs (1 Cor. i. 22, 23), on which account the apostle directed his attention to the heathen (Acts xviii. 6). With them also he met with opposition and contempt, inasmuch as they held the simple preaching of the Gospel to be folly (1 Cor. i. 17, 23, ii. 1-5); for they desired lofty wisdom, set off in fine rhetorical sentences, such as they were wont to hear from Greek sophists and philosophers (i. 22, ii. 1, 4). Nevertheless, little by little, many were brought over to the Gospel; for instance, a Proselyte of the Gate, called Justus (Acts xviii. 7—comp. Col. iv. 11); Crispus, a president of the synagogue, whose family, as well as himself, was baptised (Acts xviii. 8); also Sosthenes, another president of the synagogue (Acts xviii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 1); and Stephanas, who, with all his household, embraced the Gospel. Stephanas received baptism at the hands of Paul himself, as well as Crispus and a certain Gaius (1 Cor. i. 14, 16—comp. Acts xviii. 8, 17). Paul preached under a sense of his weakness, yet with power (1 Cor. ii. 3-4), and the signs of his apostleship were manifested (2 Cor. xii. 12) under the working of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 4). By a vision in the night, Paul was encouraged to proclaim the Gospel with more boldness and decision (Acts xviii. 9, 10). The Jews meanwhile, outraged at his course, conspired together, and compelled him to appear before the tribunal of the Roman governor, Gallio, accusing the apostle of teaching contrary to the law; but the pro-consul drove them away, declaring he was no judge in matters of the kind (12-17).

The Christian Church in Corinth thus formed by the apostle's labours consisted, for the most part, of persons humble in condition and simple in mind; yet some were men of distinction and influence (1 Cor. i. 26-28). There were members of the Church who, having previously been heathens, were guilty of various transgressions, which now, under the influence of the Gospel, they had renounced (1 Cor. vi. 9-11). Many Christian men also had heathen wives, and many Christian women had heathen husbands (1 Cor. vii. 12-16). This fact, joined with the cor-

rupting tendencies of the voluptuous city, endangered the moral purity of the Church (x. 7-14). That Church consisted chiefly of heathen Christians; for the Jews had for the most part shown themselves hostile to the apostle's teachings (xviii. 12), on which account he, in his first letter, had to rebuke errors such as were committed by persons of heathen rather than Jewish extraction. After, however, Paul had founded the Church in Corinth, and undergone much hostility (xviii. 12; 2 Thess. iii. 2), and had written there the two letters to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1—comp. 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2, 6), he, with his host and his host's wife, took ship in Cenchrea, and proceeded to Asia. Leaving them in Ephesus, Paul went through Cæsarea to Jerusalem, and thence returned to Antioch (Acts xviii. 18, 19, 22).

Though the apostle left the Corinthian community in a happy condition (1 Cor. i. 5, 6, 7), disturbing influences soon appeared in the midst of it. The elements which had been brought together soon put forth their old and injurious qualities, and threatened the dissolution of the Church. These baneful influences arose chiefly from a longing for pretension and display (1 Cor. i. 17, ii. 1, 4, 5) as well as an inclination to vice (v. 1, 9, vi. 9-11, 15, 16, 18), a propensity to idolatrous practices (x. 7, 14), a disposition to break into parties, and a readiness to go to law, accompanied by disputes (1 Cor. i. 10, 12, vi. 1-11), a morbid seeking for signs and wonders, and, among the Jewish Christians, an extravagant avoidance of flesh offered in sacrifice to idols (1 Cor. i. 22, viii. 1-13). The danger that, through elements so bad, diverse, and powerful, the unity and the peace of the Church might be destroyed, was rendered greater by influences that came from without.

Apollos, an Alexandrine Jew, distinguished by familiarity with the writings of the Old Testament and by eloquence, had become acquainted with Aquila and Priscilla in Ephesus, and, as already he was instructed in Christianity, that worthy pair took him into their house, carried on his Christian education, and, when he wished to travel into Greece, procured for him from the Christian brethren in Ephesus a letter of recommendation to the Church in Corinth (Acts xviii. 24-27, xix. 1). When Apollos arrived in the latter city, he, by his eloquence and skill in the Scriptures, converted many Jews (Acts xviii. 28, xix. 1). His teachings, seasoned with Alexandrian learning and oratorical display, enabled him to form a party (1 Cor. i. 12, iii. 4). Though, by means of Aquila and Priscilla, he had become familiar with Paul's views, and remained on friendly terms with the apostle (1 Cor. xvi. 12), yet his adherents sundered themselves from Paul's, and so gave rise to parties. This evil was increased by the arrival of other Christian teachers, who, with their Judaising preferences, extolled Peter above all (1 Cor. i. 12).

They had brought with them letters of commendation (2 Cor. iii. 1), praised themselves (v. 12, x. 12, xi. 18), and claimed the apostolic character (xi. 5, xii. 11), while they sought to lower Paul's authority, and denied that he was an apostle (1 Cor. ix. 1-3). Their adherents formed a third party, and took to themselves the name of Peter (Cephas, 1 Cor. i. 12). There was still another party who would not have communion with any of the others, and called themselves by the name of Christ himself (1 Cor. i. 12). Thus four parties had arisen in the Church; that of Paul, that of Apollos, that of Peter, and that of Christ.

With these divisions were naturally connected envyings and strife (1 Cor. iii. 3, xi. 18), failure in Christian love, and the pride of fancied wisdom (xiii. 1-3, xi. 21). Hence undue importance was ascribed to the showy gift of speaking with tongues (xiv.), while other more valuable gifts fell into disesteem. Worse still, vices prevailed (v. 1, 9-11, vi. 1, 3-20, x. 8). Besides, there were improprieties and disorders in the public meetings of the Church (1 Cor. xi. 4-16, xiv. 34, 35). Even the Lord's Supper, or feasts of love (*ἀγαπαι*), was desecrated (xi. 18, seq.). Moreover, misunderstandings existed as to Christian liberty; for instance, whether a Christian could as such be a slave (vii. 20-24); also diverse views relating to circumcision (vii. 18, 19), marriage (vii. 25-28, 36), eating of flesh offered to idols (viii. 1-13); lastly, doubts were entertained respecting the resurrection of the dead, which some flatly denied (xv. 12); many, indeed, observed Paul's directions (xi. 2), but his adversaries, thinking he would not come to Corinth, became more bold and boastful (iv. 18, 19), and even condemned him as a false apostle (ix. 1-3).

The first information which Paul received regarding the prevailing condition of the Church in Corinth, related to moral corruption, which he endeavoured to arrest by a letter that is lost (1 Cor. v. 9). This letter he had written in Ephesus, whither he came when on his third missionary tour (Acts xviii. 22, 23, xix. 1), and where he would easily receive intelligence respecting Corinth, with which place Ephesus had commercial connexions. He formed the design of visiting Corinth (Acts xix. 21); but he first sent his two companions, Timothy and Erastus, to Macedonia (22), and instructed the former to visit the Corinthian Church, and to remind its members of "the ways that be in Christ, as I teach everywhere in every Church" (1 Cor. iv. 17).

Meanwhile, fresh news came to the apostle from Corinth. Persons of the household of a Christian woman named Chloe, came and spoke to the apostle of the divisions that prevailed there (1 Cor. i. 11). There also came to him three messengers sent by the Corinthian Church, Stephanas,

Fortunatus, and Achaicus (1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18), who supplied further information, and brought a letter from the Corinthians to Paul, containing certain questions (1 Cor. vii. 1—comp. viii. 1, xii. 1, xvi. 1) relating to the different opinions in Corinth, on which the apostle's decision was desired. Probably this letter sent by the Church was a reply to the lost epistle to which reference has been made. According, then, to the intelligence that he had thus received, Paul wrote *the First Epistle to the Corinthians* that has come into our hands.

The object of this First Epistle was to restore the unity of the Church and to claim the respect due to its writer as an apostle, as well as to remove the disgraceful crime mentioned in 1 Cor. v. 4, 5, to put an end to the disorders prevalent at the Church meetings, to give replies to the questions addressed to him, and to maintain the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. Moreover, the apostle wished to give directions respecting a collection for the poor in Jerusalem (xvi. 1-4).

When the apostle wrote this letter, Timothy had not reached Corinth, at least in the opinion of the apostle, for he requests the Corinthians to receive him well on his arrival, and to allow him to return in peace to Paul, who "looked for him with the brethren" (1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11). Probably this letter was conveyed by the three messengers of the Corinthians, who returned to Corinth from Ephesus. It would appear that it was dictated by the writer to Sosthenes, who, as having been a ruler of the synagogue, was well versed in writing (Acts xviii. 17), and was at the time with the apostle (1 Cor. i. 1). At any rate, Paul did not himself write the letter, but the salutation (1 Cor. xvi. 21). The latter was written shortly before Easter, for the apostle adverts to the festival (1 Cor. v. 8), and expresses his intention of remaining in Ephesus till Whitsuntide (xvi. 8), in order then to proceed to Corinth through Macedonia (xvi. 5), where perhaps he thought of passing the winter (xvi. 6). The epistle was written in the year A.D. 57 or 58.

After sending this epistle, the apostle despatched Titus to Corinth, that he might learn what was its effect (2 Cor. vii. 5, 7). Meanwhile, he was himself, through the hostility of Demetrius (Acts xix. 24-40), led to quit Ephesus (Acts xx. 1), and to travel to Macedonia. In Troas he waited for Timothy with news from Corinth, and was uneasy at his delay (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13). He, therefore, travelled to Macedonia, where Titus came to him, and brought him a favourable account of the operation of his letter (2 Cor. vii. 6-11). There Timothy, also, again joined him, for he was with him when he wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (2 Cor. i. 1). The intelligence brought by Titus was to this effect.

The letter had had a good influence on the majority. It had occa-

sioned a desire to see the apostle himself, as well as a regard for his instructions (2 Cor. vii. 6, seq.). The Corinthians had expelled the licentious man (2 Cor. ii. 5-11), and shown themselves free from his crime (vii. 11-15). The spirit of Christ among them was powerful (xiii. 3), they had proved themselves rich in faith, in knowledge, in all diligence and in love towards the apostle (viii. 7), so that they were worthy of the apostle's regard, gave him great joy (vii. 3, 4—comp. ii. 3). Nevertheless, there was much in the community to occasion pain. Many members did not follow the Christian doctrine as they ought (vii. 14-18, vii. 1), and it was to be feared that, on Paul's arrival, there would be found much for them to repent of (xii. 20, 21). This fear was caused by his Judaising adversaries (xi. 22), who, setting up for apostles of Christ, made themselves equal to Paul (xi. 12-15, 22); nay, assumed to be superior to him (x. 12, xi. 22). Embittered by the apostle's letter, they objected against him, that, courageous while absent, he was, when present, weak, and his speech contemptible (x. 1, 10), being no hero (iv. 8-18), changeful in his purposes (i. 15-18), given to self-laudation (iii. 1, v. 12, x. 13), a corrupter of God's word (ii. 17, iv. 2), teaching diversely to Jews and heathens (i. 19, 20, iv. 2), wanting in uprightness and truth (ii. 17, iv. 2), and dishonest (vii. 2, viii. 20, 21).

Under such imputations, and as the Corinthians wanted firmness (xi. 4), and lent an ear to the false teachers, the apostle feared that they would be led astray (xi. 3), especially as they were proud of being pleased with his enemies (xi. 19, 20), at least the peace and the union of the Church were in danger (xii. 20, xiii. 11). Therefore, and since he was sending Titus again to Corinth, with two helpers, in order to collect alms (viii. 6, 18, 22), he thought it well to write by them a *Second Epistle*. He himself intended shortly to proceed from Macedonia, where he wrote, and to visit Corinth (ix. 4, 5, xiii. 1). The epistle, therefore, was composed in the autumn of the year 57 or 58.

The object of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians was the defence and justification of the writer against the shameful imputations of the false Jewish teachers, the strengthening of the better part of the Church in their good Christian dispositions, while the apostle advised them to receive back the expelled person, who had repented (ii. 5-11), and endeavoured to promote a collection on behalf of the needy brethren in Judea.

After this epistle, the apostle, who had travelled from Macedonia to Illyricum, on the Adriatic Sea, went at length to Corinth (Acts xx. 2), where in this his, according to the Acts second, according to 2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1, third visit, he tarried three months. He took up his

abode with Gaius, whom he had himself baptised (1 Cor. i. 14; Rom. xvi. 23), in whose house the Corinthian Church assembled (Rom. xvi. 23). His presence undoubtedly completed the restoration of union, order, and good feeling, in the community. Timothy and Erastus was with him when he there, in Corinth, wrote the letter to the Romans (Rom. xvi. 21, 23). After having, according to his intention, spent the winter in that city (1 Cor. xvi., vi. 7), and completed the collection (Rom. xv. 26), he left Corinth in the spring (Acts xx. 16), and, in order to go to Syria and Jerusalem (Acts xx. 3—comp. xix. 21), he chose the way by land, through Macedonia, as the Jews lay in wait for him (Acts xx. 3). His companions preceded him (5). Among these was Gaius, who had been his host in Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23), for he was born in Derbe (Acts xx. 4), and perhaps wished to pay a visit to his native place in Asia Minor.

At a later time, after his first imprisonment in Rome, the apostle once again saw the Corinthian Church, seemingly only for a short time; on which occasion one of his companions, Erastus, remained in Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20). Here, however, ends the information found in the apostolical letters respecting the Christian community in Corinth.

Section CXVIII.—THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

Paul defends his authority as an apostle, and the Gospel which he has preached, against Jewish false teachers (i., ii.), opposes the doctrine of the necessity of the Jewish law, by means of the great truth of justification by faith, without legal works (iii., iv.), and exhorts the Galatians not to allow themselves to be robbed of their liberty, and not to misuse it (v., vi.).

The Churches in Galatia and the Composition of the Letter.—In the province of Galatia or Gallogrecia, lying in nearly the middle of Asia Minor, and named after Gallic tribes which settled there about 250, A. C., there dwelt, especially in the commercial cities, e. g. Pessinus, many Jews. Some of these probably, having been at the feast of Pentecost, in Jerusalem, had heard the apostles declare the Gospel; at least Jews belonging to the neighbouring provinces of Cappadocia and Pontus were among their hearers (Acts ii. 9, 10). From these persons the Galatian Jews might easily have received the first intelligence of Christian truth.

Paul himself, in his second missionary journey, passed from Phrygia into Galatia (Acts xvi. 6). The Jews who dwelt there, and who probably had already received the Gospel message, afforded him a field for his preaching. Though, during his first stay there, the apostle was afflicted with bodily sufferings (Gal. iv. 13, 14), which, probably, was the occasion of its being short (Acts xvi. 6), since it hindered his labours, yet he preached the Gospel in the country with good results. He appeared as an angel of God to the Galatians, who were so happy in their faith that they were ready to surrender everything to him (Gal. iv. 13-15). The apostle, therefore, was able to establish Churches in several places (Gal. i. 2; 1 Cor. xvi. 1), in which the spirit bore witness, by working miracles (Gal. iii. 3); for the Galatian Christians had, by faith, become partakers of the gifts of the Spirit (2, 3), and had begun a spiritual life. Paul had so manifestly set the Redeemer before their eyes, that they saw him as if undergoing crucifixion in their sight (1).

When then, in his third missionary tour, the apostle visited them for the second time, he found them making progress in Christian knowledge and perfection (v. 7), though he had to blame them for some immoralities and crimes (v. 21). They had already suffered for the Gospel (iii. 4). Paul strengthened them in their faith and fidelity (Acts xviii. 23), and commanded a collection for the poor in Jerusalem, towards which each one was, on the first day in every week, to lay aside something (1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2). Leaving them, the apostle travelled through Phrygia (Acts xviii. 23), to Ephesus (xix. 1), where he found believers in Christ, and remained two years and a quarter (xix. 8, 10). There he had an opportunity of obtaining further information about the Galatian Churches, and soon received accounts which troubled his mind (Gal. vi. 17).

The Christian communities in Galatia consisted of converts from both Judaism and heathenism (Gal. iii. 26-29, iv. 8). The majority, however, were Jewish Christians. Soon after the apostle's departure, false Jewish teachers, who had already visited Antioch (Acts xv. 1-5), came among the Galatians, and occasioned errors of a dangerous kind (Gal. i. 7), so that there was reason to fear the utter destruction of the apostle's work (i. 6, iv. 11). The Galatian Christians doubted of the truth and genuineness of the Gospel preached by Paul (i. 8, 9), and suspected that he had taught in order to gratify and win over the heathen (10). As if by witchcraft, they had turned away from Christian truth (iii. 1), and gave again their adherence to the Jewish law (iii. 6-14, iv. 21), and were rigid in observing the Mosaic ordinances regarding days, especially the sabbath; months; the new moon and the seventh

month in the year; fasts and years; the sabbatical year and the year of Jubilee (iv. 10); and thought that works of the law were necessary for justification before God (Gal. ii. 16, 21, iv. 21). The heathen Christians allowed themselves to be pressed by the law, as by a yoke. Serious disputes and bitterness ensued (v. 14, 15, 20). With this tendency to dogmatical strife, the practice of Christian love naturally failed (vi. 2, 6, 9, 10), and in morals the Churches had retroceded (v. 19-21, 24), so that misdeeds of various kinds sullied and degraded the lives of some (v. 21). Besides, many unduly elated looked down contemptuously on others, praising their own insight, their own services, their own virtues (vi. 3-5). Hatred and division were the consequence (v. 26). So far from Christianity had these evils led them, that they required to be converted anew (iv. 19). Nay, the apostle was even in doubt as to how he should address them, and on that account wished himself with them, that he might, in his teachings, be guided by personal knowledge.

To this unhappy condition had the Churches been brought by the false teachers (v. 8, 9), who had preached quite another Gospel (i. 7), teaching that works of the Mosaic law were the conditions of salvation (ii. 16, 21). Therefore they required circumcision (v. 1, 2, 6). As the apostle taught that faith made men acceptable to God, two parties arose (v. 12, 15). His opponents went so far in their contempt of Paul, that they denied his apostleship, inasmuch as he had not been taught by Christ (i. 11, 12). Indeed, as they alleged, he renounced the law merely to gratify Pagans (i. 10, ii. 6, 7, 9), without approval on the part of true apostles (ii. 2, 6, 9), among whom they particularly mentioned Peter (Gal. ii. 11). They laid so much stress on the Jewish law in order to make themselves acceptable to the Jews, and to avoid the persecution which arose from preaching Christ crucified (Gal. vi. 12). They even falsely represented that Paul himself taught the necessity of circumcision (v. 10, 11), and only on account of the heathen did he often abstain from so doing (i. 10). But they themselves did not observe the law, and made so much of circumcision only for vain glory (vi. 13), and to alienate the Galatians from Paul to themselves (iv. 17). In order to lessen the apostle's influence, they alleged that he had learnt the Gospel only from other men, so that his doctrine was not admissible (i. 16, 17—comp. 11, 12).

Such is the import of the information which Paul, while at Ephesus, received respecting the Galatian Churches, and which filled him with grief (vi. 17). His pain at being rejected as a pseudo-apostle was the greater, since he bore in his body, marks of the sufferings that he had undergone for Christ. The matter was so important for

him, and his love to the endangered Churches so great, that he wrote this letter with his own hand (vi. 11),—a thing which he did only in another instance, namely, in the brief epistle to Philemon (19). The letter was written about the year 56 or 57, A. D.; and, according to the general assumption, at Ephesus. De Wette is of opinion that it is likely Ephesus was the place at which the letter was written; but adds, that the passage in Gal. v. 17 is best explained on the idea that the words in Rom. vii. 14, seq., were written previously. According to this, the Epistle to the Galatians was composed after Paul's departure from Ephesus into Achaia, where he wrote the letter to the Romans. The close relationship of the two Epistles makes this probable. But that this reason is not strong enough to support the notion is very clear. The most likely view is, that either Ephesus was the place, since there the apostle could most easily obtain information from Galatia, and he remained there after he received the news long enough to compose the letter; or that the apostle leaving Ephesus unexpectedly and suddenly, immediately afterwards wrote the letter in Macedonia, where he composed the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. The resemblance to the Epistle to the Romans is, on either view, easily explained.

The object of the Epistle to the Galatians is no other than to lead back to the truth of the Gospel the misled Churches, to confute the Jewish teachers with their false doctrines and calumnies (comp. v. 8, 9), and to contribute to the union and moral purity of the Galatian believers (comp. v. 13-25, vi. 9, 10), so that they might remain in the full and untroubled enjoyment of the sanctifying light of the Gospel.

Section CXIX.—THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

The apostle commemorates the divine grace which has invited the heathen to the Gospel (i.-iii.), recommends Christian unity and virtue, and the abandonment of evil habits (iv.-vi.), touches on the relations of life (v.), and, finally, describes the Christian armoury (vi.).

The Church at Ephesus, and the Composition of the Epistle.—The large commercial city, Ephesus, on the Ægean Sea, in Asia Minor, was exceedingly flourishing, in consequence of its commercial relations with Europe, and the intercourse which they involved. It was specially the seat of the worship of Diana, for there the Goddess had a temple,

which was celebrated throughout the world, and a numerous class of workers in gold and silver subsisted there by making small copies of that temple in the precious metals (Acts xix. 24-28). Heathenism, therefore, had there one of its chief supports. Yet, as the desire for hidden knowledge prevailed there, and many persons no longer found satisfaction in heathenism, so deceivers of all kinds, especially such as promised to reveal the unseen world, found there willing ears and much acceptance (Acts xix. 13, 19; 1 Tim. i. 3, 4; 2 Tim. ii. 23, 25). Luxury and licentiousness, as well as all other vices of the heathen world, were at home in Ephesus (Eph. iv. 25, seq., v. 3, 4, 18). As a consequence of wealth, display and pride manifested themselves, especially in the female sex (1 Tim. ii. 9, vi. 17-19). Jews conveyed the first news of Christianity to this voluptuous city, having heard the Gospel preached in Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost (Acts ii. 9, 10); but an exact acquaintance with the truth had not penetrated thither, for in Paul's first visit to the place, nothing is said intimating that any Christians were found there (Acts xviii. 19, 20).

In Ephesus, then, Paul was the first preacher of the Gospel. This service to the Cross he rendered when, on his second missionary journey, he, in returning from Corinth, went thither, with Aquila and Priscilla. His stay was short. He first offered the Gospel to Jews, in whose synagogue he came forward, and among whom he found a ready audience, so that they wished him to remain longer with them. He, however, soon departed, leaving there Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 19-21). They, with the Jews whom Paul had converted, formed the first small Church at Ephesus (27), which increased by the efforts of Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 26; Rom. xvi. 3), and of Apollos (Acts xviii. 24, 26, 28). The Church met together in Aquila's house. In consequence of the great intercourse between Corinth and Ephesus, the Churches in those cities were intimately connected together. The Christians, therefore, in the latter gave to Apollos, when travelling into Greece, a letter of recommendation to the Christians in the former city (Acts xviii. 27).

When now Paul, on his third great missionary tour, came for the second time to Ephesus (Acts xix. 1), he found there Aquila and Priscilla (1 Cor. xvi. 19), at whose house, as before, in Corinth (Acts xviii. 2, 3), he probably found a home (xx. 34). He began his labours by converting to Christianity twelve disciples of John (xix. 2-7); he then preached in the synagogue for three months (8), and separated the believers from the calumniating Jews (9); afterwards, for two years, he taught daily in the school of a certain Tyrannus, and, in consequence, Jews and heathen became acquainted with the Gospel, and many members were

added to the Church (xix. 9, 10, 20). It much conduced to this result, that Paul healed and exorcised many persons. Others attempted to imitate him in these miraculous operations, especially seven Jewish magicians: they failed (11-16). Newly-converted Christians, however, performed wonderful deeds, so that the Gospel was furthered and heathenism shaken (18, 19). Through the apostle's unceasing efforts, there was formed there a numerous Church, containing Jewish and heathen converts (xx. 21), over whom Paul set elders and bishops (17-28), who were closely attached to him (37, 38). This attachment the apostle fully deserved, for while he was in Ephesus he ceased not to teach and to preach, openly and in private, from house to house (19), suffering meanwhile alike from Jews and heathens (1 Cor. xv. 32); and labouring with his own hands in order to earn his bread (Acts xx. 34), he sought no one's silver or gold (33), but from his small resources assisted others, while he remembered the words of Jesus, "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (35). Such an example must have worked beneficially on all hearts, and made them inclined towards the Gospel. Whilst he laboured in Ephesus, he received from Corinth and Galatia disturbing information, and, in consequence, wrote there his first letter to the Corinthians and that to the Galatians. About this time, Apollos, who had returned from Corinth, appears to have been with the apostle in Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 12).

Meanwhile, the apostle saw his plan of remaining yet longer in Ephesus defeated by the silversmith Demetrius, who stirred up his fellow-tradesmen against Paul, because, by his preaching, their business, as makers of small shrines resembling Diana's temple, had been much lessened. The apostle, in consequence, came into great danger, from which he was rescued only by prudent friends (Acts xix. 23, 40), and out of which he himself had not expected to escape (2 Cor. i. 8-10). Being, however, delivered by the aid of God (i. 10), he quitted the city, and set out on the road to Macedonia (Acts xx. 1), whence he, for the second time, came to Corinth (xx. 2).

After he had tarried in Corinth during the three winter months (Acts xx. 2; 1 Cor. xvi. 6—comp. Acts xx. 16), he travelled through Macedonia (Acts xx. 3), and proceeded along the coast of Asia Minor as far as Miletus, where he had an interview with the elders of the Ephesian Church (13-17). Ephesus itself he passed by, because he was desirous of being in Jerusalem by the beginning of Pentecost (16).

The apostle's fate conducted him to his first imprisonment in Rome, where he wrote his Epistle to the Ephesians, about 60 or 61, A. D. (Eph. vi. 20). It is probable that this letter was intended, not for the Ephesian Church alone, but as a circular to all the Churches in its vic-

nity; for the writer makes no immediate reference to individual members of the Ephesian community, in the midst of which he had so long dwelt, nor sends greetings to any Christians in Ephesus, according to his custom; nor, again, does he speak so definitely of the false teachers whom he had formerly feared (Acts xx. 29, 30). Yet we learn from the letter, much regarding the Ephesian Church, since it was intended for them, as appears from the title (Eph. i. 1), which was probably taken from the chief community to which it was sent, and, it may be, was sent first.

In the Churches for which the letter was designed, and before all others in the Christian community at Ephesus, faith and love remained pure and firm for at least three years after the apostle's departure (comp. Acts xx. 16, xxiv. 1, 27, xxviii. 11, 12, 14, 30), so that he felt himself compelled to express deep gratitude to God on that account (Eph. i. 15, 16). In Rome, Paul could readily obtain information respecting Asia Minor, and that the rather since Christian brethren came hence to Rome, e. g. Epaphras from Colosse (Col. i. 7-9). In the communities there a warm interest was felt in the apostle's condition, so that he entreated them not to be dispirited respecting his troubles (Eph. iii. 13). The majority of believers consisted of heathen Christians, to whom, therefore, the apostle specially directed his teachings (ii. 11-17, iii. 1, iv. 17-20). Between Jewish and heathen Christians strife had sprung up, on which account Paul urges the necessity of union (3-6). A proud, susceptible disposition had therewith shown itself on both sides (iv. 2, 32), nor were former heathen vices wholly abandoned (iv. 25, 28, 31, 32, v. 3, 4, 11, 18). Many failed in love and pity (iv. 32), also in wisdom, in profiting by opportunities for doing good (v. 15-17). This all arose from the fact, that they did not well know the will of God and their own calling (v. 8, 10, 11, 17). Nor were the relations of private life fully pervaded by the spirit of Christ, for the husband regarded his wife as a slave (v. 22, 23), parents were often severe towards their children, and children were disobedient to parents (vi. 1-4). The slaves gave only outward service; their masters, on their side, treated slaves with rigour (vi. 5-9). There were also many temptations to apostasy and sin (vi. 11, 18), as was specially natural in the rich and luxurious Ephesus. Chiefly were believers threatened with danger from the prevailing inclination to hidden wisdom, which led the apostle to state that the Gospel is the highest wisdom (Eph. i. 9, 10, 17, 18, iii. 5, 8-11); that Christ stands at the head of the spiritual world (i. 20-23, iii. 10, 12); and to pray that their eyes may be opened to see the salvation offered to them in Christ (18), in his unfathomable riches (iii. 8), and in his love, which passes all knowledge (19). Towards these

things he directs their thirst for deep knowledge, since they have not penetrated sufficiently into these things, and, when they have, may forego all other wisdom. Such representations were the more necessary, because bad and deceptive men had insinuated themselves into the Churches, and by deception seduced believers into error; so that now this, now that, false doctrine appeared, and a number of the members of the Church were turned from the right way (iv. 14, v. 6, 7).

The object, then, of the epistle, is to show to heathen Christians, and especially to those who took pleasure in deep knowledge, that in God's design of calling to the Gospel, and saving, both Jews and Pagans, lay the deepest knowledge; that in Christ himself was all fulness of knowledge, and that with true wisdom must be connected right dispositions and correct conduct.

At the time when the apostle wrote the epistle, he hoped to find in Rome further opportunity for proclaiming the Gospel (Eph. vi. 19), which he now proclaimed in chains (iii. 1, vi. 20; Phil. i. 7). He sent the Epistle to the Ephesians by Tychicus, who took with him the similar letter to the Colossians and the letter to Philemon, as well as the converted slave Onesimus (Eph. vi. 21, 22; Col. iv. 7, 9; Philem. 10, 11), and who was to communicate information as to the apostle's condition in Rome by word of mouth (Eph. vi. 21, 22; Col. iv. 7, 8).

Respecting the subsequent condition of the Ephesian Church, consult the Section on the Epistles to Timothy—Section cxxiii.

Section CXX.—THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

The apostle communicates from Rome, information respecting his condition in that city (i.), recommends to the Philippians union and lowliness of mind (ii.), in order that they may make further progress in Christian excellence and heavenly demeanour (iii.), and may abound in joy, zeal, and every grace; he also returns thanks for the aid they have sent him. The entire letter breathes the spirit of deepest love.

The Church at Philippi, and the Composition of the Letter.—The city of Philippi, which derived its name from Philip, the father of Alexander the Great, king of Macedon, who enlarged it and made it a frontier stronghold against Thrace, lay on the east of the river Strymon, on an elevation at the foot of Mount Hæmus. The country around it, being well watered, was very fruitful. In its vicinity, the Roman triumvirs obtained the celebrated victory of Philippi over the republican army,

commanded by Brutus and Cassius (42, A. C.). In Philippi, the Emperor Augustus established a part of the adherents of Antony when they were expelled from Italy, and on that account he gave to the city the rights and privileges of a Roman colony, agreeably to an intimation by Luke (Acts xvi. 12). Philippi was eminent for its commerce, which drew into it strangers, among whom were Jewish families, whose house of prayer stood near a stream on the outside of the city (comp. Acts xvi. 13). Not till it was conquered by the Turks did the town begin to sink. On the place where it stood there is now only an inconsiderable place, named *Feliba*.

The Apostle Paul visited Philippi on his second missionary journey. In the country of Troy, in Asia Minor—that is, at the spot where the *Ægean* Sea separates Asia from Europe—the apostle had in the night a vision, which induced him to pass over into Macedonia, accompanied by Timothy, Silas, and probably Luke (comp. the *we* in Acts xvi. 10). At Neapolis, the landing-place, he first set his foot on the soil of Europe. Thence he hastened to Philippi (8-12); there, on the sabbath, he preached in the Jewish house of prayer (*προσευχή*), having women for his audience. A dealer in purple, by name Lydia, of Pagan blood, who, quitting her native place, Thyatira, in Asia Minor, had settled in Philippi, and worshipped with the Jews, was the first convert. Having, with her family, been baptised, she received Paul into her house (14, 15). The apostle exorcised a female slave, and so interfered with her owner's craft; in consequence, he, with Silas, was taken before the heathen magistrates, who threw him and his companion into prison. The event led to the conversion of the gaoler and his household. The apostle, however, quitted the place, and proceeded thence to Amphipolis (Acts xvi. 10-40—comp. 1 Thess. ii. 2).

Thus was the basis of Christianity laid by Paul himself in the city of Philippi. A companion of the apostle's, not named, who was left behind there (Phil. iv. 3), also a certain Clemens, and others, built on the foundation thus prepared; in consequence, the Church flourished. By a second visit made by the apostle (Acts xx. 1, 2), when he was going from Ephesus into Greece, also by his third visit, when he returned from Corinth, and was there at Easter (3, 6), were the Philippian Christians strengthened in faith and love.

The Church was bound to Paul by the deepest regard, as more than once they showed by their deeds. Shortly after he left them, they sent him twice a supply of money to Thessalonica (Phil. iv. 15, 16); they sent him a similar aid to Corinth, when he was there for the first time (2 Cor. xi. 9), and again to Rome, when he was detained there in his first imprisonment (ii. 25, iv. 10, 14, 18). Their faith in Christ had

sunk so deeply into their hearts, that it filled them with joy, and led them to walk in the footsteps of their great exemplar (2 Cor. viii. 2-5; Phil. i. 5). When Paul was with them the second time, they had willingly made a collection for the needy brethren in Jerusalem (Rom. xv. 26). They were, however, not free from opposition (2 Cor. viii. 2; Phil. i. 28-30). Their internal government was superintended by elders and bishops, among whom, probably, was Epaphroditus (Phil. ii. 25). The apostle, on his part, bore towards them deep affection (i. 3-8, iv. 1). The more did he wish to see them pure from blemish, and to guard them against every danger. Their Christian virtue occasioned the fear lest they should fail in humility, thinking themselves already perfect (ii. 3-15). Small differences, as that between Euodias and Syntyche, had arisen; still greater misunderstandings were to be feared (ii. 1, 2, iv. 5). Danger from Judaizing teachers threatened the community (iii. 2-6, 18, 19). Being bad men, as well as false teachers, they endeavoured to throw Paul into the shade (iii. 4), from whose eyes the thought of them forced tears (iii. 18).

The sending to Rome, of Epaphroditus, who had brought the assistance to the apostle, and from whom the latter had obtained more exact information respecting the Church, gave Paul the immediate occasion for writing this letter. That messenger of the Philippians was sick in Rome of a dangerous disorder, which had filled the apostle with painful anxiety. The Philippians had heard of this illness, and, much concerned on that account, had again sent a message to Rome (Phil. ii. 25-30—comp. iv. 18). At last, Epaphroditus, restored to health, was despatched by Paul with this letter to Philippi. His own desire urged Epaphroditus to return, and the apostle wished to relieve the troubled minds of the members of the Church in that city (ii. 26, 28).

As all these preliminaries required a considerable time, which must have passed during Paul's imprisonment in Rome, and in the letter itself a hope of regaining his liberty and of revisiting the Philippians is expressed by the apostle, so this epistle cannot have been written till near the end of Paul's detention in Rome, or about 63, A. D.

The object of the letter is twofold. The apostle wishes to communicate comforting news to the Philippians respecting his own personal condition, and to guard them against the dangerous errors already alluded to, specially, while confirming them in good, to exhort them to study union, and to make ceaseless efforts after Christian virtue. The two leading subjects of the letter, however, namely, the condition of the apostle and that of the Philippians, are closely interwoven, and alternately come into prominence, as one feeling or the other rises in the writer's mind; for the under tone of the whole epistle is the noble pa-

ternal love felt by the apostle towards the members of the Philippian Church.

When Paul wrote the letter in Rome, very gratifying results of his preaching had already manifested themselves in the city (Phil. i. 12, seq., iv. 22); yet the apostle remained in danger of his life (ii. 17), but the hope of deliverance was predominant (i. 25, 26, ii. 24). With him was Timothy (i. 1), whom he intended to send again to Philippi as soon as he saw what turn his own affairs took in Rome (ii. 19-23).

In times subsequent to the apostolic, the Church in Philippi continued to flourish. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, visited its members on his journey to Rome; Polycarpus, bishop of Smyrna, who, as well as Ignatius, was a scholar of the Apostle John, addressed a letter to them; and the Latin Father, Tertullian, places them among the most eminent Churches which preserved the manuscripts of the apostolic letters. Also, in many Church councils, mention is made of a bishop of Philippi.

Section CXXI.—THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

After giving thanks, and supplicating for the Colossians, the writer exhibits the elevated dignity of the Saviour (i.), utters warnings against false teachers who affect a deep wisdom and familiarity with the world of spirits (ii.), and adds exhortations, designed, first, for Christians generally; and, secondly, for individuals in their several relations in life (iii., iv.).

The Church at Colossæ, and the Composition of the Letter.—The city of Colossæ, in Phrygia, stood on the river Lycus, which at that place disappears in a chasm, and, rising from the earth further on, pours itself into the Meander (comp. Herod., vii. 30). In days before the advent of Christ, it was a large, opulent, and flourishing city (Xenoph., *Anab.* i.), but in the time of the apostles it had lost much of its repute, and was accounted only an inconsiderable place (Strabo, xii. 864 B), which was far surpassed by its neighbouring cities, Laodicea and Hierapolis. Under Nero, Colossæ, with the towns just mentioned, was destroyed by an earthquake. This event took place not long after Paul wrote to them his letter. The city arose from its ruins in a yet more beautiful form, but it has now wholly disappeared.

The first intelligence of the Gospel may have been carried to Colossæ also by Jews who had been present on the morning of the celebrated Pentecost in Jerusalem, for several of those who there heard the apostles

were from Phrygia (Acts ii. 10); but the proper herald of the Gospel in Colossæ was a certain Epaphras (Col. i. 7), who probably had heard the apostle preach in Ephesus (Acts xix. 10). Paul passed through Phrygia twice (xvi. 6, xviii. 23), but the cities of Colossæ and Laodicea lay in the south-west of the province, whither the apostle did not turn his steps, so that he was not the founder of the Churches there, nor had he seen the brethren face to face (Col. ii. 1). As, however, he laboured in Ephesus more than two years (Acts xix. 8-10), many of the Colossians and Laodiceans, brought to the great commercial city of Ephesus by business, may have there seen and heard the apostle, and, having been thus instructed, these persons may have carried the good news home, and laboured for its diffusion (comp. Acts xix. 10; Philem. 19). Thus it appears to have been with Epaphras, who afterwards saw the apostle again when he was a prisoner in Rome (Col. i. 7), and brought to him information regarding the Colossian Church (Col. i. 7, 8).

That Church consisted, for the most part, of heathen Christians (Col. i. 20, 21, 23, iii. 6, 7), and, in consequence of their faith, had to endure from the Pagans many assaults and persecutions (Col. i. 11). Whilst their teacher, Epaphras, was absent in Rome with the apostle, a certain Archippus held the post of deacon in the Church (Col. i. 7, iv. 17; Philem. 2), which met together in the house of Philemon (Philem. 2). With the Church in the neighbouring city of Laodicea, the Colossians maintained a brotherly connexion (Col. iv. 15, 16). The Gospel had, from the first, produced good fruit in Colossæ (i. 5, 6, 9), and it was the apostle's prayer that the believers there might remain faithful, and bring forth good fruit in abundance (i. 9-11).

Great danger, as the apostle had learnt from Epaphras, threatened the Church from Judaizing teachers. These persons pretended that they possessed high and hidden wisdom, could penetrate into the invisible world of spirits, and have fellowship with superhuman beings (Col. ii. 8, 18). By crafty discourses they led men to share in their illusions (ii. 3, 4), promising to put them into possession of hidden treasures of knowledge, which, in reality, were nothing better than human fancies and dreams (ii. 8, 9, 23). With this, they laid great stress on the observance of the Jewish ceremonial law (16, 17), and, going beyond it, required that certain things should not even be touched, since the use of them was destructive (21, 22). They were ascetics, given to bodily mortifications (23) as a means of learning secret things (18). No longer themselves following Christ, the head of the Church, they sundered from him their adherents (8). Such errors begot a false humility, of which pride was the essence (18, 23). As now in the whole country there prevailed a thirst for occult wisdom, so their false teachings found

much acceptance (i. 15-19, 26, 27, ii. 6-8); hence the danger of the Church was imminent, and, indeed, many of its members espoused those delusions, to the rejection of Jesus Christ (iii. 1-3).

Speculative led to practical errors. There were in the Church, members who were proud, hard-hearted, revengeful (iii. 12-14); even gross vices connected with heathenism were not abandoned (5, 8, 9). Wedded life had its faults (18, 19); nor between parents and children did the true Christian relation prevail (20, 21). The same was the case between slaves and slave-owners (iii. 22-iv. 1).

From Ephras, Paul had heard of the condition of the Colossian Church, also of their love towards him (i. 7, 8). Thankful for that love, he, though he had not seen them, dictated this letter to them, adding, as was usual with him, the greeting in his own hand-writing (ii. 1, iv. 18). The letter was written in Rome about the time when the apostle composed the Epistle to the Ephesians—that is, the year 60 or 61, A. D.

The object of the letter is to guard the Ephesian Church against the pretended wisdom of the false teachers, and to set before them Christ as the highest of all spirits, for he possesses all the treasures of wisdom. At the same time, the apostle endeavours to lead the believers in Colossæ to avoid heathen vices, and to make continual progress in the true Christian life.

The similarity of the epistle to the Epistle to the Ephesians is accordingly easy of explanation. The occasions were similar, and the time of their being composed was the same.

When the apostle wrote this letter in Rome, he had already preached the Gospel, and hoped to find further opportunity for that work (iv. 3, 4). With him were Timothy (i. 1), Luke (iv. 14), Mark (10), and others, who were his helpfellow in proclaiming Christ in Rome (11). Mark, who was soon to go to Colossæ, and of whom the Colossians had already received commands, is specially recommended by Paul to a friendly reception (10). Ephras remains in Rome, for he has fallen into bonds, perhaps through his connexion with the apostle (Philem. 23). He is also full of care for the Colossian Church, from whom he is separated (12, 13). Tychicus is sent as bearer of the letter (7, 8), and with him Onesimus, a runaway slave, converted by Paul (9; Philem. 10, 11). To Tychicus the apostle entrusts also the letter to the Ephesians (Eph. vi. 21, 22) and that to Philemon (Col. iv. 8, 9; Philem. 10-12, 17). Paul himself has a strong hope of being shortly set at liberty, and of visiting the Colossians; wherefore he bespeaks accommodation for himself in the house of Philemon, in Colossæ (Philem. 22). Somewhat previously Paul had written a letter to the Church in

Laodicea, which he mentions, requesting the Colossians to procure it for their own perusal, and also to lend the letter now sent to them to the Laodiceans for the same purpose (Col. iv. 16).

Section CXXII.—THE TWO EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.

The First Letter.—The apostle first pours forth his heart in gratitude, in the thought of the condition of the Church in Thessalonica, not without anxiety in its behalf (i.-iii.), and gives moral instructions and exhortations respecting the second advent of Christ and the fate of the dead (iv.), whence ensues the conclusion, that believers should be always prepared (v.).

The Second Letter.—The apostle praises the Thessalonians for their steadfastness in persecution (i.), and adds instructions, setting forth that Christ's re-appearance was not immediately to be expected, since before it the manifestation of anti-Christ must take place (ii.). Finally, he exhorts those whom he addresses to an orderly and diligent life (iii.).

The Church in Thessalonica, and the Composition of the Letters.—Thessalonica, a flourishing and populous commercial city of Macedonia, stood on the Thermaic gulf, and took its name from a daughter of King Philip, who was called Thessalonice, and in whose honour the former name of the place, Thermæ, was changed into Thessalonica. At the time of the apostle, it was accounted the capital of Macedonia, being under the Roman dominion, and was inhabited by Greeks, Romans, and many Jews; the last of whom had been attracted thither by trade. The Jews of the whole vicinity had there their common synagogue (Acts xvii. 1). With them, many who had been Pagans were accustomed to worship. Such persons in the New Testament are termed "devout Greeks" (4).

On his second missionary tour, Paul, in company with Timothy and Silas, went to Thessalonica from Philippi, passing through Amphipolis and Apollonia (Acts xvi. 19, xvii. 1, 4, 14), and taking up his abode with one Jason (7). During three weeks he there preached the Gospel, addressing himself every sabbath to the Jews in their synagogue (2, 3). But they, to whom the thought of a suffering and dying Messiah was an offence (comp. 1 Cor. i. 23), for the most part rejected the preaching of the apostle and Silas (Acts xvii. 4, 5), which, however, found acceptance with a few. On the other hand, the Gospel was welcomed by a great multitude of "devout Greeks" and several women of

high position (4). Hence ensued the conversion of many Pagans (1 Thess. i. 9), so that the Gospel had there no small number of adherents (6, 9). The confidence of the apostle was in consequence increased (5), and his preaching was attested by the Holy Spirit, though he had to suffer from enemies to Christian truth (ii. 2). Nevertheless, he courageously, disinterestedly and uprightly proclaimed Christ (5-8), labouring for his bread, that he might be a burden to no one (9). Twice he there received assistance from the Philippians (Phil. iv. 15, 16), and, free from solicitude in regard to subsistence, gave his whole heart to the work (1 Thess. ii. 4, 6, 7, 11, 12), so that the Gospel was received as the word, not of man, but God (13), while the young Church remained faithful in the midst of trouble (1 Thess. i. 6). This reception of the Gospel and fidelity in holding it were acknowledged in other Churches of Macedonia and Achaia, by whom the Thessalonians were regarded as a pattern (7-9).

Among the numerous members of the Church, however, there were some who had received the Gospel only in appearance, and whom the apostle had to remind of its moral obligations (1 Thess. iv. 6); others, unwilling to labour, led a disorderly, idle life (2 Thess. iii. 10). In the hostile dispositions of Jews and heathens against the young community, Paul foresaw troubles and persecutions, which he also predicted (1 Thess. i. 6, iii. 4). He even announced that fearful times were coming on the Thessalonians as well as on other Churches, and that anti-Christ must appear before the re-appearance of Christ (2 Thess. ii. 5).

The evil dispositions of the Jews against Paul and Silas (Acts xvii. 5) broke out into an open tumult in the city. Jason, their host, was hurried away before the magistrates, and accused of harbouring an agitator who taught men that Jesus, and not the Roman Emperor, was king. The Roman tribunal, satisfied that the charge was groundless, set Jason at liberty (5-9), but Paul and Silas saw reason to quit the city by night. Passing through Berea, Paul proceeded to Athens (10, 15).

Shortly after the apostle's departure, heavy troubles, as he had foretold, fell on the Church (1 Thess. iii. 3, 4), which was persecuted by the Jews with fanatical hatred (ii. 14, iii. 15). The news of this trial reached Paul while he was at Athens (i.), who, in his solicitude, twice formed the resolution to visit the Thessalonians, but was prevented (1 Thess. ii. 17, 18—comp. iii. 3). He, however, sent Timothy thither (iii. 1-3), who, having with Silas been left by the apostle in Berea (Acts xvii. 14), had come to Paul in Athens (Acts xvii. 15; 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2).

While Timothy was travelling to Thessalonica, and remained there some time, Paul went from Athens to Corinth, and in Corinth was

joined by Timothy, who brought him pleasant news from Thessalonica (1 Thess. iii. 6). The Church stood fast in faith and love, remembered the apostle, and desired to see him (1 Thess. iii. 6-9). Their fidelity to Christ had been proved in affliction, their faith had produced fruits, their love was powerful, and their hope remained firm (1 Thess. i. 3). Therefore the apostle terms them "beloved of God" (4), thanks God on their account, and makes mention of his ceaseless prayers on their behalf (2, 3). As they had manifested their brotherly love to all Christians in Macedonia (iv. 9, 10) and conduced to the spread of the Gospel (i. 8), so all this gave evidence that God worked in them (ii. 13); and the apostle, therefore, calls them "his glory and joy" (ii. 19, 20). Again, therefore, does he desire to see them, and entreats God to direct his way to Thessalonica (iii. 10, 11).

Yet the Church was not wholly free from immorality. Some who had been Pagans were given to vice (iv. 3, 5, 7); others, who previously were perhaps Jews, dealt not honourably in business (6). Nor were the teachers of the community honoured as they should have been (v. 12, 13). Specially to be regretted was it that there were Christians who did not lead a quiet, orderly, and diligent life, and so furnished to the heathen an occasion of reproach (iv. 11, 12). These were the men who had troubled the Church with notions concerning the return of Christ, specially in reference to departed brethren (iv. 13-18), desirous of knowing whether the latter world have a share in the new kingdom, and at what time the opening of that kingdom was to be looked for (v. 1, 2), in which speculations and debates they neglected the right way of preparing for the day of the Lord (v. 6, seq.). Some, in expectation of its speedy approach, had gone so far as to neglect ordinary Christian virtues (14-17), and blindly to suppress spiritual operations and despise spiritual instructions (19, 20).

Having received this intelligence respecting the condition of the Thessalonian Church, Paul applied himself to the composition of a letter for their special benefit. He thus wrote in Corinth, about 52 or 53, A.D., his First Epistle to the Thessalonians.

The object of the letter is to express the apostle's joy at the fidelity of the community in Christian faith and love, to exhort its members to lead a holy life, and finally to compose their minds respecting the second coming of the Lord Jesus and the fate of the dead.

The epistle was to be read to all the brethren (v. 27). Silvanus, or Silas, and Timothy, were with Paul in Corinth when he composed the letter (i. 1), which he dictated, and then attested by adding his greeting and his name (v. 25-28—comp. 2 Thess. iii. 17).

While the apostle was yet in Corinth, he, not long after he had sent

this letter, again received information concerning the Thessalonians (2 Thess. iii. 11). Persecutions, it appeared, continued (i. 4, 5, iii. 5), but they were borne with patience and steadfastness (i. 3, 4) and fidelity towards the apostle had been shown, so that he was confident they would observe all his commands (iii. 4). Yet was there much that needed correction (i. 11, 12). Specially had the apostle to regret that his letter had not had due effect on the idle and disorderly, who endeavoured to alarm the community by fear founded on the alleged speedy return of Christ, and a spurious letter had been ascribed to the apostle, by which his authority for that notion had been brought forward (ii. 2, iii. 17). These disturbers of the Church were deceptive, immoral, disorderly, and disobedient men (ii. 3, iii. 6), who talked much, and concerned themselves with every one's affairs save their own, for they did not labour, relying for food on the Church (iii. 11, 12), and holding that work was unnecessary and improper when Christ was so near at hand. Indeed, they had gone to such extremes, that the apostle required them to be sundered from the community (14).

On information to this effect, Paul, yet remaining in Corinth, wrote in the same year (52 or 53) his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians.

The object of that letter is to encourage the Church in their faithful endurance of tribulation, to rectify errors regarding the supposed approaching advent of the Saviour, and to put away the disorders which had arisen in consequence of that expectation.

When Paul wrote the letter, he had with him, in Corinth, Timothy and Silvanus (2 Thess. i.). Yet had he already suffered from wicked and unreasonable men (iii. 2). The letter was not written by Paul's own hand, though, in this case, as in every other, he added an attestation (iii. 17), as he states, in consequence of an attempt to ascribe to him a supposititious epistle (ii. 2).

Many years afterwards, when the apostle was on his second journey to Corinth (Acts xx. 1, 2), he returned to Thessalonica. He then found the Church steadfast in faith and love, as they showed by a collection for the poor in Jerusalem (Rom. xv. 26—comp. 1 Thess. iv. 9, 10), and by their liberal donations for the assistance of the apostle himself (2 Cor. viii. 1-5). When Paul returned from his second residence in Corinth, and again passed through Macedonia (Acts xx. 3), he, without doubt, saw the Thessalonians a third time, to which perhaps a fourth visit was added, when, after his first imprisonment, he, coming from Ephesus, where he had installed Timothy in the office of bishop, travelled into Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3). To this extent, however, goes the information found in the New Testament concerning the Church in Thessalonica.

THE FOUR EPISTLES OF PAUL TO INDIVIDUALS.

Section CXXIII.—THE TWO EPISTLES TO TIMOTHY.

First Letter.—Paul reminds Timothy of the charge committed to him, and his obligation in consequence to preach the pure Gospel, and to withstand errors, in his office of a Christian teacher (i.), to make due arrangements for public worship (ii.), to choose worthy persons for officers in the Church (iii.), and to execute his own functions wisely and efficiently (iv.-vi.).

Second Letter.—The apostle sends to Timothy, from Rome, information respecting himself, and enjoins on him the observance of steadfast fidelity (i.), gives him directions for the ordering of his own conduct (ii.), warns him against false doctrines (iii.), and makes the request that he would come to Rome to him (iv.).

Timothy, the Relations of his Churches, and the Composition of the Epistles to him.—Timothy was a native of the southern part of Asia Minor, being born in Lystra, in Lycaonia (Acts xiv. 6, xvi. 1), where lived his mother, a baptised Jewess, by name Eunice (xvi. 1; 2 Tim. 1, 5), and his father, who was a Pagan (Acts xvi. 1). His grandmother, Lois, was also a Christian (2 Tim. i. 5). She, as well as her daughter, had probably received the Gospel at Paul's first visit to Lycaonia (Acts xiv. 6, 7). Timothy's mother instructed him in the new faith so well, that when the apostle came a second time into the country, he found Timothy in repute among the Christians of Lystra and Iconium (Acts xvi. 1, 2—comp. 1 Tim. iv. 6). Paul himself, seeing in the young man a fit instrument for diffusing the Gospel, took him under his own care, and instructed him in Christian truth (2 Tim. ii. 2, iii. 14), and Timothy subjected himself to circumcision, which Paul judged to be desirable, in consequence of the prejudices of the Jews, who knew that his father was a Pagan (Acts xvi. 3).

From this time Timothy constantly co-operated with Paul, either as his companion or his messenger. He first went with the apostle to Asia Minor (Acts xvi. 4-8), whence he passed into Europe (14). At Philippi, where Paul fell into prison, Timothy was not implicated, probably on account of his youth, which kept him in the back ground

(19, 23). Accompanying his master, Timothy proceeded to Thessalonica (39, xvii. 1, 2), where he did not come forward as a teacher (4). On quitting this place, Paul left Timothy with Silas, in Berea, (10, 14, 15), whence, at the apostle's wish, Timothy repaired to him at Athens (15 ; 1 Thess. iii. 1). From this place Paul sent him back to Thessalonica (1 Thess. iii. 1, 2, 5). Having discharged this commission, Timothy returned to the apostle at Corinth, taking with him Silas, from Macedonia (xviii. 5).

During the time that Paul wrote his two letters to the Thessalonians, he had Timothy with him in Corinth (1 Thess. i. 1 ; 2 Thess. i. 1), where the latter took an active part in the proclamation of the Gospel (2 Cor. i. 19). There Timothy began his public ministry. . On Paul's leaving that city, he was accompanied by Timothy to Jerusalem and Antioch (Acts xviii. 22), also during his third great missionary tour (1 Cor. xvi. 10 ; 2 Tim. iii. 10, 11 ; Acts xix. 22). Paul sent him from Ephesus to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22), with instructions to betake himself to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17). When Paul wrote his first letter to the Corinthians, Timothy was on his way to that city (1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11). Timothy and Paul met again in Macedonia (2 Cor. i. 1, vii. 6), and they were together when the latter wrote his Second Epistle to the Corinthians (2 Cor. i. 1). Thence he again went with Paul to Corinth (Acts xx. 3), on which account the apostle, who there wrote his letter to the Romans, sends in it the greeting of Timothy (Rom. xvi. 21). On the apostle's return to Jerusalem he had Timothy in his company (Acts xx. 4) ; and while it is doubtful whether he remained near the person of Paul in Cæsarea, and followed him in his captivity to Rome, it becomes more than probable that he did so, if we consider the intimate relation there was between Timothy and Paul, whom he loved as a father (Phil. ii. 22 ; 2 Tim. i. 2), and from whom, at a later time, it cost him tears to separate (2 Tim. i. 4) : certainly he was with Paul in Rome, when the latter there wrote to the Colossians, to the Ephesians, and to Philemon (Col. i. 1, iv. 7, 9 ; Eph. vi. 21 ; Philem. 1). Towards the end, also, of Paul's first imprisonment Timothy was with him, for the apostle wrote to the Philippians that he intended to send Timothy to them so soon as he saw how it would go with him (Phil. ii. 19, 23). Whether Timothy was sent to Philippi, or whether he left Rome together with the apostle, Timothy was with Paul after the first imprisonment, for, on his journey from Ephesus, the latter left the former, as bishop over the Church there (1 Tim. i. 3). Not long after, the apostle wrote his first letter to Timothy, from Macedonia, whither he went from Ephesus, and then again became a prisoner in Rome, and, writing there his second

letter to Timothy, entreated him to come to him before winter (2 Tim. iv. 2). This request Timothy, doubtless, complied with, and so lost his liberty, which he did not regain till after the death of his master (Heb. xiii. 23). According to the testimony of Church history, he, at last, suffered martyrdom in Ephesus.

Timothy, of a susceptible and gentle nature (2 Tim. i. 4), was inclined to timidity (1 Cor. xvi. 10), on which account he was reminded by Paul to stir up the gift of God, who had given him the spirit, not of fear, but of love, and of power, and of a sound mind (2 Tim. i. 6, 7), and he was also bidden by his instructor not to be ashamed of the testimony of the Lord, but to endure afflictions, and to labour manfully on behalf of the Gospel (8, ii. 1-3), imitating the apostle (iii. 10, 11), since all that would live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution (12). In his heart lived an unfeigned faith derived from parental influence under God's grace (2 Tim. i. 5; Acts xvi. 1). Intimately united with Paul in the bonds of the Gospel, Timothy manifested towards his teacher a child-like love (2 Tim. i. 4; Phil. ii. 22), labouring with him in the work of the Lord (1 Cor. xvi. 10; 2 Cor. i. 19), in faithfulness and exemplary devotement (Phil. ii. 20, 22). On that account he was beloved by Paul (1 Cor. iv. 17; 2 Tim. i. 2), who calls him his son, brother, follower, labourer, and minister of God (1 Thess. i. 2—comp. 1 Tim. vi. 11).

Though Timothy was a young man (under 30 years of age) when he was made, by Paul, bishop of Ephesus (1 Tim. iv. 12—comp. 2 Tim. ii. 22), yet, by his constant intercourse with Paul, had he acquired the requisite knowledge, ability, and experience (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6, 12). When he entered on the duties of his office, the Church in that city was threatened with danger from Judaizing teachers (1 Tim. i. 6, 7), whose false doctrines and wickedness (1 Tim. iv. 1-4) ate, as a canker, into the vitals of the Church (2 Tim. ii. 17). Other evils troubled the Church, and hindered its progress in Christian virtue (1 Tim. vi). Hence Timothy had a difficult duty to discharge (2 Tim. ii. 1, 3). The apostle's desire to render him aid led him to write his First Epistle to Timothy, which was composed in Macedonia about 65, A. D.

The object of the letter is declared by the writer himself. It was to instruct his son in the faith, how he ought to behave himself in the house of God, the Church of the living God (1 Tim. iii. 15), under the difficult circumstances by which he was surrounded.

When, about A. D. 67, Paul, during his second imprisonment, wrote his Second Epistle to Timothy, he had a twofold aim; for he wished

to instruct and encourage him in the execution of his Christian labours, and also to give him information respecting his own condition, and, in so doing, to urge on him a speedy visit to Rome. The latter object, however, appears only incidentally, being subordinate to the former, for Paul, before all things, desired that Timothy should be "strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. ii. 1).

Section CXXIV.—THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

The apostle gives Titus, in Crete, directions respecting the choice of suitable rulers of the Church, and instructions regarding false doctrines (i.), and exhorts him thereon to observe an upright demeanour in the Church (ii., iii.).

Titus, the Relations of his Churches, and the Composition of the Epistle.—Titus, known to us, not from the Acts of the Apostles, but solely from the Pauline Epistles, a faithful companion and assistant of the apostle, was by birth a Pagan (Gal. ii. 3), early converted to Christianity; for when Paul and Barnabas travelled from Antioch to the Council at Jerusalem, they had Titus for a companion (i.), who, through Paul's influence, was not compelled to undergo circumcision (3, 4). From this place Titus seems to have travelled and co-operated with the apostle in his missionary journeys, for he is called by Paul, his "partner and fellow-helper" (2 Cor. viii. 23—comp. ii. 12, 13, vii. 6, 7, 13-15, viii. 6, 16, seq., xii. 18). After Paul's first imprisonment the two were together in Crete, where Timothy was left by Paul for the establishment of good Church government there (Titus i. 5). While in that island he received from his master the epistle that has come down to us; at the end of which he is requested by the apostle to meet him at Nicopolis, probably the place so called in Epirus (iii. 12), and to take with him Zenas the lawyer, and Apollos, who were, therefore, with Titus at the time (13). It is not said in the apostolic letters, whether Titus complied with this request; but he was with Paul in his second imprisonment in Rome, and travelled thence into Dalmatia (2 Tim. iv. 10).

The expressions of Paul give a very favourable view of the character of Titus. The Christian Churches in the cities of Crete, when the apostle left Timothy in the island, were imperfectly founded and

organised. The devolving on Titus, of so important an office as the ordering of these communities is a high eulogy on his character (Titus i. 5, 7). The undertaking was difficult. According to Epimenides, one of their own poets, the Cretans were proverbially sensual and immoral (12). The prevalent evils demanded sharp measures (13, ii. 15), especially as they were united with Jewish errors of opinion (10, seq.), which led to idle disputes (iii. 9) and gross misconduct (iii. 1, 2, 3, 9). The disorders were similar to those against which Timothy had to contend in Ephesus (Section exxiii.), whence probably they had come, since Crete and Ephesus were connected by commercial relations.

Paul, who had personal knowledge of the bad and mercenary men (i. 5) that had occasioned the evils by which the Cretan Churches were disturbed and injured, wrote this letter to Titus about A.D. 65, that is, not long after the first letter to Timothy. It was probably composed at Nicopolis, in Epirus, where the apostle intended to pass the winter (iii. 12).

The object of the letter is to give Titus instructions respecting the course he was to pursue in organising the Churches, and withstanding the progress of false doctrines and immorality (iii. 9, 10).

The great similarity of the letter to the first letter to Timothy seems to declare that the two were written at no great distance of time, and may have arisen from the similarity of the circumstances under which they were composed.

It may be added, that the authenticity of the three Pastoral Epistles has been denied by distinguished theologians, such as De Wette, Schott, and Baur. The objections against their Pauline origin show extraordinary mental acumen, but are not sufficient to shake the established opinion. The chief objections are these: 1, these letters cannot be historically understood; 2, there prevails in them a style different from that of Paul; 3, the arrangement of the thought is not Pauline; 4, the false teachers in them are gnostics, who did not rise till after Paul's days; 5, the similarity prevailing in the three, involving anti-Pauline peculiarities, points to some other person as their author. Hence has been deduced the conclusion that their origin is due to a scholar of Paul, who wrote them towards the end of the first century, when gnosticism made its appearance. This is the view taken by De Wette (*Commentar, die Pastoral briefe*, sec. 118, 122). According to Baur, however, they were not written till after the middle of the second century. In opposition to these opinions it may be remarked, that only the second reason is of any weight, since all the rest depend on hypercriticism or individual peculiarities of mind and view. This

second ground, however, is restricted to the occurrence in the epistles, of certain words and turns of expression that are not found in Paul's other writings, while in general the diction is so thoroughly Pauline that the authorship of the letters has been ascribed to a scholar of the apostle. The theory, however, has no historical foundation, for the authenticity of these epistles was universally acknowledged in the ancient Church, being denied only by gnostic heresiarchs.

1. In regard to their historical position, it may be remarked that the Acts of the Apostles are not demonstrably so complete that they must be held to comprise the whole history of Paul's life.
2. As to the second objection, there is no reason for expecting a strict adherence to exactly the same form of speech, for the diverse points here treated of would occasion diversity in the language, to say nothing of the fact that the apostle may have employed a different amanuensis.
3. There is, in truth, nothing in these letters which is contrary to the ordinary manner employed by Paul in his instructions.
4. The false teachers doubtless gnosticise; but a gnosticising tendency existed as early as their date.
5. The similarity of the three epistles is to be explained in the same way as the similarity of the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians; it was occasioned by the similarity of circumstances. Whence it may, at least, be said that the authenticity of these epistles has in its behalf more than the opposite opinion. Excellently, then, has it been observed in Rohr's *Prediger Bibliothek* (1847, vol. xxviii. 713),—"The most certain facts may be brought into question by pleading possibilities. But after all that has been written, the Pastoral Epistles retain their authority, and will retain it until better evidence is brought against their Pauline origin."

Section CXXV.—THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

The letter to Philemon contains an entreaty on behalf of Onesimus, a slave, who had run away from his master in Colossæ, and had been converted by the apostle in Rome, and now was sent back to his owner by Paul.

Philemon, and the Composition of the Epistle.—In the Phrygian city of Colossæ there lived a person named Philemon, who was distinguished in station and serviceable to the Church (1, 2, 5, 7). He owed his conversion to Paul (19). As the apostle was never in

Colossæ, he may have seen and converted Philemon in Ephesus, which lay at no great distance (Col. ii. 1—comp. Acts xix. 10). Having become a Christian, Philemon applied his powers to the work of diffusing the Gospel (1). Probably his wife was named Apphia; and he had a son called Archippus, who, like a good soldier of Christ, had fought for the Gospel (2), and was a deacon of the Church (Col. iv. 17). Philemon had a slave, who, having occasioned his owner much trouble, ran away (11, 18, 19). Proceeding to Rome, he met with Paul, and was by him brought to receive the Gospel (10). When, then, the apostle sent Tychicus into Asia Minor with the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians (Eph. vi. 21, 22; Col. iv. 7, 8), he prevailed on this slave, by name Onesimus (10), to return to his master, and bade him travel in company with Tychicus (Col. iv. 9). In order to procure for him a favourable reception from his master, the apostle, about 60 or 61, A.D., wrote the Epistle to Philemon. The object, then, of Paul is to induce Philemon to forgive his runaway slave, and, now that he is converted, to receive him as a brother.

The language comes from the heart. The epistle is a proof of the wisdom and prudence with which its writer could manage a delicate affair in private life. The epistle makes us feel how great an influence Paul must have had on the heart of Philemon. The apostle paves the way to Philemon's heart by praising the good which he has done; he begs where he might command—begs as a prisoner in chains; nay, is willing to be the debtor of a person who owes to him his highest happiness as a Christian.

In order to make the effect of the letter more sure, the apostle wrote it with his own hand (19). At the time, Paul was in Rome, and his condition was the same as that which is described in the Epistle to the Colossians (Section exxi.). Tychicus was the bearer of the letter, and its writer was in hope of visiting Colosse (22), where he intended to be the guest of Philemon, whose domestic establishment and resources were considerable (2, 7, 18, 20, 22).

Section CXXVI.—THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The letter to the Hebrews is addressed to Jewish Christians, and divides itself into two parts—one of instruction (i.-x. 18) and one of exhortation (x. 19-xiii.). The author displays the superiority of Chris-

tianity over Judaism, by the superiority of Christ himself over angels (i., ii.), over Moses (iii.), over all human high-priests, since he is the only true and eternal high-priest, of whose office there are in the Old Testament types and intimations (iv.-x.).

These instructions are followed by exhortations to a believing use of the good offered in Christianity, to faithfulness in belief, and steadfastness in suffering (xi., xii.), as well as in holy demeanour in love (xiii.).

Character, Author, time of Composition.—The title “to the Hebrews” points to those to whom the writer addressed his letter, who were of Hebrew blood, but when the epistle was written had become Christians. The contents show them to have been Jewish Christians, who, feeling the loss of the Jewish system of sacrifices, were in danger of relapsing into Judaism. The persons contemplated were not Jewish Christians in general, but such as resided in Jerusalem, as appears from their attachment to the ceremonial of the temple, and from their not having mixed among them heathen Christians, as was the case with Churches out of Palestine, as well as from the mention of persecutions as being actually endured (x. 32, xii. 1, seq.), and which at the time prevailed only in Palestine (Acts xii. 1, seq., viii. 1, seq.). Nor is this view opposed to the statement that they had not yet withstood unto blood (Heb. xii. 4), since many of the members had not become Christians at the time of these persecutions.

The aim of the letter is to guard the persons to whom it is addressed against relapsing into Judaism, and to keep them firm in the avowal of the religion of Jesus. This aim is sought throughout, by exhibiting the superiority of Christianity over Judaism. With this view, the writer sets before them “the author and finisher of their faith” in his lofty dignity and completed work (ii. 10, vii. 24, 25, ix. 12, xii. 2). The Jewish ceremonial, he shows, had only prepared the way for the proper and full atonement made by Christ (viii. 5, ix. 9, 23, x. 1). The image had lost its worth with them, since they now possessed the reality.

In order to understand the epistle, it is of the greatest consequence that we should keep before our eyes the state of mind of those for whom it was intended. Having been educated in the sacrifices of the temple worship, they could conceive of the grace of God in Christ only under the idea that his death and blood had reconciled God, his body being the victim, and he himself the high-priest; therefore have we a minute description of Jesus as a high-priest (iv. 14), and the comparison of Jesus to Melchisedec (v. 6, seq., vii. 1-3). In order to prove that the ceremonial law was now not necessary, and therefore had ceased, the writer shows that the one sacrifice of Jesus was sufficient (vii. 24, 25,

27, 28, ix. 12, 15, 25, 26, 28), and that in Christ they had a high-priest who constantly atoned for them with God (vii. 25, ix. 24). To guard against the abuse of this doctrine, the writer points out the lost condition of those who sinned wilfully after having received the knowledge of the truth (x. 26, seq.).

The treatment of the subject displays great ability and clearness of mind, though the use made of the Old Testament in the translation of the Seventy has in it something artificial and far-fetched. The author is fond of allegory, and from the Greek translation draws conclusions which he could not have obtained from the Hebrew (i. 6, 10). He sometimes builds his proof on words which are not found in the original, as in x. 5, 10, where the terms "body" and "prepared" are not in the Hebrew, but "my ear hast thou opened" (Ps. xl. 7), and where, probably, the word "ear" has been changed into "body" by an error of the transcriber, while on this word "body" the author lays great stress, since Christ gave his body as an offering to God (10). The writer also applies expressions taken from the Old Testament in senses which they do not and cannot bear, as in iv. 1-11—comp. iii. 11, 18—see Ps. xcvi. 11, where the word "rest," which is used of the tranquillity of the wandering Israelites after they had entered Palestine, is made to signify everlasting happiness after death.

The style is distinguished from the general style of the New Testament epistolary writing by a certain elegance, such as is found in the works of heathen philosophers in Alexandria, and in those of Philo the Jew. The well-turned and euphonic periods with which the epistle begins, exhibit the elaborate care taken by the author in framing his style, which is observable throughout in the arrangement of words and the connexion of prepositions.

From this description, it may be explained how, in the most ancient times, doubts arose of the Pauline origin of the letter; for, although a decided relationship in contents and language with the writings of Paul may be observed, yet not less are the actual diversities and the deviations from the doctrinal view and manner of expression by which Paul is characterised; and on this ground the opinion that the epistle was not written by the apostle was from the first maintained. In the Greek Church, the prevailing view was, that Paul was its author; on which account, Eusebius states that the apostle wrote fourteen epistles, but he adds, that some did not receive the letter to the Hebrews, since they asserted that in the Roman Church it was held not to be an epistle of Paul. Such was the fact; for, in general, Barnabas or Clemens was accounted its author, until, through the authority and influence of Augustine, the letter was admitted to be Paul's, when (397 and 504) it

was placed among the canonical books. At the time of the Reformation, Catholic writers raised new doubts against its authenticity: this was done by Erasmus. Still more decided was the opinion of Luther. The Council of Trent, however, declared its Pauline origin, and so put an end to the controversy in the Catholic Church. Luther, who considered it a work of some learned disciple of the apostles, well versed in Scripture, and perhaps of the Alexandrine Apollos, in his first edition placed the epistle apart from the rest of Paul's epistles. After him, however, a conviction that it was written by Paul gained prevalence among learned theologians in both the Lutheran and the Reformed Church, until in the last century its Pauline origin was again contested in Germany. More recently, the general opinion is, that it was not written by Paul. This result has been specially brought about by Bleek's thorough and convincing investigations.

These are the chief grounds against its Pauline origin:—1. At the beginning, there is not Paul's customary wish of Christian blessings. The entire introduction differs from the manner in which the apostle begins his letters.—2. The language, though like Paul's, is much more rhetorical, and is purer Greek than is found in his epistles.—3. The views put forth in the letter are not found in Paul's writings; for instance, the comparison of Christ to angels and to Moses, the designation of Christ as an apostle (iii. 1), the representation of Jesus as a high-priest: moreover, the allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament is not after Paul's manner, the non-appearance of the contrast constantly occurring in his letters between law and faith, instead of which quite another idea is presented, namely, fulfilment—that is, perfect atonement and blessedness—as the result of the sacrificial death of Christ (vii. 11—comp. ix. 9, x. 1, 14, xi. 40, xii. 23; also ii. 10, v. 9), the difference between the faith taught by Paul and the faith here taught, which, according to the explanation given by the author himself (xi. 11), includes the Pauline hope.—4. The non-appearance in the letter, of the vocation of Paul as the apostle to the Gentiles.—5. The circumstance that the writer of the epistle puts the golden euser in the most holy place (ix. 4), whereas it stood without—a fact which Paul, from his long residence in Jerusalem, certainly knew.—And, 6. Finally, as the chief reason, that the author clearly and distinctly distinguishes himself from the apostles (ii. 3), of whom Paul decidedly claimed to be one (Rom. xi. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 9, ix. 1, 2, 5; 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 7), laying great stress on the fact that he did not receive the Gospel from men (Gal. i. 12).

While these reasons leave it scarcely questionable that Paul was not the author of the epistle, yet the resemblance which the letter has to Paul's doctrine and mode of expression suggests that the apostle had

an immediate influence in its composition, and therefore it is not improbable that it proceeded from the pen of Apollos, for it is known that he possessed the qualities by which the epistle is characterised. Apollos, as we learn from the New Testament, was familiar with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, practised the allegorical mode of interpretation customary in Alexandria, and belonged to that cultivated city (Acts xviii. 24, 28—comp. 1 Cor. i. 17). He was also well acquainted with Paul's manner of teaching (Acts xviii. 26), and stood in intimate connexion with the apostle (1 Cor. xvi. 12; Tit. iii. 13). Nevertheless, that he was the author, is but a supposition; and we can only here repeat the words of Origen, "God only, in truth, knows who wrote the epistle" (iv. 698). It may, in general, be confidently affirmed, that the author was a Jewish Christian of Alexandria, of the school of the apostle Paul.

According to the intimations contained in the letter itself, it was certainly written before the destruction of Jerusalem, for the high-priest is still able to perform his functions (viii. 4), and offerings are still made in the temple (ix. 6, 7). The temple service then was in existence when the epistle was written; yet it cannot have been long before the overthrow of Judaism that the letter was written, for those for whom it was intended had already been Christians for a considerable time (v. 12, x. 32, 34). The time between 65 and 67, A. D., has, therefore, been fixed on, and not without reason, as the date of the letter. The place where it was composed cannot be ascertained, though some mention Ephesus or Corinth as places where Apollos dwelt (Acts xix. 1; 1 Cor. xvi. 12). Only this is certain, that the author resided beyond the limits of Judea (xiii. 19, 23, 24).

THE SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

Section CXXVII.—THE TWO EPISTLES OF PETER.

First Epistle.—After referring to the happy hope of Christians, Peter gives exhortations to a holy life (i.-iii.), requiring obedience towards magistrates (ii. 13, seq.), towards slave-owners (ii. 18, seq.), towards husbands (iii. 1, seq.), encourages a tranquil endurance of sufferings and persecutions (iii., iv.), and, finally, communicates rules of conduct, especially for rulers of Churches and young Christians (v.).

Second Epistle.—Having enjoined a virtuous conversation, and mentioned his reasons for writing (i.), the author warns his readers against false teachers (ii.), and such as doubt the second coming of Christ (iii.).

The Apostle Peter.—The name Peter was originally given to this apostle by the Saviour himself (John i. 43), in consequence of the rock-like firmness of his conviction and his pervading energy (comp. Matt. xvi. 15-19). The Greek word Peter is of the same signification as the Syrian term Cephas—that is, rock (1 Cor. 1, 12, iii. 22, ix. 5, xv. 5). The apostle's proper name was Simon (Matt. x. 2; John i. 43). He was the son of a fisherman, named Jonas (John i. 43, xxi. 15, 16), of Bethsaida (John i. 45). He had a brother, by name Andrew (Matt. iv. 18, x. 21). Both sons carried on the trade of their father, on the sea of Galilee (Matt. iv. 18—comp. John xxi. 1-3). By Andrew was Peter first introduced to Jesus (John i. 42, 43). Thus being acquainted with the Saviour, Peter and his brother unhesitatingly followed him, when invited to do so, near the lake of Galilee (Matt. iv. 19, 20). Peter, as a disciple of Jesus, stood, like John and James, in intimate relations with the Lord, for he, with them, was often selected to be near Jesus in moments of consequence, as on the raising of the daughter of Jairus (Luke viii. 45), during the transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1), at the apprehension of Jesus in Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi. 37). Peter was also sent with John to make ready the passover lamb (Luke xxii. 8); he followed the Redeemer into the palace of the high-priest (Matt. xxvi. 58), saw him shortly after his resurrection (Luke xxiv. 34), received forgiveness from him at the lake of Gennesareth (John xxi. 15, seq.), and, finally, heard from the lips of Jesus the announcement of his fate (18).

Of special importance in his history, in connexion with Jesus, are the following incidents:—His walking on the sea (Matt. xiv. 28), his ready and firm confession of faith (Matt. xvi. 16—comp. John vi. 68, 69), the payment of the tribute-money (Matt. xvii. 24), the washing of his feet by the Lord (John xiii. 6), the attempt to defend Jesus when apprehended (John xviii. 10), his denial of his Master (Matt. xxvi. 69; John xviii. 17, seq.), his hastening to the sepulchre (John xx. 3).

After Jesus had quitted the earth, Peter was specially active in Jerusalem for the diffusion of the Gospel. In the Acts of the Apostles, he is the chief actor, as far as chapter xii.: for he requires the election of a new apostle in the room of Judas (Acts i. 15), is the first to preach the Gospel (ii. 14), heals a lame man at the gate of the temple (iii. 4), and, in consequence, is, with John, made prisoner (iv. 1-3). Being set at liberty (iv. 21), he punishes Ananias and Sapphira (v. 1, seq.), is then apprehended a second time (18), when, being set free by an angel (19), and again taken before the Sanhedrim (26), he is allowed to depart,

through the intervention of Gamaliel (40). Thereupon, he travels to Samaria, where he rebukes Simon Magus (viii. 14, seq.), and proceeds to Lydda, Joppa, and Cæsarea. In Lydda he heals Eneas (ix. 32), in Joppa he raises Dorcas (36), and in Cæsarea he converts Cornelius (x). Returning to Jerusalem, he is for the third time cast into prison (xii. 3), but, being again set at large by an angel (7), he quits Jerusalem (17), and, according to Eusebius (iii. 1), visits Asia Minor (comp. 1 Pet. i. 1); he is, however, present at the apostolic council in Jerusalem (xv. 7, seq.). Proceeding to Antioch, and being found unduly yielding to Jewish prejudices, he is rebuked by Paul (Gal. ii. 12, seq.). From Antioch he went into other parts, and again met with Paul in Rome, where both suffered martyrdom, 67, A. D. (Euseb. ii. 25). According to tradition, he was crucified, with his head downwards, on the same day that Paul was decapitated.

That Peter, as the Catholic Church maintains, founded the Christian community in Rome, cannot be proved. That Church makes him to have been in the capital of the world twice—the first time under the Emperor Claudius, when he founded the Church there, and was its first bishop; the second time under Nero, when he was put to death with Paul. But the first visit rests only on a baseless tradition, which represents Peter as having disputed in Rome with the magician Simon, in the reign of Claudius (Euseb. ii. 13, 14), to which the addition is made that he then assumed the episcopal chair.

It deserves notice, that Peter was a married man, for the Saviour healed his wife's mother of a fever (Matt. viii. 14, 15), and Paul expressly refers to Peter's example (1 Cor. ix. 5). According to ecclesiastical teaching, Peter's wife also underwent martyrdom, and that before her husband's death, who is said to have supported and comforted her when about to suffer (Euseb. iii. 30).

Peter had marked peculiarities of character. He was of a lively temperament, and therefore often showed himself rash, positive, and fiery, as in his ready confession (Matt. xvi. 16; John vi. 68, 69), in his words on the Mount, "Master, it is good to be here," &c. (Luke ix. 33); in his words when Jesus washed his feet (John xiii. 8), and in his protestations (Matt. xxvi. 33-35). Similar rash words and deeds are ascribed to him in Matt. xiv. 28, xvi. 21, seq.; John xiii. 36, seq., xxi. 7, seq.; whence we can explain his hastiness and anger, as displayed in cutting off the ear of Malehus (Matt. xxvi. 51; John xviii. 10). Such a character is prone to change (Matt. xxvi. 69; John xviii. 17, seq.), as is also seen in Peter's yielding to the Judaizers in Antioch (Gal. ii. 12, seq.). When, however, his faith in Christ was strengthened and purified by repentance (Matt. xxvi. 75), he, in reality, manifested

the fidelity which he had vowed to the Saviour. The whole of his life afterwards is a proof of his thorough change. He was animated by the holiest zeal for the Lord. Above the fear of man, he preached the Gospel in Jerusalem before thousands, and willingly endured bonds and chains. In the true spirit of religious heroism did he stand before the Sanhedrim (Acts iv. 12, 19, v. 29). His love for Jesus, which is manifested before, appeared after, his fall in purity, and in unshaken strength that was superior to death (comp. John xxi. 15, seq.).

Peter was not suddenly, but by degrees, led by the Divine Spirit into all truth. This is evident from the fact, that not till long after the effusion of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost was he brought to the conviction that the heathen were admitted to the benefits of the Gospel (Acts x. 14, 15, 34, 35). He also shared the opinion that the dead abode in Hades (Acts ii. 31—comp. 1 Pet. iii. 19, 20), and the expectation that the return of Christ was at hand (1 Pet. i. 5, 7, 13, iv. 7, v. 4). As in these opinions he was in unison with the notions entertained by the Jews, and connected the coming happiness immediately with the approaching appearance of Christ (1 Pet. i. 5, 7, v. 4—comp. iii. 21), so did he in his preaching find more acceptance with his countrymen, and was specially accounted the apostle of the circumcision (Gal. ii. 7, 8); his adherents in Corinth formed a separate party (1 Cor. i. 12), and many Jewish Christians and false Jewish teachers set him above Paul (Gal. i. 18, ii. 11, 12; 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11), fancying that he held to the Jewish law more than that apostle.

Section CXXVIII.—CONTINUATION.

Character and Formation of the First Epistle.—The First Epistle was addressed to the Christian communities of Asia Minor (1 Pet. i. 1), which consisted partly of Jewish, partly of heathen, Christians; for in the letter they are regarded either as originally Jews (i. 10, seq., iii. 6, 20), or as originally heathens (i. 14, 18, ii. 10, iv. 3, 4), so that the expression at the commencement, “to the elect strangers scattered,” &c., refers not merely to persons of Hebrew blood, but generally to Christian communities that existed beyond the borders of Palestine, and were composed of both Israelite and Pagan disciples. These communities had to endure either actual persecutions, or the immediate prospect of them; for the apostle entreats his readers to be firm

and steadfast (i. 6, ii. 19, seq., iii. 13-17, iv. 1, 4, 12-19, v. 6, 10), to practise virtue (i. 12, seq., ii. 1, seq., 9, 11, 12, iii. 8, seq., 16, iv. 2, 8, seq.), to fulfil civil obligations (ii. 13-17), as well as those of their homes (ii. 18, iii. 1), so that by their upright lives they might put their enemies to silence. In order to strengthen them, he adverts also to the blessed hope they had in the future (i. 3-5, iv. 13, 14, v. 4), to what Christ had done for them (i. 18, ii. 24, iv. 1), to the perishableness of all human grandeur (i. 24), to the lofty image of the Saviour (ii. 21-23, iii. 18), and to the assistance of God (iii. 12-15, iv. 19, v. 7-10), showing how, by their excellence, their calumnious adversaries would be brought to shame (ii. 12, 15, iii. 16). It also appears from the letter that some of its readers had doubts respecting the doctrine preached to them (v. 12—comp. i. 25), and that many moral deviations prevailed in the Churches. The object then of the letter is to convince and confirm disciples in the opinion that the doctrine which they had been taught “is the true grace of God” (v. 12), so that being strengthened, they might endure their afflictions patiently, and lead lives exemplary for holiness and love.

The style of the epistle is concise and pregnant with thought, so as sometimes to make the sense obscure. According to its object the letter is rather hortatory than didactic. Its similarity in thoughts and words to Paul’s writings and the Epistle of James has occasioned the conjecture that Peter made use of those compositions; but the facts are fully explained by the necessary resemblance there was between the minds of the two apostles, by their intercourse, and by a general acquaintance with Paul’s epistles (comp. 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16), and the forms of thought and expression peculiar to Christianity, which were widely spread in the primitive Church. It is also true that whatever resemblance there is between the writings of Paul and those of Peter, there is also a sufficient diversity both in idea and in diction to show that they were thoroughly independent witnesses in the common cause of the Gospel.

The epistle was written at Babylon (v. 13). Some without reason have supposed that Rome was intended. The epistle itself proves that the city on the Euphrates was meant, for the succession of places given in the commencement, and proceeding from the East (1 Pet. i.), shows that the writer was in an oriental, not a western, city. Silvanus was the bearer of the epistle (v. 12). Now Silvanus was a companion of Paul near the end of his second missionary tour (Acts xviii. 5). It was, then, after this journey that he repaired to Peter. To the same time may the composition of the letter be referred. This view is confirmed by Peter’s being acquainted with Paul’s letters, and the fre-

quent reference to persecution. From these facts it may be deduced that Peter wrote the letter towards the close of his life, probably during Nero's persecution, which lasted from 64-68, A. D. The year 65, A. D., is that which is commonly given. At the time of its being composed, Mark, "my son," was with Peter, from whom he sends a greeting, and to whom, perhaps, he may have dictated the epistle (1 Pet. v. 13 : Sections xeviii. and cix.).

Character and Composition of the Second Epistle of Peter.—The Second Epistle was addressed to the persons whose benefit was aimed at in the first (2 Pet. iii. 1). Paul had also written to them (15). They were troubled and injured by teachers who, to false doctrine, added corrupt morals and scornful dispositions (ii. 1-3, 10, 12-22, iii. 3-7). Against these corrupt men the writer speaks, makes their character known, and declares that their punishment is certain (ii. 3, 9, 12, 17, iii. 17), warning his readers against them (ii. 13-19, iii. 14, 17).

The object accordingly, which Peter has in view, is, with reference to these false teachers, to lead the disciples, whom he addresses, into the way of true Christian knowledge, and to aid them in the cultivation of a holy life. Specially he wishes to confirm the doctrine of the re-appearance of Jesus Christ—in this imitating the course taken by Paul, in writing to the Thessalonians. There is, however, a difference in the states of mind referred to. In Thessalonica that re-appearance was not doubted. On the ground of its certainty, the disciples were solicitous lest departed Christians should fail of a share in the blessings it would bring. Among those, however, whom Peter addressed, there were men who even derided the expectation.

The diction of the letter has some resemblance to the diction of the former composition. But the diversity is greater than the similarity. It is worthy of special notice, that in the second chapter the writer has profited by the Epistle of Jude, only he has re-produced, in more words and details, the matter concisely given by Jude (comp. 2 Pet. ii. 13, Jude 12 ; 2 Pet. ii. 17, Jude 12 ; 2 Pet. ii. 11, Jude 9). The succession of the thoughts, however, in Jude is firm and distinct, and the opponents are firmly and distinctly characterised as vicious men, while in Peter the succession is wavering, and the opponents appear changed from bad men into erroneous teachers.

In this relation of the two epistles, some have been led to deny that Peter was the author of the second letter commonly ascribed to him, and chiefly for these reasons : 1, the first centuries of Christian history give no testimony on its behalf ; even Eusebius places it among the disputed writings (vi. 25), and Jerome expressly asserts that most persons disowned Peter as its author, because its style is different from the style of

the first epistle: 2, and in reality the diction and expression are different in the two letters; as instances, we may mention that in the second epistle the word "Lord" and "Saviour" are frequent, while in the first epistle only the former word occurs, and that but once (1 Pet. i. 3); also that the re-appearance of Christ in the second epistle is designated by the words "return" and "day of the Lord;" but in the first epistle, by the words "revelation" or "appearance of Jesus Christ:" 3, the author distinguishes himself from the apostles when he gives the injunction (iii. 2), "remember the things said by the holy prophets and the command of our apostles."* The writer speaks of "all" Paul's epistles (iii. 16), which, in the lifetime of Peter and of Paul (15), did not exist as a collection, nor were they then all generally known: 4, the third chapter speaks of doubts regarding the second advent of Jesus, which could have arisen only in a day later than that of Peter, when the hope began to feel itself disappointed: 5, the use made of Jude's letter is not worthy an apostle as was Peter: 6, the author characterises the Mount of Transfiguration as "the Holy Mount," but the New Testament knows nothing of such a designation (i. 18—comp. Luke ix. 28, 38; Matt. xvii. 1, 9): 7, the author seems to betray an anxiety to describe himself as the Apostle Peter (i. 1, 13-18, iii. 1, 2, 15), whilst in the other apostolic letters the writers are satisfied with simply giving their designation: 8, in the description of the false teachers there prevails an indefiniteness, since they are represented as now in the future (ii. 1, seq.), and now in the present† (ii. 12).

Influenced by these considerations, the greater number and the most eminent of theologians have given their verdict against the Petrine origin of this second epistle, and have fixed on the commencement of the second century as the time when it was written, since about that time Christianity began to be appreciated and praised in a manner observed by our author (2 Pet. i. 2, 3, 5, 6, ii. 21, iii. 18). The opinion has, therefore, been put forth that some scholar of Peter, wishing to transmit to posterity certain utterances which he had heard from the apostle, committed them to writing after the custom of his times, designating them by the name of Peter. Nothing is known as to the place where the letter was written.

* Καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἡμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος. For ἡμῶν, Tischendorf on good authority gives ὑμῶν, *your*, which strengthens the remark in the text. The original is incorrectly rendered in both Taylor's and Sharpe's translations.

† This argument has very little if any force, as will appear from the literal translation of the verbs found in the verse; thus, *blaspheming, they shall be destroyed*. The participle is indeed present, but, according to usage, it takes its time from the verb with which it is connected.

On behalf of the authenticity of the Second Epistle of Peter, the following grounds have been adduced: 1, the epistle did not become known so soon as other New Testament writings; and when it was known, occasions for quoting from it did not offer themselves: 2, the difference of style is not so great, and there are several points of resemblance, e. g. the reference to prophetic expressions in the Old Testament which were referred to Christ (1 Pet. i. 10; 2 Pet. i. 19), the citation of the Flood and Noah (1 Pet. iii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 5), the exhortation to a virtuous life by reference to a divine vocation (1 Pet. i. 15, seq.; 2 Pet. i. 3, seq.): 3, the words in 2 Pet. iii. 2 may have stood originally so as to authorise the common translation of them: 4, though *all* the epistles of Paul are referred to, yet the expression does not involve a collection: 5, doubts regarding the return of Christ may have existed in the later years of Peter's life (comp. 2 Pet. iii. 14, 15): 6, Peter and Jude may have made use of a common source of information: 7, the writer distinctly describes himself as the Apostle Peter (2 Pet. i. 1, 16, iii. 1, 2, 15).

These are the chief considerations which have been alleged for and against the Petrine origin of the epistle. In the absence of distinct testimony from Christian antiquity, we cannot decide with certainty in favour of either side. We subjoin the view taken by Ullmann, who holds that only the first chapter proceeded from Peter, while the two others were additions; and certainly the substance and language of the first chapter speak in favour of this opinion.

Section CXXIX.—THE THREE EPISTLES OF JOHN.

The First Epistle.—The apostle confirms the certainty of the Gospel, and shows how fellowship with God promotes holiness (i., ii). He then cautions his readers against false teachers who deny that Jesus is the Christ (ii.), and enjoins holiness and love, especially brotherly love (iii., iv.), which are advanced by a firm faith, for that overcomes the world (v.).

The Second Epistle is addressed to a Christian woman, named Kyria, and to her children, whom the apostle commends. Urging to Christian love, he warns them against false teachers who deny that Christ has come in the flesh.

The Third Epistle is addressed to a friend of the name of Gaius,

whose hospitality is praised, and whom the writer strengthens in faith and love.

Character and Composition of the First Epistle.—The contents and language of the letter are an unquestionable evidence that the same Apostle John, of whose character we have already spoken (Section cii.), and who wrote the Gospel known by his name, was its author; for not only does he speak of himself (i. 1-5, iv. 14), as he does in the Gospel (i. 14, xix. 35), namely, in the character of a hearer of Christ and eye-witness of his life, but in both he employs the same words, forms, and turns of expression, the same structure of sentences, and the same modes of proof: he also gives the same lessons, and warmly recommends Christian love towards fellow-disciples, so that, unmistakeably, the same apostle is the author of both productions. To this effect also is the invariable testimony of Christian antiquity. The fact, moreover, is attested by Polycarp, the pupil of John. It is also beyond a question, that the diction of the epistle is fuller of words, broader and richer in repetitions, as might be expected in a composition produced in advanced age. The composition has the form of a treatise rather than a letter, for the apostle does not put his name in the commencement, as was usual in letters, nor does he terminate with a greeting; yet the contents show that the piece is really a letter, for the apostle is well acquainted with his readers, turns to them, and repeatedly addresses them. The persons for whom he intends the letter are Christians, or Christian Churches, in Western Asia, consisting mostly of converts from Paganism (v. 21), among whom the apostle has laboured as a teacher, on which account he often terms them his children (ii. 1, 12, 18, 28, iii. 7, 18, v. 21), sometimes substituting the word “beloved” (iii. 2, 21, vi. 1, 7, 11). The occasion for writing the letter was given to the apostle by the existence of false teachers and deceivers, who were active among his readers (ii. 26, iv. 1). These persons, taking offence at the humbleness of Jesus in his earthly existence, and at his death on the cross, in consequence denied that he was the promised Messiah (ii. 18-26, iv. 1-6, v. 5). Some seem to have taught that Jesus had a body only in appearance, not a real body of flesh and blood (comp. iv. 2, 3), thus agreeing with false teachers of a later day, namely, the Docetæ, who maintained that the Messiah, before his crucifixion, quitted his apparent body, and returned to heaven, while another, namely, Simon of Cyrene, was crucified in his place. These false teachers were also morally dangerous men, who seduced others to a lawless and unchaste life (ii. 26, iii. 7—comp. ii. 11, 16, iii. 4, 6, 7, 15, 17).

Accordingly, the object of the letter is twofold—1, the apostle warns his readers against false doctrine, and entreats them to hold fast the

genuine Gospel respecting Christ, the Son of God, who appeared on earth in a bodily form, and whom he had seen with his own eyes, and handled with his own hands (i. 1-3, iv. 14); and, 2, he aims to confirm them in a holy and loving course of conduct, so that they may obey God's commands, especially by loving one another. The last is obviously the chief purpose of the writer, on which account he constantly recurs to the subject. It is a peculiarity of the letter, that it is pervaded by the gentle fire of love; everything breathes of deep and heartfelt affection. As the letter was specially designed for heathen Christians (v. 21), it contains no quotations from the Old Testament.

It deserves remark, that the Apostle John conceives of the return of Christ as not distant, and regards the appearance of the false teachers as a proof that "the Lord is at hand" (ii. 18, 28, iv. 3). This opinion, indeed, was generally entertained by the primitive Christians, as by Paul (1 Thess. iv. 15-17; 1 Cor. xi. 26, xv. 52), by Peter (1 Pet. i. 7, iv. 7, v. 4), by James (James v. 7-9), by Jude (17, 18—comp. 4), by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. ix. 28, x. 23, seq., 37), and by the author of the Apocalypse (i. 1, 3, 7, ii. 25, iii. 11, xii. 17, xxii. 10). That they erred in this, is shown by the event, which did not take place as was expected by the earliest Church; and the fact is a specially noticeable proof that the spirit of God did not at once give them the full knowledge of the truth, but, as the Saviour himself promised, led them thither, as we clearly see in the case of Paul, who was gradually turned away from his earlier expectation of a near return of Christ (2 Cor. v. i, 8; Phil. i. 23; 2 Tim. iv. 18: Section exiii.).

That the Apostle John was the author of this epistle, is a proposition which does not lie open to the smallest doubt. Nevertheless, one passage in the letter has been proved, and is, by general consent, acknowledged to be, an addition by a later hand. It consists of these words in verses 7 and 8 of the fifth chapter, namely, "in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness on earth." These words, after the full development and distinct formation of the doctrine of the Trinity, were apparently written on the margin by some transcriber, and afterwards taken into the text, for they are not found in the most ancient manuscripts, nor in the most ancient translations. As little are they cited by the ancient Fathers of the Church. In consequence, Luther did not originally admit them in his version of the Scriptures.

The time when the epistle was written falls unquestionably after the overthrow of Jerusalem, consequently towards the end of the first century; for the style, by certain negligencies and repetitions, openly

points to the latter years of the apostle; and as John spent the more advanced period of his life at Ephesus, living there until the commencement of the second century, it is probable that Ephesus was the place where the letter was composed.

Section CXXX.—CHARACTER AND FORMATION OF THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES.

The diction of these two letters is also a sufficient proof that they were written by the Apostle John, for they present turns of phrase and expressions, and other decided peculiarities of John's style; the contents also consist of John's views and ideas, without having the least thing that is not perfectly conformed to John's manner of thought, which is well known to us. The two are private letters, addressed to individuals. In this fact may be the cause why doubts of their apostolic origin arose. Eusebius enumerates them among the disputed writings (iii. 25). The idea seems to have been, that it was not worthy an apostle, like John, to write private letters so small and inconsiderable. Nevertheless, testimonies of a very high value are given to their authenticity by ancient ecclesiastical Fathers. Eusebius, who received them himself as genuine apostolic writings, mentions that many held them to be authentic.

The object of the *Second Epistle* is to exhort Kyria and her children to be steadfast in the true Gospel, and constant in a holy and loving life (4-6); also to warn them against seducers, who denied that Christ had really, and in a bodily form, appeared on earth (7-11).

The object of the *Third Epistle* is to exhort Gaius to continue his hospitable reception of necessitous Christians who travelled into those parts and aided in the diffusion of the Gospel (6, 8, 11), and at the same time to utter a caution against a certain Diotrophes, and to commend to favour a certain Demetrius (12).

Nothing more is known of the persons to whom the letters are addressed. From the second epistle we learn that Kyria's children were known to the apostle, whom he was rejoiced to find walking in the truth (4), and that children of Kyria's sister were residing in the place where the apostle dwelt (13). Kyria, therefore, was probably a member of some Church in Asia Minor. The apostle having, from

her Christian virtues, been led to esteem her, desired by the letter to strengthen her in her virtuous course. At the end he alludes to his hope of being shortly able to see her in person (12).

There is a twofold conjecture respecting Gaius, for two persons of the name are mentioned in the New Testament. With now the one and now the other of these has John's Gaius been identified. One, a companion of Paul, was a Macedonian, and resided at Derbe, in Asia Minor (Acts xix. 29, xx. 4). The other lived in Corinth, was baptised by Paul (1 Cor. i. 14), and entertained him during his second abode in that city (Rom. xvi. 23). Possibly these two may really have been the same person.

We have not the means for determining the time when, or the place where, these letters were written. We may, however, conclude that both were written at the same time, and not long before John's contemplated journey, from the mention made by the apostle of his intention to travel shortly, which is expressed in both letters in nearly the same words (2 John 12; 3 John 13, 14). If to this we add that the apostle in the first letter calls himself "the elder" (1), and that in the second letter (7), he undeniably alludes to the same false teachers that he mentions in the first (ii. 18, seq.), we may seem justified in inferring that the second and third epistles were written after the first, and in old age. Now, as the apostle spent the close of his life in Ephesus, he may there have composed these two brief scriptures.

Section CXXXI.—THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

After an exhortation to a stedfast endurance of various afflictions, the apostle speaks of the right reception of the divine word (i.), of a practical, as being the true, faith (ii.), then of sins of the tongue (iii.), of the lust of gain, pride and selfishness (iv.), and finally of unrepentant rich men, of oath taking, of intercessional prayer, and care of the sick and the erring (v.).

The Apostle James.—There are in the New Testament three persons bearing the name of James. To each of these has our epistle been attributed. These three may be described thus:—

1. *The Apostle James the Elder* was the son of Zebedee and Salome, and a brother of the Evangelist John (Matt. x. 2; Luke v. 10; Mark xv. 40—comp. Matt. xxvii. 56). He, with Peter and John, was on very

intimate terms with Jesus (Luke viii. 45; Matt. xvii. 1, xxvi. 37), and first, of all the apostles, received the crown of martyrdom, being slain in Jerusalem by Herod Agrippa I. (Acts xii. 1, 2). 2. *The Apostle James the Less*, or the Younger, was the son of Alpheus or Cleophas (Matt. x. 3; John xix. 25; Acts i. 13), and of Mary, a sister of Jesus' mother (Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40, xvi. 1; Luke xxiv. 10; John xix. 25). On account of his near relationship to Jesus, Paul calls him "the brother of the Lord," that is, the blood relation of Jesus (Gal. i. 19); for that in this place this James, and not an own brother of Christ, is meant, appears from this, that he is clearly numbered among the apostles, no one of whom is mentioned as own brother to Jesus. 3. *James*, who was really *a brother of the Lord*. In the New Testament four brothers of Jesus are found, namely, "James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas" (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3), who at first did not believe in the Lord (John vii. 5); but afterwards became his disciples (Acts i. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 5). This James, the real brother of Jesus, was, as we learn from Eusebius (ii. 1, 23), surnamed "the Just." He was, moreover, appointed by the apostles the first bishop of the Church in Jerusalem, and was slain a short time before the death of Festus.

That neither the first nor the last of these three persons, bearing the name of James, composed the epistle under consideration, appears from the ensuing considerations:—James the Elder was put to death in Jerusalem in 44, A. D. (Acts xii. 2: Section cv.); but the relations and references in the epistle point decidedly to a much later period as the date of the composition. Among these may be mentioned the already existing misunderstanding of the Pauline doctrine concerning faith (James ii. 14-26), the acquaintance of the author with the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, the persecutions which had already come on the readers of the letter (i. 1-12, v. 7-11), the existence of many Christian communities (i. 1), and the competition for offices in the Church (iii. 1); all which does not at all correspond to the time of the elder James, when only the Church at Antioch was just organised. To this it may be added, that not one ancient Father ascribes our letter to this James. But hardly can the last-mentioned James, who was truly our Lord's brother, have written the epistle. Not the least reason appears in the New Testament for holding him to be its author, since he is never described as a specially prominent confessor and servant of Jesus. Besides, what is said of him by Eusebius, seems to rest merely on mistaking him for James the Less, so that his remarks respecting the brother of Jesus properly belong to James the Less. Probably the mistake was occasioned by the passage (Gal.

i. 19) where the words, "Lord's brother," were applied by Clemens, in Eusebius (ii. 1), to the own brother of Jesus. This substitution became permanent among the ecclesiastical Fathers, and in recent times these two James's have often been substituted one for the other. The epithet "Just," however, very well suits James the Less, as appears from what is said of him in the New Testament, for he was held in very high respect in the apostolic age, and that in Jerusalem. Nor does it oppose his being the author of the letter, that he names himself, not an apostle, but "a servant of God and the Lord Jesus Christ," for so does Paul describe himself in his letter to the Philippians (Phil. i. 1). Of this James, we find in the New Testament the following particulars:—

James the Less, after the ascension of the Saviour, stands in the Jerusalem Church as a highly respected apostle, whose opinion in difficulties decided the question. Accordingly, Peter, when let out of prison, communicates the information primarily to James (Acts xii. 17). Paul, the next day after his arrival in Jerusalem, proceeds at once to James, in whose abode he finds the elders assembled (xxi. 18). In the apostolic council the view taken by James proves decisive (xv. 13, seq.). James is the first of the three pillars of the Church mentioned by Paul (Gal. ii. 9). His position in the Church is also attested by the fact, that certain persons who came from Jerusalem to Antioch are said to have come from James (12). The contents of the epistle, known as that of James, correspond with this elevated position. The substance of the opinion given by James in the apostolic council, was, that converts from Paganism had no need to observe the whole law, yet were bound to "abstain from pollutions of idols, fornication, from things strangled, and from blood" (Acts xv. 20). In regard to Jewish Christians, however, the law, he thought, was not abrogated, but he combined its moral requirements with the true Christian spirit. We find similar views in the epistle. His position in the mother Church at Jerusalem gave him occasion for writing to other communities; so that without bearing a special relation to any, he had the right to instruct, encourage, or rebuke all. When, then, Eusebius reckons this letter among the disputed writings, this is a proof only that the early Church did not know which James was its author.

Character and Formation of the Epistle.—The letter was designed for "the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad," in various parts of the world (i. 1). The word "tribe," as appears from the contents, implies only that the Christian converts addressed, were of Hebrew extraction. The connected circumstance that they were scattered, referring to the fact that vast numbers of Jews were now living beyond

the borders of Palestine, conveyed to the mind of Israelites the idea of trouble, affliction, and persecution, since Palestine was the centre of their affections. The Churches formed out of this scattered Hebrew population did not stand to James in the close relations borne towards their founder by the Pauline communities. In regard to their relations in general, the following information may be gathered from the epistle itself. There were among their numbers many rich and eminent members who were elated at their condition (i. 9-11, v. 1-3, iv. 6), who indulged in severe, unloving, and even unjust conduct towards their fellow Christians (v. 4-6), and who shamelessly gratified their desires (ii. 2, iv. 1, v. 5). They received unseemly preferences even in public worship (ii. 1-9). Christian love, in consequence, was much disregarded (ii. 8, 9, 13, 15, 16—comp. i. 27), and various sins and improprieties were committed (i. 19, seq., ii. 8, 9, iii. 2-18, iv. 1), while externally the Churches had to endure manifold temptations, assaults, and persecutions (i. 11-12, ii. 6, v. 8-11).

The object, then, of the letter is to give strength against these afflictions, to correct moral abuses, and to convey right views of Christian faith.

In regard to the last particular, it has been objected to James that he held, in respect of faith, quite a different view from that of Paul, and, in the well-known passage (ii. 14-26), contradicted the apostle. This, however, is not the case, for he merely opposes the false view of faith that had arisen from the misunderstanding of Paul's view. Paul taught that faith alone, apart from works of the law, justified a man. This was misconceived, as if he intended to represent a mere historical faith in Christ as sufficient, making good works unnecessary and superfluous, whereas, by faith, Paul had always meant a living faith, whence necessarily flowed good works, as good fruit are borne by a good tree. When, then, he rejected works, it was merely such as were thought to merit salvation, and which did not proceed from the right source, the love of God, begotten by faith. In all his letters are found exhortations to true Christian virtue. James, then, is not at all in contradiction with Paul, when he rejects a mere historical faith in Christ, and recognises a living, as the only true, faith, demanding good works as its proper fruits. On the contrary, he is perfectly at one with Paul, only he specially exhibits one side of the doctrine, the exercise of Christian virtues, because it was disregarded; while on the other hand, Paul presents the other side, showing that faith and love are the fountain of goodness and bliss, in opposition to the widely-spread notion of self-righteousness. But that James has reference to Paul's doctrine, and aims to correct the misuse made of it, appears from the fact that he

avails himself of the words and instances employed by Paul (comp. Rom. iii. 20, 28, iv. 1-5; Gal. iii. 6, 11). Luther then was wrong in characterising this as "an epistle of straw," because he did not find therein his great doctrine of justification by faith.

This epistle has its own peculiar beauties. No regular plan, indeed, appears in it. The ideas sometimes follow one another loosely, and the writer passes without points of transition from one subject to another (i. 19, ii. 1, iii. 1, iv. 1, v. 1). Yet the language surpasses all the other writings of the New Testament in the purity of its Greek, in liveliness, and in felicity of expression. It has but few Hebraisms. The following peculiarities deserve notice: 1, an abundance of fine striking images, which, considered altogether, has no parallel in any apostolic letter (i. 6, 10, 11, 23, 24, ii. 26, iii. 2-6, iv. 44, v. 7, 8); 2, an oratorical accumulation of adjectives and verbs (iii. 15, 17, iv. 13, v. 5, 6); 3, a poetic presentation of thoughts (i. 14, 15, iii. 6, v. 1-4).

The epistle must have been written before the fall of Jerusalem (70, A. D.), for it contains not the slightest trace of that calamity; on the contrary, faith in the approaching return of Christ is confidently uttered (v. 7-9), which was connected in time with the fall of the capital. Respecting the place where the letter was written, nothing is known. It may have been Jerusalem.

Section CXXXII.—THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

The letter contains warnings against godless men, and ends with exhortations to its readers to persevere in good.

Jude.—The authorship of the epistle has been ascribed to three persons—1, to the Apostle Judas, called also Lebbeus, or Thaddeus (Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13; John xiv. 22—comp. Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18); 2, to an own brother of Jesus, called Jude (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3); 3, to a brother of the Apostle James the Less (Jude 1). That the Apostle Judas did not write the letter, appears from the fact, that the author clearly distinguishes himself from the apostles (17). Besides, the writer describes himself only as "the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James" (1). In Luke iv. 16, the Apostle Judas is called "the brother of James" (Acts i. 13). Hence, the apostles Judas and

the Jude who wrote the epistle have been identified; but in the passages in Luke and the Acts, instead of "brother," "son" is the more proper word by which to supply the ellipsis. With more probability, therefore, has the own brother of Jesus been accounted the author of the epistle before us; but, if so, it is strange that he should not have described himself as brother of the Lord. This, it is pleaded, modesty kept him from doing, while he spoke of himself with sufficient distinctness when he took the title of brother of James, the brother of Jesus, since James was, as the first bishop of Jerusalem, a well-known and eminent person. But the James who was the first bishop of Jerusalem was probably not the own brother of Christ. It was the Apostle James the Less that held that office in the Jerusalem Church. The author of the letter, then, without being himself an apostle, may have been the brother of the Apostle James the Less; but, from the uncertainty which belongs to the subject, we see how it was that there arose doubts respecting the apostolic origin of the epistle. Eusebius places it among the disputed writings.

Character and Formation of the Epistle.—Those to whom the letter was addressed were Jewish Christians. To this conclusion we are led by the references made to the Old Testament history (5-9, 11), the mention of a prophecy by Enoch, and the employment of such ideas as were peculiar to Jewish Christians (6, 13). It is not, however, to Christians in general that the author writes, but to Christians living in a certain place, in which had appeared the godless men that are mentioned. Conjecture fixes the locality in Asia Minor, Palestine, or Syria. From the epistle, it appears that its readers were in good circumstances (12, 16, 22), and surrounded by a luxurious Paganism (3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 19, 23). Among them there had intruded themselves persons who, by their shameless vices, were very dangerous (4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 18, 19).

The object, then, of the epistle, is to warn the reader against these men, and to recommend a faithful and virtuous life. In order to further his purpose, the writer adduces instances from history (14, 15, 17-19). The similarity of this letter to the Second Epistle of Peter has already been spoken of: the Epistle of Jude is the original (Section cxxviii.). The author of this letter adduces a Jewish legend, namely, the conflict of the Archangel Michael with the Devil for the body of Moses (9). He also takes a passage from the apocryphal book of Enoch (11), which is found among the Ethiopic Christians (14, 15). We here find, too, the Jewish notion of Hades (6, 7), called, in the Second Epistle of Peter (ii. 4), Tartarus. Hence it appears, that we have in this composition the Jewish-Christian point of view, which was spe-

cially suited for its readers, and which is, in part, found in Peter (Section exxvii.).

The epistle was composed before the year 70, A. D., for had Jerusalem been destroyed, the author would have adverted to so great an example of divine justice, since it was specially conducive to his object. There is no intimation as to the place where the letter was written.

Section CXXXIII.—THE PROPHETIC BOOK.

The Revelation of John.—The Apocalypse (*uncovering*) contains, in twenty-two chapters, the conceptions and expectations held in the primæval age of Christianity respecting things that were to precede the return of Christ, also respecting that return itself, the consequent judgment, and the blessedness that was thereafter to commence. All this is set forth in images and expressions borrowed from the prophets. The whole appears to the author in visions, in which he beholds the fate and the completion of the Christian Church.

Character of the Book.—According to the commencement and the termination, the writing is, in form, a letter. The author, who calls himself John (i. 1, 9, xxii. 8), greets his readers with an apostolical greeting (i. 4, xxii. 21), and prefixes the introduction usual in epistles (i. 4). Nevertheless, the substance is not epistolary, but symbolical and prophetic, such as is found in Daniel and Ezekiel, from whom most of the images and expressions are taken. All these symbolical transactions appear to the author in visions, the description of which forms the proper contents of the book. The book is addressed to seven Churches in Asia Minor (i. 4, 11), though it appears to be intended for a larger circle of readers, and specially for heathen Christians (ii. 9, 14, 15, 20, iii. 9). The occasion of the writing was found in persecutions carried on by heathenism against the professors of the Gospel. In Asia Minor, especially, solicitudes arose from such afflictions, and they fired the mind in the hope of Christ's speedy re-appearance. To communicate to his readers instructions on this point, and to comfort and encourage them with that hope, and so to strengthen their faith and love, and to aid them to be firm under their trials—such, obviously, was the great object of the writer. The contents display a well-considered plan and an artificially-elaborated form, in which the Old Testament history is freely used as materials, so that an immediate inspiration of the whole is not to be thought of. Luther said of the book, that "it contained

nothing apostolic, nothing prophetic;" and, "at any rate, there is no trace of its being formed by the Holy Spirit."

The plan of the book is this:—After a heading (i. 1-3), in which the whole is described as a prophecy which an angel brought to John, there follows—1. The dedication to the seven Churches of Asia Minor, wherein it is related how the author had a vision in the Isle of Patmos, in which he saw Christ in his majesty, and received from him the injunction of writing to those seven communities what he had seen. Accordingly, 2. There follow seven minor dedications, one to each of the seven Churches, giving the exact words uttered by the Saviour to the author (ii., iii.). This is the introduction. Then, in order to describe the return of Christ, there follow, 3. Three series of visions, all of which lead on to that great event, and describe the afflictions by which it is preceded. In the first series of visions (iv.-xi.), the author sees God himself in his glory (iv.), having in his hand the book of fate, closed with seven seals, which is given to the Lamb (Christ) to be opened (v.). Christ accordingly opens one seal after another; after each opening, frightful plagues fall on the earth and on men (vi.). Before the seventh seal is opened, Christians are secured against the coming ruin (vii.). At the breaking of the seventh seal, a new succession of plagues is introduced by seven angels, each sounding a trumpet (viii., ix.); but, before the seventh trumpet is blown, the fate of Jerusalem is foretold (x., xi.), when with the seventh trumpet the kingdom of Christ is solemnly proclaimed (xi. 15-19). In the second series of visions (xii. 14), the author, in a new vision, sees how Judaism and Christianity are persecuted on the earth by the devil (xii.), how heathenism and its false prophets deceive man (xiii.), whereon the divine wrath is announced against Babel—that is, Rome—as the chief seat of Paganism, and the reward of the pious, as well as the punishment of idolaters, is intimated (xiv.). The third series of vision again presents, in a new vision to the seer, seven angels, who, from seven vases, pour forth on the earth seven plagues (xv., xvi.). Then are painted Rome's majesty, corruption (xvii.), and downfall (xviii.). Its ruin is brought about by Christ, seated on a white horse, and attended by the heavenly host. Then, under the image of a marriage feast, the kingdom of Christ is proclaimed (xix.). 4. After these preparatory events on the earth, the second coming of Christ himself is painted (xx.-xxii.). In the first place, the devil is confined for a thousand years, and then ensues the first resurrection—the resurrection, that is, of the pious—whereon the devil is loosened for a short time, and raises frightful wars against the holy ones. Then is he for ever cast down into the brimstone abyss, and the second resurrection takes place, in which all the dead are raised and

judged (xx.). Then appear a new heaven and a new earth; the New Jerusalem comes down from heaven, and God himself dwells with men. Thereon is described the majesty of the New Jerusalem, as well as the blessedness of the good therein, while all the wicked are excluded, and are consigned to burnings in the second death (xxi.-xxii. 5). 5. In an appendix, which forms the conclusion of the whole, John assures his readers that all this was showed to him, and will soon take place; when follows a threat against those who add to or take from this prophecy, and a desire for the speedy appearance of Christ is uttered (xxii. 6-21).

This is the substance of that remarkable and wonderful book, which has led to monstrous notions and fanaticism, because men have deserted the only right way of interpreting its contents, namely, the ground of history, and the Jewish-Christian point of view which was held by its author, and have wished to find therein a special prophecy of the remotest events of history, and even things yet to be looked for. Rightly, therefore, does Dr. Lücke observe—"For centuries has the explanation of the Apocalypse been nothing but a rival conflict between error and folly." The announcement made by Christ, of the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the coming end of the world (Matt. xxiv. 25), gave occasion to our author to paint the whole scene under the aid of his Jewish fancies, and materials borrowed from the prophets, especially Daniel. Two things then are necessary for understanding the book—1, a knowledge of the condition of the world at the time, which forms the basis from which the author sets out; 2, an acquaintance with the Jewish expectation of the advent of the Messiah and his universal kingdom. Whilst both these qualifications fail, and what is Jewish in the writer's views and language is held for pure and genuine Christian truth, expositors are led to form and put forth views which mock at all sound and reasonable interpretations, and give an impulse to the most fanatical expectations.

This was the condition of the world in the age of our author—that is, at the time when Christianity was now founded, and by the agency of the apostles had already been spread over a great part of the then known world. The Jewish kingdom was approaching the ruin which was to come from the arms of Rome, whose universal empire was shaken to its foundation by idolatry and crime; yet still the Christians suffered bitterly from their Pagan adversaries. The Roman dominion, held to be Daniel's fourth monarchy, lasted only till the beginning of the Messiah's kingdom. If Rome had fallen, the much-desired Messianic age began; consequently, all the hopes and expectations of our author pass not beyond that limit. With the downfall of Rome, Christ appears, and his everlasting kingdom is begun. The afflictions by

which it is preceded are only the Messiah's sorrows, which, according to the prophets, must precede the advent of Christ. The author paints those afflictions with the resources supplied to him by the fancy of a Judaical Christianity and the symbolism of the Old Testament. In the description of the approaching kingdom of the Messiah, even Pharisaic conceptions mingle with pure Christian elements. To the former belong—1, the entire succession of the events; 2, the double resurrection, first of the pious, then of all men; 3, the imprisonment of the devil for a thousand years; 4, the wars which the devil raises; 5, the earthly glory of the Jerusalem that descends from heaven; 6, the blessedness of the pious here on the earth. Of all this, nothing whatever is taught either by Christ or by Paul; only in the early letters of the latter is there a faint echo thereof (1 Thess. iv. 15, seq.; 2 Thess. ii. 3, seq.; 1 Cor. xv. 23, seq.). The whole, however, was declared and set forth by the Pharisees and the Jewish rabbis, and the author has only so far modified them as to substitute the return of Jesus Christ for the advent of the Messiah, and to describe the happiness of the pious man according to Christian hope. While, therefore, the prophecies of the book, so far as they contain the Christian spirit and Christian truth, will retain their everlasting validity, it is idle to attempt to apply each vision of the picture to historical events, since the non-fulfilment of the separate incidents is obvious to every unprejudiced person, on a comparison of them with history; as, for instance, the actual fall of Rome and of Paganism is wholly different from that which is given in the prophecies thereon found in the Apocalypse. As Christian truth, however, there appear the ideas of the conflict of Christianity with heathenism, of the victorious progress of the former, and the downfall of the latter; and so there remain firm the promises and expectations of the final supremacy of Christ's Gospel in the world, though here, again, minute points find no literal accomplishment. The genuine Christian views and hopes of the writer appear often so pure and so beautiful (ii. 10, iii. 20, 21, iv. 22, 23, xiv. 13), that the book remains of high value in the Church, independently of its historical worth as a witness of expectations entertained respecting the end of all things in the early Church.

The style of the book is peculiar. The spirit of the ancient prophets, pervaded by Christian ideas, gives to the diction a singular archaic tone. The language presents more Hebraisms, grammatical anomalies, and more rudeness of style, than any other book of the New Testament—a fact that may, in part, be traced to the writer's materials, which may easily be discovered in the Old Testament. Thus the throne of God, with the four beasts (iv. 2, 5, 6), calls to mind Ezekiel i. 5-7, 10 (comp.

Dan. vii. 9, 13; Isai. vi.); the song of praise sung by the four beasts calls to mind Isaiah vi. 3; the sealed book (v. 1) calls to mind Daniel xii. 4, 9; the swallowing of the book (x. 8-11) calls to mind Ezekiel iii. 1-3; the sealing on the forehead (vii. 2, 3) calls to mind Ezekiel ix. 4, 6; the measuring of the temple (xi. 1, 2) calls to mind Zechariah ii. 1, 2; the plagues (viii. 6-13, xv.) call to mind the plagues of Egypt. Other instances could be given, but these are sufficient to show how the author lived and breathed in the Old Testament history and prophecy, and how his imagination thence took the shapes and hues of his images.

Section CXXXIV.—CONTINUATION.

Formation of the Book.—It may be considered as fully established by learned inquiry, that the Apostle John did not write the Apocalypse. The testimonies of the ancient Church as to the author are varying and contradictory, for some ascribe, others deny, the composition to the apostle, and that without any distinct historical ground or exact investigation. Consequently, in Eusebius (iii. 25), the book stands with the disputed writings; but the internal grounds against its being written by the Evangelist John are so clear and convincing, that the matter is set at rest for every impartial person. In Eusebius (iii. 18, 20, 23) and Jerome (*De Ver. Ill.* iii. 9) is found, indeed, the legend that, under Domitian, John, in a time of persecution, was banished to the Isle of Patmos, where near the end of that emperor's reign he wrote the Apocalypse, and, under Nerva, returned in freedom to Ephesus. This story rests on the statement of the author, found in i. 9, and is decidedly contradicted by the contents of the book itself; for, according to xi. 1, 2, Jerusalem and the temple are still standing, and are to perish by a predicted earthquake; but, under Domitian, they had long lain in ruins.

These are the internal reasons for denying that the apostle was the author. The views, manner of thinking, and language, are totally unlike those of the evangelist, and the diversity is of such a nature as cannot be explained by a difference of age or subject. We may enumerate—1. A rude carelessness of style, which is not found in John: John's pure Greek is wholly wanting. 2. Peculiarities of John's style in the use of certain particles, constructions, favourite turns of expression, altogether fail, and, instead, there are found other peculiarities and other modes of utterance. 3. The quiet and emotional diction of John fails entirely. Faith, knowledge of the truth, and love, on which

John lays so high a value, and to which he ever recurs, are here not mentioned, or not made prominent; instead, the reader finds commands and threatenings. 4. John shows himself, in his style, a simple and not a learned writer, but the author of the Revelation is full of rabbinical wisdom and skill. 5. Anti-Christ in it appears as a great earthly ruler—in John, false prophets bear the name (1 John ii. 18, seq., iv. 1). 6. In John, there is nothing concerning angels and demons—here they play the first part. 7. According to John, a true happy life begins on earth in belief in the Saviour—in our author, on the contrary, the pious pray for revenge (vi. 10, 11), and are restored to life in the first resurrection, that they may reign with Christ a thousand years (xx. 1-5). From these grounds, every one not blinded by a pre-formed opinion may be led to the conclusion that the Apostle John was not the author of the Apocalypse, but rather some Jewish Christian. The writer calls himself John (i. 1, 9, xxii. 8), but nothing further is known respecting him.

The book was incontestably written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and after the death of the Emperor Nero, for Jerusalem is still standing (xi. 1), and Nero, as the fifth Roman emperor, is dead and his return is expected* (xvii. 10); reference is also made to the persecutions under Nero as having already taken place (vi. 9, xvii. 6). Most of the apostles were dead, for they are represented as with God in heaven (xviii. 20). An exact determination of the time is not possible: contradictory opinions have been advanced on the point. Patmos has been held to be the place where the book was composed, since the writer declares that he had his visions on that island (i. 9, 10), but the words do not state that he put them into writing there. Some place in Asia Minor, as Ephesus, has been assumed, since the contents seem to direct the mind to that quarter, especially the reference to the seven Churches (i. 11), for whom the instruction was specially designed. From this fact, we may infer, with certainty, that the author lived in those parts, and was intimately connected with the Asiatic communities. Still it remains unknown at what particular place he wrote his book: it may have been the Isle of Patmos.

* See the view given in *The People's Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. 127.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY RICHARD KINDER,
GREEN ARBOUR COURT, OLD BAILEY.

Price 10s. 6d.

ILLUSTRATIONS

OF THE

DIVINE IN CHRISTIANITY;

A Series of Discourses

EXHIBITING VIEWS OF THE TRUTH, SPIRIT, AND PRACTICAL
VALUE OF THE GOSPEL.

SUBJECTS.

| | |
|--|---|
| Vestiges of God. | The Divine in Attraction. |
| Ignorance of Divine Power. | The Divine in Impulse. |
| Divine Power in its Mastery over the World. | The Divine in Self-Discipline. |
| The Secrecy of Divine Influence. | The Divine in Conversion. |
| The Divine in Nature. | The Divine in Experience. |
| The Divine in Man. | The Divine in Atonement. |
| Limitations of Human Power. | The Divine in Union. |
| The Divine in Revelation. | The Divine in Largeness of Heart. |
| The Divine in Judaism. | The Divine in Vitality of Will. |
| The Scriptural View of the Divine. | The Divine in Growth. |
| The Divine in the Bible. | The Divine in Spiritual Nutriment. |
| The Divine in Jesus Christ. | The Divine in Christ's Relations to Man. |
| The Divine in Outer Manifestation. | The Divine in Christ's Relations to Man. |
| The Divine in Outer Manifestation. | The Divine Power in Christ. |
| The Divine in Attestation. | The Divine in Qualification. |
| The Divine in Teaching. | The Divine in Reliance. |
| The Divine in Humiliation. | The Divine in Progress. |
| The Divine in Suffering. | The Divine in Providential Operation. |
| The Divine in Pity. | The Divine in View of the World. |
| The Divine in Rebuke. | |

"My appeal is to the universal impressions of the human mind. If they are adverse to the Gospel as found in the New Testament, the Gospel will soon come to an end; but if they, when rightly challenged, give an answer of ready welcome and earnest approbation, then the Gospel is of God, and can never perish."—*Preface*.

"If we could suppose that so able a man as Dr. Beard was an imitator, we might fancy that he had Channing in his eye, when composing these Discourses. But if he fails to reach the sustained elevation of Channing, his Biblical learning enables him to give solidity and practical value to his Discourses, and that is what we miss in Channing's orations."—*Manchester Spectator*.

"These Discourses do more than sustain the reputation of the author. They present forcibly, eloquently, and in a great variety of aspects, the divine element in the character and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. Though popular and unsystematic in form, they possess that unity of thought which shows the leading principles of the writer to be well considered, and harmonised together."—*Inquirer*.

Price 10s. 6d.

A CRITICAL HISTORY

OF

RATIONALISM IN GERMANY.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND EDITION OF THE ORIGINAL
FRENCH OF AMAND SAINTES.

"The last step of Reason is to know that there is an infinitude of things which surpass it. If it cannot reach this point, Reason is very weak. We ought to know where to doubt, where to be confident, where to submit. He who does not act thus, knows not the true character of Reason."—*Pensées de Pascal*.

Price 2s.

SCRIPTURE ILLUSTRATED,

FROM RECENT DISCOVERIES IN THE GEOGRAPHY OF
PALESTINE.

With a Map, showing the different Levels of the Country.

“ In this pamphlet, sacred geography is converted into a valuable branch of Christian Evidence, after the Horæ Paulinæ manner. The student of the historical proof of Christianity will be much gratified in following the steps of the author.”—*British Quarterly Review*.

“ Intelligent and valuable.”—*Nonconformist*.

“ The recent discoveries of Russegger, Molyneux, Symonds, and the late American Expedition, are introduced and ably commented on.”—*Journal of Royal Geographical Society—President's Address*.

Price 2s. 6d.

SCRIPTURE VINDICATED

Against some Perversions of Rationalism.

IN AN INVESTIGATION OF THE MIRACLES, “ FEEDING THE FIVE THOUSAND,”
AND “ WALKING ON THE WATER.”

With a Map of the Sea of Galilee.

“ These treatises are of no common order, especially the latter, directed against the Rationalism of Paulus and Strauss.”—*Nonconformist*.

“ So far as his space admits, the author shows us how entirely in harmony with ascertained facts are the Biblical implications and phraseology, and from the review of the whole case draws the fair inference that the Biblical writers were well-informed and trustworthy men.—The value of these little works is increased by the two excellent Maps which accompany them—one of Palestine, the other of the Lake of Galilee. The former is a little volume of interesting information in itself.”—*Christian Reformer*.

SECOND EDITION.

In Two Vols. 8vo, 1268 pages, price, neatly bound in cloth, £1. 1s.

THE PEOPLE'S DICTIONARY

OF

THE BIBLE,

Profusely Illustrated with Maps and Engravings;

And Comprising

A LIST OF SCRIPTURE PROPER NAMES ACCENTED, AND A LIST OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS BOOKS.

The above Work may be had entire, or in Forty Monthly Numbers,
price 6d. each.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND Co.
AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.

BS514 .S394

An introduction to the book of the Old

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00037 6402